A NEW

HISTORY

OF

Eccleſiaſtical Writers:

Containing an ACCOUNT

Of the *Authors* of the ſeveral Books

OF THE

Old and New Teſtament;

And the *LIVES* and *WRITINGS* of the

PRIMITIVE FATHERS;

An Abridgment and Catalogue of all their WORKS;

Cenſures Determining the GENUINE and SPURIOUS,

A *Judgment* upon their *Style* and *Doctrine*,

AND

The Various Editions of their WRITINGS:

To which is added,

A Compendious Hiſtory of the COUNCILS;

And many neceſſary Tables and Indexes.

Written in *FRENCH*

By *Lewis Ellies du PIN*, Doctor of the *SORBON*,

And *Regius* Profeſſor of Divinity at *Paris*.

VOLUME the FIRST,

Containing the AUTHORS *that Flouriſhed in the THREE Firſt AGES of the CHURCH.*

The Third Edition, Corrected.

LONDON,

Printed for Abel Swalle and Tim. Childe, at the *Unicorn* at the Weſt-End of St. *Paul's Church-Yard*, MDCXCVI.

1696
fo D93
v.1=1696
v.2=1697
v.3=1693
MCALPIN COLLECTION
71953

ADVERTISEMENT

Concerning this

TRANSLATION.

WHEN I first undertook to Reviſe this following Tranſlation, I had no Thoughts of having my Name made ſo publick as it has been ſince upon this Occaſion. Few Men I ſuppoſe will aſcribe it to Vanity or Ambition, ſince the French Language is ſo very common among us, that it is not thought a part of Learning to underſtand it: For though Tranſlating is not always the eaſieſt Employment in which a Man may be buſied, yet the Opinions of Men, by which moſt things receive their Eſtimate, have ſet ſo much an higher Value upon Original Productions, than upon any, even the exacteſt Copies, that it is no wonder if that has been for the moſt part concealed, which, when divulged, would have brought ſo little Credit.

But I am ſenſible that Apologies are tedious things to thoſe who are abſolutely unconcerned: And it will be rather expected that I ſhould acquaint the World with what they ſhall find in this Tranſlation, then either why it was Reviſed by me, after the ſeveral Tranſlators had finiſhed their Parts; or why the Notice of its future Publication ſeemed to have been immediately given by my Order. And here indeed I ought to ſay, that the Book it ſelf, with which the Engliſh Reader is preſented, is a very valuable One. The Doctrines and Practices of the Primitive Church are repreſented with ſo much Candour and Sincerity, that thoſe who are unacquainted with the Wrirings of the Fathers, need not fear being impoſed upon. Our Author is indeed of the Communion of the Church of Rome, and accordingly he does not (as indeed he durſt not) any where conceal his own Opinion; but yet, as long as he never ſuffers the Sorboniſt to break in upon the Hiſtorian, his Writings carry an Authority with them, greater than they could have done had they come from a Proteſtant. Truth, I confeſs, is the ſame, whoever ſpeaks it; yet all Men grant, that it carries a more Convictive Force along with it, when extorted from thoſe whoſe Ingenuity over-bears their Intereſt, than when it freely comes from Men that advance their Cauſe by telling it.

For this Reaſon I have taken as much Care as I could, that Monſieur du Pin's Sence ſhould be exactly preſerved; and therefore, when he cites Authors whom, for Form ſake, he was obliged to call Hereticks, if they are not named with Applauſe, it is not to be wonder'd at.

Advertiſement concerning this Tranſlation.

In ſome few places I have thought fit to interpoſe: But leſt that might occaſion any Confuſion, the Paragraphs are all incloſed in Hooks; which will plainly diſtinguiſh whatever I ſay, from my Author's Words.

The great uſe of Books of this kind is, to form an Idea *in the Minds of thoſe that read them, of that unaffected Piety and Zeal which inſpired the Primitive Chriſtians, and which at laſt ſubdued the whole* Roman *Empire, and made its Princes follow the Banner of the Croſs of Chriſt with Joy and Pleaſure. What a Thing that was, can be but imperfectly conceived from the Writings, and, God knows! much more imperfectly from the Practices of this degenerate Age. The Abridgments of the Books of theſe firſt Chriſtians will be much more effectual to this Purpoſe, than a bare dry Hiſtory could poſſibly have been; for they wrote about Things that their Hearts were full of: And Men who are at all Times ready to lay down their Lives in Defence of any Cauſe, will produce warmer and more moving Arguments to awaken their drowzy Brethren, than can poſſibly come from others that are leſs concerned, becauſe in much leſs Danger:*

If therefore the Reading of theſe Papers ſhall be a Means to incite thoſe that are able to draw from the Fountains in larger Quantities, having found theſe ſmall Streams ſufficiently inviting; and thoſe that muſt take what they Read upon Truſt, to endeavour to live up to theſe great Patterns which are here propoſed to their Imitation, I ſhall have my End; and ſhall think the Pains which I have taken in this Work, not only very well beſtowed, but my ſelf abundantly rewarded.

LIBRARY
UNION
THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY
NEW YORK

W. W.

THE

THE Author's PREFACE.

PART I.

The Reaſon of the Title. An Account of thoſe Authors that have written upon the ſame Subject. A general View of the Deſign of this Work.

THE Name of *Bibliotheca*, or *Library*, is not only given to thoſe Places that contain great Numbers of Books; but alſo to Collections that have been made by ſeveral Authors, and to thoſe Books that Treat of their Works. Thus Collections of the Works of ſeveral Fathers, are called *Bibliothecæ Patrum*: A General Hiſtory drawn out of vaſt Numbers of Hiſtorians, ſuch as *Diodorus Siculus*'s *Bibliotheca Hiſtorica*: A Book that Treats of the Sacred Volumes of Scripture, ſuch as *Sixtus Senenſis*'s *Bibliotheca Sancta*; or rather, *Bibliotheca Sacrorum Codicum*: A Treatiſe upon thoſe Authors who have written concerning Matters of Religion, as this of ours is, *Bibliotheca Authorum Eccleſiaſticorum*: And, in ſhort, any Book that ſpeaks indifferently of all ſorts of Authors, and Writings, compoſed upon different Occaſions, may be called a *Bibliotheca*.

This is not the firſt time that ſuch ſort of *Libraries* have been made: *Apollodorus*, an *Athenian*, a moſt Learned Grammarian, that lived under the Reign of *Ptolomæus Euergetes*, Two hundred and forty Years, or thereabouts, before the Nativity of Jeſus Chriſt, compoſed a *Bibliotheca* of the Original of the Gods; that is to ſay, of the moſt ancient Hiſtory, as it lies diſguiſed under Fictions and Fables. In imitation of him, *Diodorus Siculus*, that lived in *Auguſtus*'s Time, compoſed a *Bibliotheca* of General Hiſtory; which was taken out of an infinite Number of *Authors*. To theſe, we muſt joyn thoſe Authors that have written the Lives of Illuſtrious Perſons; ſuch as *Hermippus*, *Antigonus*, *Satyrus*, *Heraclides*, *Ariſtoxenus*, and *Diogenes Laertius*, amongſt the *Greeks*; and amongſt the *Latins*, *Varro*, *Tully*, *Nepos*, *Santra*, *Hyginus*, and *Suetonius*; who have compoſed the Lives of the Philoſophers, and other Authors.

To deſcend now to thoſe Chriſtians that have made Catalogues of their own Authors: Are not *Clemens Alexandrinus*'s *Stromata* a *Bibliotheca* of the Opinions and Judgments of an incredible Number of Writers? May not the Hiſtory of *Euſebius* be called *a Library of Eccleſiaſtical Authors*? ſince his whole Book is little elſe but an Account of their Lives, a Catalogue of their Works, and a Collection of ſeveral memorable Paſſages. But St. *Jerom* is the firſt of the Chriſtians, that has expreſly treated of Eccleſiaſtical Authors; which Book was Tranſlated into *Greek* by *Sophronius*. *Gennadius* of *Marſeilles*, *Iſidore* of *Seville*, *Ildefonſus* of *Toledo*, continued it down to their own Times. *Honorius* Biſhop of *Autun* made a ſmall Abridgment of theſe four Authors. *Sigebert* of *Gembloars*, and *Henry* of *Ghent*, continued their Books down to St. *Bernard*'s Time. And Laſtly, *Aubertus Miræus*, who publiſhed theſe Authors under the Title of *Bibliotheca Eccleſiaſtica*, continued the Hiſtory of theſe Eccleſiaſtical Writers down to our Times. *Trithemius*, who lived about Two Hundred Years ago, made a diſtinct Book upon the ſame Subject. We ought not to forget the *Roman* Council, held under Pope *Gelaſius* the Firſt, in the Year 494, in which there is a

Catalogu-

Catalogue of the Sacred Books, and of Catholick and Apocryphal or Heretical Authors. Amongſt the *Greeks*, the Learned *Photius* compoſed an excellent *Bibliotheca*, in which he gives a ſhort Summary of the Books that were read; and paſſes his own Judgment upon near Three hundred Volumes of different Authors, that not only treat of Religion, but alſo of *Hiſtory*, *Rhetorick*, *Philoſophy*, *Grammar*, *Phyſick*, *Medicine*, and other profane Sciences. But never was more Induſtry and Labour beſtowed upon all ſorts of Books, and eſpecially Eccleſiaſtical, than has been in theſe laſt Ages, wherein we have revived (if I may uſe the Expreſſion) all manner of Learning and Knowledge, and carried Criticiſm to a Perfection and Heighth that it never arrived to before. The *Roman Catholicks* and *Proteſtants* have ſeemed to Rival each other in compoſing of theſe *Bibliotheca's*. *Eraſmus*, who cauſed ſome of the Fathers to be Printed, writ ſeveral Prefaces and Annotations upon their Works, that contain abundance of judicious Reflections; and though he is ſometimes over-haſty in rejecting ſome particular Books, yet however we muſt own that he opened the Way for thoſe that followed him. Since him, moſt of thoſe Perſons that have obliged the World in publiſhing theſe Authors, have written their Lives, and made ſome Critical Obſervations upon their Works. But to confine my ſelf at preſent, only to thoſe that have written upon Eccleſiaſtical Authors, *Sixtus Senenſis*, in his *Bibliotheca Sacra*, has not only Treated of the Authors of the ſeveral Books of the Bible, but likewiſe of the Commentators too: And ſince there is ſcarce any Eccleſiaſtical Author to be found, who has not writ ſomething or other about the Scripture, he was obliged to ſpeak of moſt of the Fathers, and a great Number of other Eccleſiaſtical Writers. Cardinal *Baronius* alſo, whoſe principal Deſign was, to collect together every thing that had a Relation to the Hiſtory of the Church, in his Annals, has written the Lives of the greater part of the Eccleſiaſtical Writers, and mentioned their Books. *Bellarmine* writ a diſtinct Treatiſe of Eccleſiaſtical Authors, which reaches down to the Year 1500. wherein, after he had briefly taken notice of their Profeſſion, and the Time when they lived, he makes a Catalogue of their Works, with ſome Criticiſms upon them. This little Book is very valuable for the great variety of Things contained in it, but yet it is very imperfect, and his Critical Remarks upon the Works of theſe Authors are not always exact. *Poſſevin*, in his great *Apparatus*, that is diſpoſed in an Alphabetical Order, has ſupplied part of thoſe things that are wanting in *Bellarmine*'s Book An *Italian Maſter of the Sacred Palace*, has made ſome uſeful Reflections and Notes upon ſeveral Books. *Halloixius* Treats very largely of Eccleſiaſtical Authors, but ſpeaks very little of the Writers of the firſt Ages. After him Father *Labbé*, a Jeſuit, compoſed a Book of Eccleſiaſtical Writers, as a Supplement to *Bellarmine*, but it is very imperfect; and he himſelf tells us, that it was only an Extract out of a great Univerſal Library, that he had been preparing a long time: but whether he never liv'd to finiſh it, or for whatever other Reaſon it was, it has not as yet ſeen the Light. I ſhall ſay nothing of thoſe that have made Critical Animadverſions upon theſe Authors ſince his Time, becauſe they have only copied from other Criticks that wrote before them, without adding any thing remarkable of their own. I ſhall likewiſe paſs them over that have Criticiſed upon ſome particular Books; as, *Sirmondus*, *Launoy*, and *Morinus*, upon the Books attributed to St. *Dionyſius* the *Areopagite*; becauſe it will be time enough to take notice of them, when I ſhall Treat of the Books upon which they have Criticiſed.

But we ought by no means to omit thoſe Books which the *Proteſtants* have written upon theſe Eccleſiaſtical Authors, becauſe, though they are full of Errors, Falſhoods and Invectives, and ſometimes Treat the Fathers with little Reſpect; and have beſides, upon falſe Conjectures rejected ſeveral Books which they diſliked, as not being agreeable to their own Opinions, and diſcovering their own Errors; though, I ſay, it muſt be owned, that almoſt all the Treatiſes written by them upon this Subject, abound with ſuch Faults as ought to be abhorred by all Catholicks; yet we muſt do them the Juſtice to confeſs, that for what has a Relation to the Critical part, they have ſometimes ſeen more clearly than the Catholicks themſelves, and have diſcovered ſome Things that we are obliged to acknowledge and approve. The *Centuriators* were the firſt amongſt the *Proteſtants* that ſeriouſly attempted to write the Lives of the Eccleſiaſtical Authors, and to make Critical Remarks upon them; and it muſt be owned, that their Books are very uſeful even to the Catholicks themſelves. *Conrardus Geſner*'s *Bibliotheca*, Abridged by *Joſias Simlerus* and *Friſius*, and augmented by ſome others, is no ill Dictionary of theſe Authors. *Perkins* and *Cook* have publiſhed an accurate Examen of Spurious Books; but they have done it rather upon the Faith of other People, than by their own proper Light. *Sculletus*'s Work upon the Fathers of the Four firſt Ages of the Church, is more conſiderable, not only for ſeveral

Points

Points of Hiſtory and Criticiſm, that are there very ſuccinctly ſet down; but alſo for the *Analyſis*, or the Abridgment of their Writings, which he has performed with great Exactneſs, but in a Scholaſtick Way, and conſequently tedious. *Voſius*'s Treatiſes upon the *Greek* and *Latin* Hiſtorians, Poets and Philoſophers, amongſt whom he has placed ſeveral Eccleſiaſtical Writers, are excellent Things in their kind, and ſhew a great deal of Learning. *Rivet* has taken the greateſt Pains, is the moſt Exact, and has performed the part of a Critick beſt upon Spurious Works; but then his Book is not exempt from thoſe Faults that are common to Proteſtants, as we have obſerved above. I ſhall not mention thoſe that have ſpoken of the Eccleſiaſtical Authors by the bye; as, *Toſſanus*, *Hottinger*, *Aubertin*, *Mareſius*, *Sandius*, and many others: As alſo thoſe that have compoſed particular Treatiſes upon ſome Books; as, *Blondel* upon the falſe Decretals of the Popes, and the Books of the *Sibyls*; *Daillé* upon the Canons and Conſtitutions of the Apoſtles, and upon the Epiſtles of St. *Ignatius*; *Pearſon*, and ſome other *Engliſh*-Men, upon the ſame Letters; *Voſſius* upon the Creeds; *Beveridge* upon the Apoſtolick Canons; *Alix* upon *Tertullian*; and ſeveral others.

There is not one of all theſe Books which we have mentioned, that comprehends all that might be ſaid upon theſe Eccleſiaſtical Authors. Some of them contain nothing, in a manner, but their Names, and a Catalogue of their Works: Others only give a ſhort Account of their Lives, and handle what relates to the Critical Part very ſuccinctly. The greateſt part of them wholly employ themſelves in Examining the Spurious and Suppoſitious Books. *Photius* is the only Man amongſt the Ancients, that has made an Abridgment, and paſſed his own Cenſure upon the Books he mentions; but then the Eccleſiaſtical Authors he treats of are few in Number; and beſides, he paſſes over ſome of them very ſuperficially, and ſlightly. *Sculletus* is the only Modern Writer, who has given the World an Epitome of the Doctrine of the Fathers; but then he ſpeaks little or nothing of their Lives, and has made no Critical Reflections upon their Works, The perplexed manner wherein he treats of theſe Matters, renders him diſagreeable to the Reader: And beſides, he only concerns himſelf with the principal Authors of the Four firſt Centuries. *Halloixius* has wrote upon fewer of theſe Authors; and his Work, which is of a prodigious Bulk, is by no means exact, and he is full of falſe and uſeleſs things. Having thus obſerved the Miſtakes or Failures of all theſe Works, I undertook to make a *Bibliotheca* of Eccleſiaſtical Authors, more ample and perfect than thoſe that have hitherto appeared in the World; and that I might the better ſucceed in my Deſign, I endeavoured to render it as like as was poſſible to what we commonly call a *Bibliotheque*, or *Library*. Thus, as we ordinarily range the Books in thoſe places, according to the Order of their Matter and Time, I have likewiſe in this Work diſpoſed the Eccleſiaſtical Authors according to the Order of Time; and it will be an eaſie matter to reduce them into a Method, according to their Subjects, by the Aſſiſtance of a Table at the End of every Volume. When we enter into a *Library*, the firſt thing we generally take notice of, are the Titles of the Books; and in this *Library* alſo, at the firſt opening of the Leaves, the Reader may ſee the Names of the Authors, and a Catalogue of their Works. But ſince it is not enough barely to conſider the Titles of Books, ſo that we muſt of neceſſity read them over if we would be Learned, I have not contented my ſelf with making a Catalogue of their Treatiſes only, but I have drawn up an Abridgment or Summary of what is contained in them, obſerving at the ſame time what particular Opinions are to be found in their Writings. If in other *Libraries*, you often ſee the Pictures of Great Men and Famous Authors, either Painted upon Cloth, or Engraven upon Copper; here alſo you may ſee their Pictures drawn after a more Lively and more Natural manner; not only in the Hiſtory of their Lives, but alſo in the Judgment that we have given of their Stile, their Spirit, and their Genius. Laſtly, As in great *Libraries* Men are not content with having only one Edition of an Author, but endeavour if they can to procure all, or at leaſt a great part of them; ſo in this, I have taken notice of all the different Editions of Authors, that came to my knowledge, and I have endeavoured to omit as few, as was poſſible: However this *Library* of mine, will contain more Volumes upon Eccleſiaſtical Matters, than any other Collection of Books can pretend to ſhow; becauſe, it not only comprehends thoſe that we now have; but likewiſe gives an account of thoſe that are loſt; the Number, whereof is exceeding great; and then it may boaſt of another advantage wholly peculiar to it; and that is, It helps to diſtinguiſh thoſe Books that are forged, from thoſe that truly belong to the Authors, whoſe Names they bear, which are confounded and mingled together in common *Libraries*. This is the deſign of my Undertaking, a ſmall but very conſiderable part whereof I now preſent

to

to the Publick, which only concerns the Three firſt Ages of the Church; with a Reſolution to publiſh a Continuation of the other Ages (a good Part of which is already done) and ſo to bring it down to our own Times, if God gives me Abilities and Strength enough to finiſh ſo long a Work, and if the Reception it meets withal in the World ſatisfies me that my Endeavours may be of ſome advantage to the Publick. I am not ſo vain as to flatter my ſelf with having performed ſo great a Deſign, as perfectly as it ought to be, whatever Diligence, Pains or Exactneſs I have uſed in the Performance: But this at leaſt, I may venture to aſſert, That of all the Books that have been written upon Eccleſiaſtical Authors, there is none that comprehends ſo many things. If I have failed in my undertaking, I have this to comfort my ſelf, that I have drawn ſuch an Idea of a Work as may employ the Learned a conſiderable time for the Publick Benefit; and if they will be pleaſed hereafter to acquaint me with the Faults which I may have poſſibly committed, or inform me of thoſe things which I have let ſlip, and communicate to me part of their Obſervations, as well upon the Authors that are in this Volume, as upon thoſe that I ſhall examine in the next; I hope this Work will be able to acquire ſome ſort of Perfection, according to my hearty Wiſhes, for the common Benefit of Mankind, the Advancement of Learning, and the Advantage of Religion it ſelf.

PART II.

Some Obſervations upon the Method. An Account of the Deſign of the Work. Rules of Criticiſm laid down.

IT being not ſufficient barely to repreſent the general Deſign of this Work, as I have done in the Firſt Part of the Preface, I found my ſelf obliged to give ſome ſhort Account of the Method I uſed in the Management of it. I uſually begin with the Life of every Author, which I relate as ſuccinctly, and in as few Words as poſſibly I can. For there being two ways of Writing the Life of any Perſon; one by taking in the Moral; the other by comprehending the Hiſtorical Part: I have applied my ſelf wholly to the laſt, as being the moſt agreeable to my Deſign. In the firſt, I ſet down all the Actions of thoſe Men, whoſe Lives I write, and then enlarge upon their Vertues; and make ſeveral Reflections upon their Behaviour and Conduct: In the Second, I only take notice of the principal Circumſtances of their Life, paſſing over thoſe Actions that are purely Perſonal, and that have no Relation to the Hiſtory of their Times, contenting my ſelf with delivering Matters of Fact without a large Examination, whether they were well done or not. After this Manner, I have endeavoured to write the Life of thoſe Authors of whom I have Occaſion to ſpeak, chiefly taking notice of thoſe Circumſtances that concern their Writings, and may ſerve either to illuſtrate them, or to make the Order, Subject, and Occaſion of them known. For nothing is of more Uſe to make us underſtand the meaning of any Author, than the knowing when, and with what Temper he wrote, what Hereticks he oppoſed, what Opinion he deſigned to eſtabliſh; and laſtly, what Condition he was in at that Time. A Biſhop, for Example, writes otherwiſe than a Lay-Man, an *African* otherwiſe than an *Aſiatick*, and a Man under Perſecution, talks in a different manner from one that is at eaſe. An Author that attacks the Hereſie of his own Time, and beſides, has perſonal Conteſts with his Adverſaries, expreſſes himſelf in another ſtrain, than a Man that writes againſt an Hereſie that is extinct, and who has no other ſhare in the Quarrel, or no other Motive of Writing than to defend the Truth: In a Word, we ſpeak and we write generally according to the differen: Motions and Paſſions, with which we are agitated; the Objects that moſt forcibly ſtrike us, repreſent themſelves in a lively manner to our Imaginations, and by that means determine our Tongues and Pens to that ſide. After *Tertullian* was provoked againſt the Church, he never wrote one ſingle Book, wherein he does not fall upon it, and bring in the *Paraclete* of *Montanus*. St. *Cyprian* making it his Buſineſs to ſupport his own Authority and the Diſcipline of the Church againſt thoſe that attacked both, ſpeaks always of the Unity of the Church, and of the Publick Pennance. *Origen*, who was full of the *Platonick* Philoſophy, conſiders all the Principles of Chriſtianity as they have a Relation to *Plato*'s Doctrine.

S. *Athanaſius*.

St. *Athanaſius*, a ſworn Enemy of the *Arians*, never took Pen in hand, but he fell upon them. St. *Auſtin* having the *Donatiſts* and *Pelagians* always in View in all his Writings, and even in his Homilies, talks perpetually of the Church and of Grace. 'Tis the ſame with all the reſt, and if we examine the Matter narrowly, we ſhall find that all Men are made after the ſame ſort, and agree as to this particular. We commonly know by a Man's Diſcourſe what Books he reads, what Sciences he ſtudies, what Religion he is of, what Profeſſion he follows, whether his Circumſtances in the World are happy or not, and whether he is well or ill received by great Men; ſo difficult a Matter is it to conceal our own Opinions, when they have once made a deep Impreſſion within! We offer a Violence to our ſelves when we attempt to conceal them for any time, and ſooner or latter they eſcape from us, notwithſtanding all our Endeavours to the contrary. And this ſhows what a conſiderable Advantage it is to us towards the better Underſtanding of any Author, to be perfectly inſtructed in the Hiſtory of his Life, and to know what Country he was of, in what Times he lived, what was his Profeſſion, his Genius and Inclination, what Hereticks he oppoſed, and what Intereſts he had to manage.

This very ſame Reaſon likewiſe makes us ſenſible, that it is not ſufficient to know in general the Age wherein any Author wrote; but that we muſt alſo, if it is poſſible, find out the exact Time and Year in which he wrote every Treatiſe, and ſo obſerve the Order and Series of his Works; for beſides, that a Man writes otherwiſe when he is Young, than when he is well in Years; it is a certain Truth, that the ſeveral Changes, that happen every day in the Courſe of worldly Affairs, and to every Perſon in particular, often make Men alter their Stile. *Tertullian*, when he was engaged in the Sect of the *Montaniſts*, oppoſes what he had formerly eſtabliſhed. St. *Cyprian* ſpeaks of the Reconciliation of Penitents, according to the different Circumſtances of the Times he lived in; St. *Auſtin*, when he writes againſt the *Pelagians*, ſpeaks otherwiſe of God's Grace and of Free-Will, than he uſed to do before. St. *Athanaſius* when he was under Perſecution, wrote more violently than when he enjoy'd Tranquility. In a word, ſince nothing is ſo changeable as the Mind of Man, and ſince every Accident, that influences it, is under continual Motion, it muſt neceſſarily follow, that an Author will write differently in different Times. It is therefore of infinite Uſe to obſerve, as we have done, the Chronology of any Writer's Works, if we can diſcover it either by Reaſoning, or by Conjecture; and this was more eaſily done in Polemical Diſcourſes, than Treatiſes of Morality. The Characters, that help us to know the Time and Order of their Works, are, 1. The Years of the Emperors, the Names of Conſuls; or laſtly, the Years when any particular *Epocha's* begin, as we find them any where ſet down. 2. The Names of Perſons that are mentioned there. 3. The Citations of the Works of other Authors, or of the Author himſelf. 4. Conjectures drawn from the Stile, the Matters that are treated of, and the Manner wherein they are delivered. I do not explain theſe Characters, becauſe they are ſo eaſie to be underſtood, and becauſe they may be ſo often diſcovered by an infinite Number of Examples in the Book it ſelf.

A Catalogue of the Works of theſe Authors was abſolutely neceſſary: Sometimes I made it ſeparately, and ſometimes, as I had occaſion to diſcourſe of them in a Chronological Order. This Catalogue as well comprehends the Books that we have at preſent, as thoſe that are loſt, whoſe Titles have been preſerved by the Ancients: but this has not been obſerved in the ordinary Catalogues, where they content themſelves with ſetting down thoſe Books only that are to be found in the Editions we now have. I have not ſuffered even thoſe Authors to eſcape me, of whom we have not any entire Diſcourſe remaining. I have made a Catalogue of their Treatiſes, where I cou'd be fully informed of them by any of the Ancients, and I have taken Care to preſerve the Fragments of ſome Writers that are ſtill remaining, and to acquaint the Reader in what Authors and in what Places they are to be found. I have referred what I have to ſay of the Rules of Criticiſm to the End of the Preface, where I ſhall examine them more particularly.

One would imagine that a Summary or Abridgment of theſe Books would prove a long Work, and ſwell the Volume to a mighty great Bulk; yet I have reduced it into very narrow Bounds, and have ſuffered nothing that was of conſiderable Moment, to eſcape me. I have contrived to make it as little troubleſome and tedious as was poſſible, by not always confining my ſelf to the Formality of an exact Method, and without making a ſcrupulous *Analyſis* of their Propoſitions and Reaſonings.

I contented my ſelf with delivering the Arguments of their Books in a few Words. When I met with any conſiderable things either for Doctrine, Morality, or Diſcipline, I carefully took notice of them, and I have alſo drawn out of ſeveral Books thoſe Paſſa-

ges that appeared to be the moſt Beautiful, and thoſe Thoughts that were the moſt Sublime. For the end which I always propoſed to my ſelf, was to give a true Character of the Author I treated of, and to omit nothing that was remarkable, and yet for the Reader's Eaſe, I have done it as ſhort as I could.

After this Abridgment of their Work, I generally give my Judgment of the Stile, and Genius, and Learning of the Author. I don't in the leaſt queſtion but that ſeveral Perſons will be offended at the Liberty I have taken, and that even thoſe who approve my Deſign in the main, will be of a different Opinion from me; for the Judgments of Mankind are ſo vaſtly divided in nothing as in the Cenſures they paſs upon other Men. Every Man thinks he has ſufficient Authority in himſelf to judge another, and indeed every Man judges after his own Way, led by his own Fancy or Humour, without any certain or ſteady Rules.

Hence it follows, that it is almoſt impoſſible to find two Perſons that agree in their Opinions of a Third Perſon, and indeed this Reflection made me at firſt alter my deſign of drawing up the Characters of my Authors, foreſeeing plainly, that I ſhould hereby draw upon my ſelf a great number of Adverſaries. For though the Perſons of whom I ſpeak, have been long ſince dead, yet they have abundance either of Admirers, or Cenſurers, that will appear either for, or againſt them; ſo that whether I commend or blame them, it's all one, and I muſt expect to be cenſured and ill thought of. But afterwards, when I conſidered with my ſelf, that ſince all the World give themſelves the Liberty to judge the Ancients upon all occaſions, juſt as they pleaſe, I thought that no Man ought to condemn me for doing the ſame, after I had careſully read them over, and particularly in a Book where the Subject and Deſign ſeemed to require it; I reſolved to do it however with Moderation, and yet with a convenient Freedom. I don't pretend to oblige any Man to follow my Judgment; neither do I flatter my ſelf that I have always found out their true Characters; I only deſire my Reader not to condemn me inconſiderately, or upon the Faith of another, without having ſo much as read or ſtudied theſe Authors; and I likewiſe conjure him to reſt ſatisfied, that in paſſing my Cenſures, I have uſed all imaginable Exactneſs and Application, knowing that a Man cannot be too circumſpect when he offers to judge others, and eſpecially thoſe Perſons that have left ſo great a Reputation behind them in the World, and to whom we owe ſo much Reſpect.

I conclude with a Catalogue of the ſeveral Editions of thoſe Books, which I have examined with the utmoſt Care and Diligence. I am not certain that I have ſet down all, yet I am ſatisfied that I have mentioned the beſt, and given my Judgment of each in particular. So that any Man may ſee at firſt ſight, which Edition is moſt uſed, and ought to be moſt valued.

At the End of theſe Three firſt Centuries, I have made an Abridgment of the Doctrine, Diſcipline, and Morality of thoſe Times, that whatever is to be learnt in the Authors of thoſe Ages, may be ſeen at one View. This Summary I have compoſed as faithfully and in as ſhort a Compaſs as I cou'd; however I don't pretend to have taken notice of every thing that is to be found in the Authors of the Three firſt Ages upon theſe Subjects, ſince I only deſigned to ſet down the Principal Points, that I might give my Reader a ſmall Idea of them.

Laſtly, There are ſeveral Tables at the end of each Volume, which will not be wholly uſeleſs. The firſt contains a Catalogue of the Authors, in a Chronological Order, where one may ſee the time of their Birth, and Death, and that wherein they flouriſhed. The Second contains a Catalogue of the ſame Authors, in an Alphabetical Order. The Third is a Catalogue of their Works: The Genuine, the Spurious, and thoſe that are loſt. The Fourth, is a Catalogue of their Works, according to the Matters contained in them. And the laſt, is an ordinary Table of the things contained in the Body of the Book.

I have only now to acquaint my Reader, that at the end of each Author, I have added ſome Annotations, that are merely Critical, to make my Book as plain and eaſie as was poſſible. In theſe Notes you will find ſome Illuſtrations and Proofs of the things that I aſſerted in the Text. I was not willing to reſerve them till the end of the Volume, becauſe generally moſt Men do not look ſo far, and ſo never mind them; nor to charge the Margin with them; becauſe they were too long to be placed there, and conſequently wou'd have interrupted the Series of the Diſcourſe. But I have placed them at the end of each Author, where it is an eaſie Matter to conſult them by obſerving the ſeveral Letters that will conduct the Reader, and yet not detain him too long from the Text. Thoſe that are but indifferently skilled in theſe Matters, may, if they pleaſe, paſs over theſe Notes;

Notes; but I would desire those that have a Mind to examine carefully what I have written, to read them along with the Text, because I have often barely asserted several things in the Text, that are justified and proved by these Notes.

I shall leave the Reader to judge, whether this Book may be of an advantage to the Publick, or no; but I think I ought to acquaint him, that the principal End I proposed to my self, was to excite those that shall peruse it, to read the Works of the Holy Fathers; and that whoever imagines himself dispensed with for consulting the Originals by reading my Book, does manifestly pervert and abuse the Design of it. I published it with an Intention to give them a Taste, and not to make them lose their Appetite for the Fathers; and the Abridgment I have made of their Works, was only designed to inflame those that love these things, to go and refresh themselves at the Fountain head. This work may easily inspire Men with a Desire of reading the Fathers, since it gives them before-hand a general *Idea* of their Doctrine and Maxims; but here is not enough to save them the labour of reading the Originals: and let a Work of this Nature be never so well written, yet we ought to read these things in their Originals, where only they are to be found in their Purity, and Natural Beauty. This I thought necessary to premise, before I set down the Necessity and the Rules of true Criticism, and the great importance of them, which I am now going to explain.

Criticism is a kind of a Torch, that lights and conducts us in the obscure Tracts of Antiquity, by making us able to distinguish Truth from Falshood, History from Fable, and Antiquity from Novelty. 'Tis by this means, that in our Times we have dis-engaged our selves from an infinite number of very common Errors, into which our Fathers fell for want of examining Things by the Rules of true Criticism. For 'tis a surprizing thing to consider how many spurious Books we find in Antiquity; nay, even in the first Ages of the Church. Several Reasons induced Men to impose Books upon the World, under other Mens Names. The first, and most general, is, the Malice of Hereticks, who, to give the greater Reputation to their Heresies, composed several Books, which they attributed to Persons of great Reputation; in which they studiously spread their own Errors, that so they might find a better Reception, under the Protection of these celebrated Names. And thus the first Hereticks devised false Gospels, false Acts, and false Epistles of the Apostles, and their Disciples: And thus those that came after them published several spurious Books, as if they had been written by Orthodox Authors, that so they might insensibly convey their Errors into the Minds of their Readers, without their perceiving the Cheat.

The Second Reason that inclined People to forge Books under other Men's Names, is directly contrary to the First; being occasioned by the indiscreet Piety of some Persons, who thought they did the Church considerable Service, in forging Ecclesiastical or Profane Monuments in favour of Religion and the Truth. And this Reason prevailed with some ancient Christians, to forge some Testimonies in behalf of the Christian Religon, under the Name of the *Sibyls*, *Mercurius Trismegistus*, and divers others; and likewise induced the Catholicks to compose some Books, that they might refute the Hereticks of their own Times with the greater Ease. And Lastly, The same Motive carried the Catholicks so far as to invent false Histories, false Miracles, and false Lives of the Saints, to nourish and keep up the Piety of the Faithful. Now, though the Design of these Persons seems to be commendable, yet we ought not, by any means, to approve of the making use of these sorts of Artifices to defend the Truth; which is well enough supported by real Proofs, without the necessity of inventing any false ones. It would be a Shame to call Lying and Falshood to its Assistance, and we must never use such sort of Methods, which Truth and Sincerity will always condemn, whatever good Effects they may pretend to have.

The Third Reason of the Forgery of some Books, keeps a middle Way between those we have already mentioned; for there have been some Persons in the World, that have been guilty of this Imposture, without any other Design, than to divert themselves at the Expence of their Readers, and to try how nearly they could imitate the Stile of other Men. Hence it is, that some Authors have composed Treatises under St. *Cyprian*'s, St. *Ambrose*'s, and St. *Austin*'s Names. But it must be confessed that this Reason has not been near so common as the other two, and that it very rarely prevailed, especially in the Primitive Times. Only in these latter Ages there have been some, who having Vanity enough to over-value their own Productions, have published them under the Name of antient celebrated Authors; desiring rather (as the Abbot of *Bili* says) to appear abroad, and be esteemed under other Men's Names, than to continue despised, and be buried in Darkness, by

writing in their own. And these are the Reasons that may have occasioned the Forgery of Books, Malice, Indiscreet Piety, and the Humors of Men.

But besides these Reasons that have advanced this Trade of Forgery, there are several others that have occasioned the setting Authors Names to several Books, which they never writ. The first, and the most general, is, the Fault of the Transcribers, or Printers, who have frequently set wrong Names in the Title Pages of their Books. And this has happened several Ways; for either they did it to raise the Price of the Copy, or, because they found these Tracts at the End of some other Author, they therefore concluded too rashly that they were done by the same Hand; or through Ignorance and Negligence; or lastly, some not being able to find out the Name of the true Authors, upon the strength of a few feeble Conjectures, have supposed they had good Reason on their side to change it.

From hence therefore, one Book has often carried the Name of several Authors in Manuscript, and this has principally happen'd to Sermons; either because the Transcribers found it their Interst to publish them under the Names of Great Men, to make them more vendible; or because these Sermons, though of different Authors, by being often inserted into the Office of the Church, and divided into Lessons, were so interwoven and confounded one with another, that it was a difficult matter to distinguish them.

A Second Reason of the giving to some Books the Name of wrong Authors, is, because sometimes Men have written Books by way of Dialogue, or otherwise, to which, in imitation of *Tully*, they have given the Names of those Persons whom they have introduced there as Speakers. After this manner *Vigilius Thapsensis* made five Books under the Name of St. *Athanasius*; and perhaps too under the same Name he composed the Creed that is attributed to that Father: Whence it happened, that those that looked upon the Titles of these Books, attributed them to St. *Athanasius*, without examining the Reasons why they carried his Name: As if we should attribute *Tully*'s Books to *Lælius*, *Brutus*, or *Cato*.

Lastly, the Ambiguity of Titles, and the Resemblance of Names, have often contributed to the ascribing of Books to those to whom they did not belong. Two Authors were of the same Name, though perhaps they differ'd in every Circumstance beside; and this has given Occasion to several unwary or ignorant Readers, to attribute their Books to the wrong Persons. This has frequently happen'd; and, to give one remakable Instance of it, the Resemblance of the Names of *Sixtus* the Philosopher, and *Sixtus* the Pope, caused the Sentences that were written by the former to be attributed to the latter.

Having thus discovered the Reasons why we find so many Books attributed to Authors who have no just Title to them, we ought to establish the Rules of true Criticism. 'Tis equally dangerous to be ignorant of them, as to take them the wrong way and mis-apply them; for if we do not know them, we may be easily imposed upon by false Monuments; and if we do not understand them aright, or if we abuse them by allowing our selves too great a Liberty, we may very often reject the Truth it self. This last Abuse has been frequent with many Criticks of our Time, and particularly *Protestants*, who, upon very slight superficial Conjectures, have rejected several Books that are unquestionably ancient and genuine, because they contradict their Doctrine or Discipline. Wherefore we may, in the first place, set this down for a general Rule in these Matters, that we ought always to act fairly, and upon the Square; and that we must lay aside our Passions, or our Interests, and hearken only to our Reason, when we pass our Judgment upon Supposititious or Genuine Books. 'Tis very ill done to conclude that such a Book is spurious because it pinches us, and afterwards to search for Reasons why it may be thought so. We ought, on the contrary, when a Book does not please us, to use more than usual Circumspection to examine the Reasons that make us call it into question; since it is to be feared, that unless we take due Care, the Prejudices we have formed against it may cast a Mist before our Eyes, and make us mistake frivolous Conjectures for solid Reasons. We shall now examin the Proofs and Conjectures that a Man may have of a Book's being spurious, one by one, as they lie: They are either External, or Internal; and both one and the other may be convincing or probable.

The Internal Proofs are those that are drawn out of the Books themselves, which we apparently demonstrate to be supposititious, either by the Time there set down, or by some other Sign, or by the Opinions that are there maintained, or by the Stile wherein it is written. Time is one of the most certain Proofs; for nothing more evidently shews that a Book cannot belong to that Time wherein it is pretended to have been written, than when we find in it some Marks of a later Date. These Marks, in the first place, are, False Dates;

for

for 'tis an ordinary thing for Impoſtors, that are generally Ignorant, to date a Book after the Death of the Author to whom they aſcribe it, or of the Perſon to whom it is dedicated, or written; and even when they do fix the Time right, yet they often miſtake in the Names of the Conſuls, or in ſome other Circumſtances: All which are invincible Proofs, that he that Dated this Book did not live at that time. Secondly, Impoſtors very often ſpeak of Men that lived long after the Death of thoſe Perſons to whom they attribute thoſe ſpurious Diſcourſes, or they relate the Hiſtory of ſome paſſages that happened afterwards, or they ſpeak of Cities and People that were unknown at the time when thoſe Authors wrote; or Laſtly, they cite Authors that wrote and lived after thoſe whom they make to mention them.

The Opinions or Things contained in a Book, do likewiſe diſcover the Forgery of it: 1. When we find ſome Opinions there, that were not maintained till a long time after the Author, whoſe Name it bears. 2. When we find ſome Terms made uſe of, to explain theſe Doctrines, which were not cuſtomary till after his Death. 3. When the Author oppoſes Errors, as Extant in his own time, that did not ſpring up till afterwards. 4. When he deſcribes Ceremonies, Rites and Cuſtoms, that were not in uſe in his Time. 5. When we find ſome Opinions in theſe Spurious Diſcourſes, that are contrary to thoſe that are to be found in other Books, which unqueſtionably belong to that Author. 6. When he Treats of Matters that were never ſpoken of in the Time when the real Author was alive. 7. When he relates Hiſtories that are manifeſtly fabulous.

In ſhort, Stile is a ſort of Touch-ſtone, that diſcovers the Truth or Falſhood of Books; becauſe it is impoſſible to imitate the Stile of any Author ſo perfectly, as that there will not be a great deal of difference. By the Stile, we are not only to underſtand the bare Words and Terms, which are eaſily imitated; but alſo the Turn of the Diſcourſe, the manner of Writing, the Elocution, the Figures, and the Method: All which Particulars, it is a difficult matter ſo to counterfeit, as to prevent a Diſcovery. There are, for inſtance, certain Authors, whoſe Stile is eaſily known, and which it is impoſſible to imitate: We ought not however always to reject a Book upon a ſlight difference of Stile, without any other Proofs; becauſe it often happens, that Authors write differently, in different Times: Neither ought we immediately to receive a Book as Genuine, upon the bare Reſemblance of Stile, when there are other Proofs of its being ſpurious; becauſe it may ſo happen, that an ingenious Man may ſometimes counterfeit the Stile of an Author, eſpecially in Diſcourſes which are not very long: But the Difference and Reſemblance of Stile may be ſo remarkable ſometimes, as to be a convincing Proof, either of Truth or Falſhood.

The external Proofs are, in the firſt place, taken from ancient Manuſcripts; in which either we do not find the Name of an Author: or elſe we find that of another: The more ancient or correct they are, the more we ought to value them. Secondly, From the Teſtimony or Silence of Ancient Authors; from their Teſtimony, I ſay, when they formally reject a Writing as Spurious, or when they attribute it to ſome other Author; or from their Silence when they do not ſpeak of it, though they have occaſion to mention it: This Argument, which is commonly called a Negative one, is oftentimes of very great weight. When, for example, we find, that ſeveral entire Books which are attributed to one of the Ancients, are unknown to all Antiquity: When all thoſe Perſons that have ſpoken of the Works of an Author, and beſides, have made Catalogues of them, never mention ſuch a particular Diſcourſe: When a Book that would have been ſerviceable to the Catholicks, has never been cited by them, who both might, and ought to have cited it, as having a fair Occaſion to do it, 'tis extreamly probable that it is ſuppoſititious. It is very certain, that this is enough to make any Book doubtful, if it was never cited by any of the Ancients; and in that Caſe, it muſt have very authentick Characters of Antiquity, before it ought to be received without Contradiction. And on the other hand, if there ſhould be never ſo few Conjectures of its not being Genuine, yet theſe, together with the Silence of the Ancients, will be ſufficient to oblige us to believe it to be a Forgery.

Theſe are the Rules of Criticiſm, by which we diſtinguiſh Falſe and Spurious Works from thoſe that are Genuine. As I ſaid before, ſome of theſe Rules are convincing, and ſome are only probable; the Internal Proofs are generally more certain than the External; and amongſt theſe, the poſitive Teſtimony of Authors is the moſt preſumptive and ſtrong. But it may be ſaid, that all of them are ſometimes more, and ſometimes leſs convincing and probable; and that the Sovereign Rule is, the Judgment of Equity and Prudence; according

according to which we ought to balance the Reaſons of one Side and the other, and conſider all the Conjectures that can be brought for or againſt it. For it often happens, that although every Conjecture, conſider'd apart, does not ſeem to bear any conſiderable weight, yet when they are all joined together, they make the thing almoſt morally certain. I have brought no Examples to explain all theſe Rules that I have ſet down; for, beſides that they are ſufficiently clear and intelligible of themſelves, it is impoſſible to read in any Pages of my Book, without finding them applied upon all occaſions.

Before I conclude my Preface, I am oblig'd to make ſome kind of Anſwer to thoſe who have been pleaſed to Declare, that they ſhould have been better ſatisfied if I had wrote my Book in *Latin*. Some Perſons have been of that Mind, becauſe they have a greater Value for *Latin*, ſince it has laſted longer, and is more currant in Foreign Countries: Others take it ill that I have publiſhed thoſe things in *French*, which, as they pretend, ought only to be underſtood by Divines. Theſe Men have told me, That they could not endure to ſee Women and ignorant People learn the moſt curious Parts of Divinity: And that it might prove of dangerous Conſequence, to inſtruct them throughly in the Doctrine of the Fathers.

As for the Firſt, I ſhall take care to ſatisfie them, by Tranſlating my Book into *Latin* ſome time or other, if the Publick ſhall think it worth being preſerved.

For the Others; As their Complaint is unreaſonable, ſo I never ſaw any good Reaſons to hinder my publiſhing it in *French*: For when the Fathers themſelves wrote, they made uſe of a Language that was underſtood by all the World: and we live at preſent in an Age, wherein great Numbers of their Books have been Tranſlated with applauſe. No Man therefore ought to take it ill, that I publiſh an Abridgment of their Doctrine to all the World: On the contrary, It were to be wiſhed, that every Chriſtian could be inſtructed in theſe Matters, that they might be the better confirmed in their Belief, when they ſee that this Doctrine has been always taught in the Church of *JESUS CHRIST*, who is the Pillar and Ground of the Truth.

THE

THE CONTENTS OF THE First Volume.

PREFACE.

PRELIMINARY DISSERTATION.

Sect. I. *Of the Authors of the several Books of the Old Testament.* Pag. 1.

Sect. II. *Of the Canonical Books of the Old Testament, of Books Doubtful, Apocryphal, and Lost, that belong to the Old Testament.* 26

Sect. III. *The History of the* Hebrew *Text; of the Version of the* Septuagint, *and other* Greek *Versions of the Old Testament.* 35

Sect. IV. *Of some Authors, whose Works have a relation to the Old Testament;* viz. Philo, Fl. Josephus, Justus, Aristeas, Aristobulus, Josephus Bengorion, Berosus, *the false* Dorotheus, Zoroaster, &c. 41

Sect. V. *Concerning the Authors of the Books of the New Testament.* 43

Sect. VI. *Of the Canon of the Books of the New Testament; and particularly, of those Books that were formerly doubted of* 49

An Account of the Lives and Writings of the Primitive Fathers, *&c.*

Of the Letter falsly supposed to be sent by Jesus Christ *to King* Agbarus, *and of that of* Agbarus *to* Jesus Christ. Pag. 1

Of some Letters falsly attributed to the Virgin Mary. 2

Of the Counterfeit Gospels. 3

Of the Counterfeit Acts of the Apostles, and of the false Revelations. 4

Of the Epistle to the Laodiceans, *and some others attributed to St.* Paul. 5

Of the Epistle of St. Barnabas. 6

Of the Liturgies that are falsly attributed to the Apostles. 8

Of the Apostles Creed. 9

Of the Canons and Constitutions attributed to the Apostles. 13

Of the several Books attributed to Prochorus, Linus *and* Abdias; *of the Acts of the Passion of St.* Andrew. 16

Of the Books of the Sibyls, Mercurius Trismegistus, *and* Hystaspes; *Of the Letters of* Lentulus *and* Pilate, *concerning* Jesus Christ; *of the Epistles of* Seneca *to St.* Paul; *and of a Passage in the History of* Josephus, *concerning* Jesus Christ. Pag. 17

Hermas. 26

St. Clemens Romanus. 27

St. Dionysius *the* Areopagite. 31

S. Ignatius. 35

St. Polycarp. 44

Papias. 46

Quadratus *and* Aristides. 48

Agrippa. ibid.

Hegesippus. ibid.

St. Justin *the Martyr.* 50

Melito. 55

Tatian. ibid.

Athenagoras *and* Hermias. 56

Theophilus *Bishop of* Antioch. ibid.

Apollinarius *of* Hierapolis. 57

Dionysius *of* Corinth. ibid.

Pinytus, Philippus, Modestus, Musanus, *and* Bardesanes. 58

St. Irenæus. ibid.

Victor, Polycrates, Theophilus *of* Cæsarea, *and* Bachillus *of* Corinth. 61

Several Writers, of whom nothing remains, and who were little known amongst the Ancients. ib.

Serapion *of* Antioch. ibid.

Rhodon. ibid.

Pantæus. ibid.

St. Clemens Alexandrinus. 62

Miltiades; *the two* Apolonii; *and the two Anonymous Authors, who wrote against the Heresies of* Montanus *and* Artemo. 66

Tertullian. 69

Caius. 86

Hippolytus. 87

Geminianus, *or* Geminus. 90

Alexander. ibid.

Julius Africanus. 91

Minutius Fœlix. 92

Ammonius. 95

Origen. 96

Ambrose

The Contents of the First Volume.

Ambrose *and* Tryphon, *Disciples of* Origen. Pag. 116.
Beryllus. ibid.
St. Cyprian. 117
Pontius. 144
Cornelius. ibid.
Novatian. 145
St. Martialis. 146
Sixtus. 147
Gregory Thaumaturgus. ibid.
St. Denys *of* Alexandria. 149
Theognostus. 153
Athenoges. 154
Denys *Bishop of* Rome. ibid.
Malchion. ibid.
Archelaus. 155
Anatolius. ibid.
Victorinus. ibid.
Pierius. 156
Methodius. ibid.
Pamphilius. 161
Lucian. ibid.
Phileas. 162
Zeno *of* Verona. ibid.
Arnobius. 163
Lactantius. 165
Commodianus. 169
Julius Firmicus Maternus. 170

Of the Councils held in the Three First Ages of the Church. 171
Of the false Decretals attributed to the first Popes. 173
Abridgment of the Doctrine, the Discipline, and the Morals of the Three First Ages of the Church. 178

A Chronological Table of the Authors of the Old Testament.
A Chronological Table of the Authors of the New Testament.
A Chronological Table of the Ecclesiastical Authors treated of in this Volume.
A Table of the Books, Canonical, Apocryphal, and Lost, which belong to the Old Testament.
A Table of the Books that belong to the New Testament.
A Table of all the Works of the Authors treated of in this Volume; shewing which are Genuine, which Spurious, and which Lost.
A Table of the Works of the Authors disposed in the Order of Matters on which they treat.
An Alphabetical Table of Authors Names.
An Index of the Principal Matters.

A PRELI.

A Preliminary Diſſertation ABOUT THE AUTHORS OF THE BIBLE.

SECT. I.

Of the Authors of the Books of the Old Teſtament.

OF all thoſe (*a*) Paradoxes, that have been advanced in our Age, there is none, in my Judgment, more raſh and dangerous than the Opinion of thoſe, who have preſumed to deny, that *Moſes* was the Author of the *Pentateuch*: For what can be more raſh than to deny Matter of Fact, that has been eſtabliſhed by expreſs Texts of Holy Scripture (*b*), by the Authority of Jeſus Chriſt (*c*), by the Conſent of all Nations (*d*) and by the Authentick Teſtimonies of the moſt Ancient Authors (*e*)? And what can be more dangerous, than to bid Defiance to Antiquity, and conſequently deſtroy the Authority of thoſe Books, which are, as it were, the very Foundations of our Religion (*f*)? And yet this they do, who dare affirm that the Books of the *Pentateuch* are not written by *Moſes*, and endeavour to prove it by ſuch weak Conjectures, that 'tis impoſſible for a Man of tolerable ſenſe to be convinced by them (*g*). For, allowing all that they alledge were true, (*h*) they could only prove, the ſame thing has happen'd to the Books of *Moſes*, which has happen'd almoſt to all the Books of Ancient Authors, *viz.* That ſome few Words, Names and Terms have been altered or added to render the Narrative more intelligible to thoſe that lived in the following Ages. For example: We find the Ancient Names of Cities are ſometimes changed for thoſe they received afterwards, becauſe they would have been no longer known by their Ancient Appellations. There are likewiſe ſome ſhort Explications inſerted into theſe Sacred Books, to illuſtrate what was ſaid by the Author: And, in ſhort, ſome neceſſary Paſſages have been added to compleat the Hiſtory. Theſe things are common, and we find Examples of it in the Books of *Homer*, *Herodotus*, and almoſt all the Ancient Hiſtorians, and yet no Body is inclined for all this to reject their Books, as if they did not belong to thoſe whoſe Names they bear. Why then ſhould we not ſay the ſame thing of the Books of the *Pentateuch*, which have been more conſtantly aſſigned to *Moſes*, than the Poems of the *Iliads* or the *Odyſſes* to *Homer*, or the Hiſtories of *Herodotus* and *Thucydides* to thoſe by whoſe Names they are known? Let us examine all the Reaſons that are alledged againſt the Antiquity of the *Pentateuch*, ſince they imagine they are unanſwerable, (which yet is very falſe, as we ſhall make appear in theſe following Diſcourſes) and we ſhall ſee they only prove that ſome Names of Cities or Countries are changed, ſome few Words inſerted to explain ſome Difficulties; and laſtly, that the account of *Moſes*'s Death has been put in ſince, which was but neceſſary to finiſh the Hiſtory of the *Pentateuch*. We ought

 therefore

therefore to affirm it for a certain Truth, That *Moſes* was the Author of the firſt Five Books of the *Bible*, called the *Pentateuch*.

There are given to each of theſe Five Books, (which have their Names in *Hebrew* from the firſt Word in each Book) there are given 'em, I ſay, ſuch Names as have a relation to the Subject. The firſt is called *Geneſis*, becauſe it begins with the Hiſtory of the Creation of the World. It contains beſides that the Genealogy of the Patriarchs, the Hiſtory of the Flood, a Catalogue of the Deſcendants of *Noah* down to *Abraham*, the Life of *Abraham*, of *Jacob* and *Joſeph*, and the Hiſtory of the Poſterity of *Jacob* down to the Death of *Joſeph*. So that this Book comprehends the Hiſtory of 2369 Years, or thereabouts, following the account of the Years of the Patriarchs, as we find them in the *Hebrew* Text.

The Second is called *Exodus*, becauſe the principal Subject of it is the Departure of the Children of *Iſrael* out of *Egypt*, and all that paſſed in the Wilderneſs under *Moſes*'s Conduct, for an Hundred forty five Years, *viz.* from the Death of *Joſeph*, to the Building of the Tabernacle. We find there a Deſcription of the Plagues wherewith *Egypt* was afflicted; an Abridgment of the Religion and Laws of the *Iſraelites*; together with the Admirable Precepts of the *Decalogue*.

The third is called *Leviticus*, becauſe it contains the Laws, the Ceremonies, and Sacrifices of the Religion of the *Jews*: All which has a particular Relation to the Levites, to whom God gave the charge of all thoſe things that concern'd the Ceremonial part of that Religion.

The fourth is called *Numbers*, becauſe it begins with the Numbring of the Children of *Iſrael* that came out of *Egypt*, and concludes with the Laws that were given the People of *Iſrael* during the Thirty nine Years of their ſojourning in the Wilderneſs.

Deuteronomy, that is to ſay, the ſecond Law, is ſo called, becauſe it is, as it were, a Repetition of the firſt: For after *Moſes* has deſcribed in a few Words the principal Actions of the *Iſraelites* in the Wilderneſs, he recites abundance of the Precepts of the Law.

(*i*) We don't certainly know when theſe Books were compoſed by *Moſes*, or which was firſt written: However, 'tis very certain, that *Deuteronomy* was written laſt, in the Fortieth Year of the Departure out of *Egypt*, and a little before the Death of *Moſes*.

We can't ſo certainly tell who are the Authors of the other Books of the *Bible*: Some of 'em we only know by Conjecture, and others there are of which we have no manner of Knowledge.

It is not certain that the Book of (*k*) *Joſhuah* was written by himſelf; for as it is obſerved by the Author of the Abridgment of the Scripture attributed to St. *Athanaſius*, this Title is ſet at the Head of that Books not ſo much to diſcover the Author, as to make the Subject of it known; becauſe it treats of War, and other things that happen'd under the Conduct of *Joſhuah*, after the ſame manner as the Books of *Judges*, of *Kings*, of *Tobit*, of *Judith*, are ſo called, becauſe they give an Account of the Lives and Actions of thoſe whoſe Names they bear. But though 'tis commonly believed that this Book was written by *Joſhuah*, and this Opinion ſeems to be countenanced by ſome Words of the laſt Chapter, where it is ſaid that *Joſhuah wrote all theſe things in the Book of the Law*: Nevertheleſs we muſt affirm, that 'tis certain, that *Theodoret*, and ſome others among the Ancients, are not of this Opinion, and that we have Reaſons ſtrong enough to make us doubt whether he is the Author or no. However it is, 'tis a moſt unqueſtionable Truth, that this Book is ancient, and that if it is not *Joſhuah*'s, it was written either by his particular Order, or a little after his Death. It carries the Hiſtory of the People of *Iſrael* Seventeen Years beyond the Death of *Moſes*, or thereabout.

We yet know leſs of the Author of the Book of *Judges*. Some with the *Talmudical* Doctors attribute it to *Samuel*, ſome to *Hezekiah*, others to *Ezrah*. In ſhort, ſome Perſons are of Opinion, that every Judge wrote his own Memoirs, which were afterward collected by *Samuel* or *Ezrah*. Be it as it will, the Book is certainly ancient, and (*l*) admit it was put into the condition we now find it by *Ezrah*, yet we cannot reaſonably queſtion its being compoſed from ancient Memoirs. It contains the Hiſtory of what happen'd to the *Iſraelites* from the Death of *Joſhuah*, to that of *Sampſon*. We cannot preciſely tell what Number of Years it takes in, though 'tis commonly fixed to ſomething above 300 Years.

The Book of *Ruth* is a kind of an Appendix to the Book of *Judges*, which is the reaſon why the *Jews* made but one Book of theſe two, and for the ſame reaſon 'tis commonly believed that one Author compoſed both. 'Tis certain, that the Hiſtory of *Ruth* comes up to the times of the Judges, but we don't know the time exactly. We may aſſign it to the time of *Samgar*, Eight and twenty Years, or thereabouts, after the Death of *Joſhuah*.

The two firſt Books of *Kings* are called by the *Hebrews* the Book of *Samuel*, which has occaſioned the Opinion that they were in part written by that Prophet (*m*); that is to ſay, that he compoſed the Four and twenty firſt Chapters, and that the Prophets, *Gad* and *Nathan* afterwards compleated the Work. This is the Opinion of the *Talmudiſts* and *Iſidore*, and is founded upon theſe Words of the *Chronicles*, 1 Chron. 29.29. *Now the Acts of* David *the King, firſt and laſt, behold they are written in the Book of* Samuel *the Seer, and in the Book of* Nathan *the Prophet, and in the Book of* Gad *the Seer*. *Theodoret* and *Diodorus* of *Tarſus* ſeem to be of this Opinion, when they ſay, that it was the cuſtom of all Prophets amongſt the *Hebrews* to write down whatever happen'd in their time; and that upon this ſcore it is, that the firſt Book of *Kings* is called the Propheſie of *Samuel*. Others pretend that theſe Books are of a later date, becauſe we find ſome ways of ſpeaking there which don't belong to that time, but perhaps they were added ſince; and it is very probable that both theſe Books are very ancient.

However, 'tis certain that they were written before the *Chronicles*. The firſt of theſe two Books of *Kings* contains that which paſſed under the Government of *Eli* of *Samuel*, and under the Reign of *Saul*:

The

The ſecond, is the Hiſtory of *David*'s Government. The two laſt Books of *Kings*, contain the Hiſtory of the Reign of *Salomon* Son of *David*, and afterwards the Reigns of the ſeveral Kings of *Iſrael*, and *Judah*, down to the Deſtruction of *Iſrael*, and the Captivity of *Judah*. We don't know who is the Author of theſe two Books. Some, as the *Talmudiſts* for inſtance, attribute them to *Jeremiah*, others to *Iſaiah*, and the greateſt part to *Ezrah*. 'Tis a Collection, or an Hiſtorical Abridgment drawn out of ſeveral Memoirs and Books of the Prophets, which are there frequently quoted. Theſe Four Books of *Kings* contain the Hiſtory of almoſt Six hundred Years.

The two Books of *Chronicles* are called *Paralipomena* by the *Greeks*, becauſe they contain ſome Circumſtances that were omitted in the other Hiſtorical Books. The *Hebrews* call them *Diaries*, and St. *Jerom Chronicles*. 'Tis commonly believed that *Ezrah* wrote them, and that he drew this Abridgment partly from thoſe Books of the *Bible* which we have, and partly from other Memoirs that he had at the time of his writing. St. *Jerome* thinks that this was the Book that is cited in the Book of *Kings*, under the Name of *The Book of the Sayings of the Kings of* Judah. But 'tis evident that it is not, and that the Book of *Chronicles* was written ſince that of *Kings*, as we prove by the laſt Words of that Book, where mention is made of the Deliverance of the *Jews* by *Cyrus*.

'Tis commonly believed that it was *Ezrah*, who compoſed the firſt Book of thoſe that carry his Name; and indeed *Ezrah* ſpeaks there in his own Perſon (*n*) *Huetius* pretends that the firſt Chapters of that Book were written by another Author, but his Conjecture is not ſtrong enough to make us quit the common Opinion (*o*). The ſecond Book belongs to *Nehemiah* without queſtion (*p*), for he declares himſelf the Author of it in the beginning of the Book, and always ſpeaks of himſelf in the firſt Perſon. The firſt of theſe two Books contains the Hiſtory of the Deliverance of the *Jews* from their Captivity, and their Re-eſtabliſhment in *Judea* from the firſt Year of *Cyrus*, to the twentieth of *Artaxerxes Longimanus*, for 82 or 83 Years. And the ſecond begins from the twentieth Year of the aforeſaid *Artaxerxes*, and reaches to the Reign of *Darius* his Son, Sirnamed the *Baſtard*, which comprehends the Hiſtory of the *Jews* for thirty or one and thirty Years.

'Tis commonly believed, that *Tobit* and *Tobias* wrote their own Hiſtory themſelves (*q*): But this Opinion is very uncertain. 'Tis generally believed that this Book was at firſt writ in *Chaldee*, that Saint *Jerom* tranſlated it into *Latin*, and that this Hiſtory was afterwards put into *Hebrew*. There are two different *Hebrew* Editions of it, one ſet out by *Munſter*, and the other by *Fagius*. There is alſo an ancient *Greek* Edition, out of which the *Syriac* Verſion was compoſed. *Tobit* was one of the *Iſraelites* that were carried out of *Samaria* by King *Shalmanezer*.

The Author of the Book of *Judith* is yet leſs known, as *Iſidore* has obſerved. Some believe it was written by *Eliachim*, or *Joachim* High Prieſt of the *Jews*, of whom mention is made in that Book: Others ſay it was *Joſhuah* the Son of *Joſedec*, the Companion of *Zorobabel*: Others in ſhort, maintain that it was not written till the time of *Antiochus Epiphanes*, before the *Maccabees* time. 'Tis written in *Chaldee*, and that has made *Huetius* think that it was written during the *Babylonian* Captivity. Saint *Jerom* tranſlated it into *Latin*, rather following the Senſe, as he tells us, than the bare Letter. The *Greek* Verſion which we have is very different from the *Latin*, and ſeems to be more literal. The time wherein the Hiſtory mention'd in this Book did happen, is no leſs uncertain (*r*). Some place it before the Captivity, others after, and ſome have the boldneſs to ſay, That whatever is in this Book, is only a Parable and Allegory, that has nothing of Hiſtorical Truth in it.

The time, and the Author of the Hiſtory of *Heſter*, are alſo very uncertain (*ſ*). St. *Epiphanius*, St. *Auſtin*, and St. *Iſidore*, attribute this Book to *Ezrah*. Others to *Joachim* High Prieſt of the *Jews*, Grand-Son of *Joſedec*. Moſt Men ſay that *Mordecai* wrote it (*t*), who is ſo often mentioned in it. The *Talmudiſts* attribute it to the Synagogue. The ſix laſt Chapters, that are found in the *Greek*, are not in the Original *Hebrew*. *Origen*, in his Letter to *Africanus*, believes it was loſt. *Grotius* pretends that theſe Chapters were compoſed by the *Greek* Proſelytes. *Sixtus Sinenſis* ſays they were taken out of *Joſephus*. *Bellarmine*, and ſome others, maintain, that there are two *Hebrew* Editions of this Book, one larger than the other, where theſe laſt Chapters are found, and the other the ſame with what we have. Some ſay the Hiſtory of *Heſter* happen'd under *Darius* the Son of *Hyſtaſpes*; others place it under *Xerxes*; and laſtly, there are ſome who place it under *Ciaxares* King of the *Medes*. The firſt Opinion ſeems to be moſt probable.

The time wherein *Job* lived, is yet more difficult to diſcover; and the Author of the Book, who has compiled his Hiſtory, is no leſs unknown (*u*). Some, as *Origen*, St. *Gregory*, and *Suidas*, attribute it to *Job* himſelf: Others believe that *Moſes* was the Author of it, or that he tranſlated it into *Hebrew*. St. *Gregory Nazianzen* attributes it to *Salomon*; others to *Iſaiah*, or to ſome one of the Prophets. All theſe Opinions are built but upon very ſlight Conjectures. Wherefore 'tis better in my Opinion, to ſuſpend ones Judgment, than to aſſert any of the above-mentioned Opinions that are equally uncertain. But at the ſame time we muſt not fall into the oppoſite Error, by ſaying with the *Talmudiſts*, and ſome other Criticks, that the Hiſtory of *Job* is an entire continued Fiction (*x*). The Perſons and Nations that there are called by their proper Names, the Teſtimonies of *Tobit*, of *Ezekiel*, and St. *James*, with the Opinions of the Ancient Fathers, ought to convince us that the Foundation of this Hiſtory is real and true. But the manner wherein 'tis related, the Converſation that is held with the Devil, the Prolixity of the Diſcourſes of *Job*'s Friends, and of what *Job* himſelf delivered in his miſerable eſtate, ought to make us acknowledge, that this Hiſtory is mightily amplified and adorned with ſeveral feigned Circumſtances, to render the Story more uſeful and agreeable. 'Tis commonly believed that *Job* lived before *Moſes*, or at leaſt in his time, and that the Hiſtory related in this Book happen'd during the time when the *Iſraelites* were in the Deſert, becauſe there is not a Word ſpoken there about

the Written Law. Some there are who make *Job* to deſcend from *Nahor*, the Brother of *Abraham*, but (*yy*) others from *Eſau*. The laſt Opinion ſeems to me to be the moſt probable, becauſe 'tis ſupported by the Authority of a very ancient Addition, which is to be found at the end of the *Greek* Edition of the Book of *Job*.

Though the *Pſalms* are commonly called *The Pſalms of David*, or rather *The Book of the Pſalms of David*; yet 'tis certain, as St. *Jerom* has obſerved in many places, that they are not all of 'em his (*aa*), and that there are ſome of them which were written long after his Death. 'Tis therefore a Collection of Songs that was made by *Ezrah*. It is a difficult matter to ſay who are the Authors (*bb*), and to diſtinguiſh thoſe that were made by *David*, from thoſe that were compoſed by others. But whoever were the Author, 'tis certain, as *Theodoret* has judiciouſly obſerved, that they were compoſed by Perſons inſpired by God, and that they are cited under that Character both in the Old and New Teſtament (*cc*).

The Authors of the following Books are better known; the *Proverbs* or Parables belong to *Salomon*, whoſe Name is written in the beginning of that Book, *The Proverbs of Salomon the Son of David*. 'Tis obſerved in the 25th Chapter, that the following Parables are ſtill *Salomon*'s, but that they were collected by ſome Perſons choſen by the King *Hezekiah*. *Theſe are alſo the Proverbs of Salomon, which the Men of Hezekiah King of Judah copied out*. The 30th Chapter begins with theſe Words. *The Words of Agur the Son of Jakeh*, which ſhew that this Chapter is an Addition made to the *Proverbs* of *Salomon* by one *Agur*, as is eaſie to be proved, becauſe this Chapter is entirely ſeparated from the reſt, and beſides is written in another Style. In ſhort, the laſt Chapter is entituled *The Words of King Lemuel*. We ought therefore to conclude, from what has been ſaid, that the 24 firſt Chapters are *Salomon*'s Originally, that the five following ones are Extracts or Collections of his *Proverbs*, and that the two laſt Chapters were added afterwards.

The Book of *Eccleſiaſtes* is aſcribed to *Salomon* by all Antiquity: And yet the *Talmudiſts* have made *Hezekiah* the Author of this Book, and *Grotius*, upon ſome ſlight Conjectures, pretends it was compoſed by *Zorobabel*. It begins with theſe Words, *The Words of the Preacher, the Son of David, King of Jeruſalem:* Which may be applied to *Hezekiah* as well as to *Salomon*: But what is ſaid of that Wiſdom in ſeveral places, which was peculiar to him, and in the ſecond Chapter of his Riches and Power, determines that we ought rather to underſtand it of *Salomon*.

The Song of Songs, that is to ſay, a *Song* by way of Excellence, is allowed to be *Salomon*'s by the Conſent of the Synagogue and the Church. The *Talmudiſts* attribute it to *Ezrah*, but without any Grounds.

The Book of *Wiſdom* is commonly ſaid to be *Salomon*'s (*ee*), but this Opinion is not very probable. For, 1. This Book is not to be found in the *Hebrew*. 2. It was never received into the *Hebrew* Canon, 3. 'Tis evident, as St. *Jerome* has obſerved, that the Style is extreamly different from that of *Salomon*, and that it was compoſed by a *Greek*. The ſame St. *Jerome* obſerves, that it was commonly attributed to *Philo*, which we are to underſtand of an older *Philo* than him whoſe Works we have, However it appears plainly, that it was compoſed by a *Helleniſt Jew*, who had a mind to imitate the Books of *Salomon*, from whom he has borrowed abundance of Thoughts.

The Preface which is before the Book of *Eccleſiaſticus*, and the Fifth Chapter of that Book, inform us, that the Author thereof was a *Jew*, named *Jeſus* the Son of *Syrach*, who compoſed it in *Hebrew*, and which was tranſlated into *Greek* by his Grand-Son. St. *Jerome* tells, he ſaw in his time an *Hebrew* Copy of it (*ff*). Some of the Ancients attribute it to *Salomon* (*gg*), perhaps becauſe of the reſemblance of the Subject, and the Thoughts, which is ſo great, that 'tis viſible he deſigned to imitate him, and that ſeveral Thoughts are taken from him.

The Books of the Prophets carry the Names of their Authors undiſputed. *Iſaiah* is the firſt and moſt excellent of the Prophets. He was the Son of *Amos*, whom we are by no means to miſtake for the Prophet of the ſame Name (*hh*). He Prophefied from the end of the Reign of *Uzziah*, to the time of *Manaſſes*, by whoſe Command, they ſay, he was cruelly ſlain, and ſawn aſunder with a Wooden Saw (*i*). He himſelf collected into one Volume all thoſe Prophecies which he delivered under *Uzziah*, *Jotham*, *Ahas* and *Hezekiah*, Kings of *Judah*. Beſides theſe, he wrote a Book of the Actions of *Uzziah*, which is mention'd in the 2d of *Chron.* Chap. 26. Verſe 22. Some Apocryphal Books are aſcribed to him; amongſt others, that famous one ſo often quoted by *Origen*; and another, intituled, *The Aſcenſion of Iſaiah*, which St. *Jerome*, and St. *Epiphanius* mention; and a later one likewiſe, called, *The Viſion of Iſaiah*. Some have pretended that this Book of *Iſaiah* which we have, is only compiled out of the Works of *Iſaiah*; but the Conjectures which they bring to prove it, are extreamly frivolous (*kk*).

Jeremiah, born in a Village near *Jeruſalem*, of Sacerdotal Extraction, began to Propheſie about the end of the Reign of *Joſiah*, when he was very young, and continued his Prophecies till after the Captivity of the *Jews* in *Babylon*. He was not carried away with the other *Jews* into that City; but tarrying in his own Country to lament its Deſtruction, he was afterwards taken Priſoner, and carried into *Egypt* along with his Diſciple *Baruch*; where, as 'tis commonly believed, he was ſtoned to Death. The Fathers think that he always lived in the ſtate of Celibacy, We are told in the beginning of the 36 Chapter, that King *Jehoiachim* having burnt the Book of his Prophecies, this Prophet compoſed a new Volume larger and ſtronger than the former. He afterwards added thoſe Propheceis, which he made till the *Babylonian* Captivity, and thoſe which he delivered in *Egypt*. In the 50th and 51 Chap. he foretels all that was to come to paſs in *Babylon*, and theſe he tranſmitted thither by *Saraiah* the Son of *Neriah*. The 52d Chapter does not belong to him, for his Prophecies terminated at the end of the 51 Chapter, as appears by theſe Words, *Thus far are the Words of Jeremiah*. It was rather written by *Baruch*, or *Ezrah*, and contains an Account of taking *Jeruſalem*, and of what happen'd during the

Captivity

tivity of the *Jews* in *Babylon*, after the Death of *Iſaiah*. It ſerves to illuſtrate the Prephecies of *Jeremiah*, and particularly his *Lamentations*, which follow in order, and make another part of the Works of *Jeremiah*. In this laſt Book one ſees the Ruin and Deſolation of *Jeruſalem* painted in lively Colours, and eſpecially the Grief and Concern of the Prophet upon occaſion of that mournful Scene. It has a Preface in the *Greek* and Vulgar *Latin*, which is to be found neither in the *Hebrew*, nor in the *Chaldee* Paraphraſe, nor in the *Syriac*, and ſeems plainly to have been added to explain the Argument of the Book. In ſhort, theſe *Lamentations* end with a Prayer to God. The Style of *Jeremiah*, if we may be determined by *St. Jerome*'s Teſtimony, is Simple in its expreſſions, and Majeſtick in its Senſe. But this Simplicity of Language does not appear to us at preſent. On the contrary, we find him Elevated and Sublime, both in his Senſe, in the Turn, and the Majeſty of his Expreſſion.

The Propheſie of *Baruch*, who was the Diſciple and Secretary of *Jtremiah*, formerly made up but one Book with that of this Prophet. *Joſephus* reports that *Baruch* was deſcended of an Illuſtrious Family, and that he perfectly underſtood the Language of his own Country. We are told in the Firſt Chapter, Verſe the Firſt, That he wrote this Propheſie in *Babylon*, but we don't certainly know the time (*ll*.) The *Hebrew* Coppy of *Baruch* is loſt, though we need not doubt but it was written in that Tongue. There is a Letter in the *Syriac*, which by ſome is attributed to *Baruch*, but 'tis very clear that it is written by a *Chriſtian*. The Epiſtle to the Captives of *Babylon*, which we find in *Baruch*, belongs to *Jeremiah*. The Author of the Second Book of the *Maccabees* has mention'd it; it is exactly the Style of that Prophet, and contains nothing but what is very agreeable to the time in which it was written.

Ezekiel the Son of *Buzi* the Prieſt, having been carried away into *Babylon* under *Jeconiah*, began to Propheſie in the fifth Year of the Captivity, and was ſlain, as 'tis commonly believed, by a Prince of that Nation, whom he reproved for his Adoration of Idols. His Propheſies are dark and obſcure. St. *Jerome* ſays, his Style is neither very eloquent nor very mean, but between both.

Daniel one of the Royal Family, was ſent Captive into *Babylon*, when he was but an Infant. The *Jews* don't reckon him amongſt their Prophets: But the *Chriſtians*, following the Authority of Jeſus Chriſt, who gives him that Title in St. *Matthew*, *Chap.* 24. *Verſe* 15. look upon him under that Quality and Character: And indeed there is no diſpute, but what he has wrote, deſerves the name of Propheſie, as the *Jews* themſelves are obliged to confeſs. But they don't give him the name of a Prophet, becauſe he lived a Life extreamly different from that of the other Prophets, and rather like one of the Great Men of *Babylon*: beſides, they think that he was an *Eunuch*, and there is a paſſage in his Book ſeems to confirm it (*mm*.) 'Tis certain that the firſt Chapters of *Daniel*'s Propheſies are undoubtedly his, though we have reaſon to doubt of the Antiquity and Truth of the two later, which contain the Hiſtory of *Suſanna*, and *Bel* and the *Dragon* (*nn*.) The four firſt Chapters in *Daniel* are written in *Hebrew*, the following ones, as far as the 18th Chapter in *Chaldee*, and were afterwards Tranſlated into *Hebrew*. The laſt are written orignally in *Greek*.

The Twelve leſſer Prophets compoſed but one Book among the *Hebrews*. *Hoſea* the Son of *Beeri* is the firſt (*oo*.) He Propheſied in the Days of *Uzziah*, *Jotham*, *Ahaz*, and *Hezekiah*, Kings of *Judah*; and 'tis very plain, that he wrote this Propheſie, becauſe he frequently ſpeaks of himſelf in the firſt Perſon. There is one paſſage in his Book that appears very extraordinary, and that is, God's commanding him *to take a Wife of Whoredoms, and Children of Whoredoms*. But either this ought to be ſimply underſtood of a Viſion, as St. *Jerome* pretends, or we are to ſuppoſe that God did not command him to commit Adultery, but only to eſpouſe a Proſtitute, as St. *Baſil* and St. *Auſtin* have explain'd this place. The Style of this Prophet is very pathetick, and full of ſhort lively Sentences, as St. *Jerome* has obſerved.

The Prophet *Joel* follows *Hoſea* (*pp*.) in St. *Jerome*'s Edition; but we don't certainly know the time when he Propheſied (*qq*.) Some Perſons believe that he is more ancient than *Amos*; others ſay that he did not write till after the Captivity of the Ten Tribes; and there are plauſible conjectures both of one ſide and the other. According to ſome he was of the Tribe of *Gad*, but others place him in the Tribe of *Reuben*.

Amos, a Herdſman of *Tekoah*, a Village two Leagues from *Bethlehem* to the South, was choſen of God to be a Prophet in the time of *Uzziah* King of *Judah*, and of *Jeroboam* the Son of *Joaſh* King of *Iſrael*, two Years before the Earthquake, which happen'd in the 24th or 25th Year of *Uzziah*.

The time of *Obadiah*'s Propheſying is altogether unknown (*rr*.) St. *Jerome*, with the *Jews*, believes that this Prophet was he, that was Governor of the Houſe of King *Ahab*, who is mentioned in the firſt Book of *Kings*, Chap. 18. Verſ. 4. he that fed the Hundred Prophets. Others believe he is the ſame with that *Obadiah*, whom *Joſiah* made Superviſor of the Building of the Temple, who is mentioned in the Second Book of *Chronicles*, Chap. 34. Verſ. 12. Moſt People make him Contemporary with *Hoſea*, *Amos* and *Joel*. Some after all, believe that he lived in the time of *Jeremiah*, after the taking of *Jeruſalem*.

Jonah, the Son of the Prophet *Amittai* (*ſſ*.) of the City of *Gath*, near *Dioceſarea*, of the Tribe of *Zabulon* in *Galilee*, Propheſied under King *Jeroboam*, *Uzziah*, and *Azariah*. God ſent him to the City of *Nineve* to Preach Repentance there, and his Book is an Account of his Meſſage and Journey. He has written another Prophecy mention'd in the Book of *Kings*. This Book which we have, ſeems to be quoted by *Tobit* in the 14th Chapter, Verſe the 4th, and is approved by our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt himſelf.

The Prophet *Micah*, born at *Moraſthai*, a Village of *Paleſtine* in the Tribe of *Judah*, Prophecied under the Reign of *Jotham*, *Ahaz* and *Hezekiah*, after the Prophets of whom we have ſpoken already,

but

but before *Jeremiah*, who cites him in the 26*th Chapter*. He is a different Perſon from him, who lived in the time of *Ahab* and *Jehoſhaphat*, and 'tis commonly believed that he died a Martyr.

We don't certainly know the Country of the Prophet *Nahum*: Nor have we any better aſſurances of the time wherein he lived. His mentioning the Deſtruction of *Ninive*, makes ſome think that he lived in the time of *Sardanapalus* under *Joaſh* and *Jehu*; which if it were ſo, he would be the moſt ancient of the Prophets. *Joſephus* is of Opinion, that he lived in the time of *Jotham*, and that he foretold the Ruine of *Ninive*, which happen'd many Years after the time of *Joſiah*. *St. Jerome*, *Theodoret* and *Theophylact* ſay, he Prophecied after the Captivity of the *Iſraelites*; others ſay under *Hezekiah*, and ſome under *Manaſſes*. The moſt received Opinion is, that he Prophecied after the Captivity of the Ten Tribes by *Shalmanezar*, before *Sennacherib*'s Expedition againſt the Tribe of *Judah*, which is foretold in the firſt Chapter of his Prophecy.

Nor have we any better Information either of the Country or time of the Prophet *Habakkuk*. The *Jews* ſay that he Prophecied in the time of *Manaſſes*, or *Jehoiachim*, a little before the Captivity. *St. Epiphanius*, and the falſe *Epiphanius*, make him Contemporary with *Zedekiah* and *Jeremiah*. Others ſay he lived in *Joſiah*'s time, *St. Jerome* in *Daniel*'s, confounding him with that *Habakkuk* who is mentioned by that Prophet. The moſt probable Opinion is, that he lived under the Reign of *Manaſſes*, whoſe iniquities he ſeems to deſcribe in his Firſt *Chapter Verſe* 13, and 14. and before the Expedition of the *Chaldeans* againſt the *Jews*, which he foretells in the Firſt *Chapter*, *Verſe* 6. as well as their Deſtruction, *Chap.* 2. *Verſe* 3.

The time wherein *Zephaniah* Prophecied, is exactly marked out to us in theſe Words at the beginning of his Prophecy, *The Word of the Lord came unto Zephaniah, the Son of Cuſhi, the Son of Gedaliah, the Son of Amariah, the Son of Hizkiah, in the days of Joſiah the Son of Amon King of Judah*. We don't know from what Country he came. *St. Cyril* makes him to have been of Noble Extraction, becauſe he mentions his Anceſtors.

Haggai, and the two following Prophets, Prophecied not till after the return of the *Jews* from the Captivity of *Babylon*. It is ſaid in the beginning of *Haggai*'s Prophecy, that it was written in the Second Year of *Darius* (*tt*) the Son of *Hyſtaſpes*, and the Sixth Month.

Zechariah the Son of *Barachiah*, Grand-Son of *Iddo* (*uu*,) wrote his Prophecy in the ſame Year of *Darius*, two Months after the Prophet *Haggai*, as he himſelf has obſerved in the beginning of his Prophecy. He is a different Perſon from that *Zechariah*, of whom *Iſaiah* ſpeaks in his Eighth *Chapter* (*xx*,) and of him that was ſlain by the Command of King *Joaſh* between the Temple and the Altar, 2 *Chron.* 24. 20.

Malachi, whoſe name in *Hebrew* ſignifies *My Angel* (*yy*,) Prophecied ſince *Haggai* and *Zechariah*, after the Rebuilding of the Temple; For the two former exhort the People to build the Temple, but he exhorts them to obſerve the Law, and offer their Sacrifices with Purity: which does neceſſarily ſuppoſe that the Temple was already rebuilt. Beſides this, the Diſorders for which he reproves the *Jews*, are the very ſame with thoſe which *Nehemiah* lays to their charge, which is a manifeſt Argument that they both lived in the ſame time. *Malachi* is the laſt of the Prophets; and as there was none other to ſucceed him till the coming of Jeſus Chriſt, ſo he concludes his Prophecy with an Exhortation to the *Jews* to obſerve the Law of *Moſes*, and wait for *the great and dreadful Day of the Lord, who ſhould turn the Hearts of the Fathers to the Children, and the Hearts of the Children to their Fathers*. All which clearly and expreſly ſets before us *St. John Baptiſt* and Jeſus Chriſt.

The two Books of the *Maccabees* were not written by the ſame Perſon, as the ſenſible difference of the Style, of the Chronology, and the Hiſtory ſufficiently ſhew (*zz*,) We don't know who is the Author of the firſt; 'tis indeed very probable that it was Originally written in *Hebrew*, and afterwards Tranſlated into *Greek* and *Latin*. The Second is an Abridgment or Epitome of *Jaſon*, who was one of the *Jews* of *Cyrene*, as it appears by the Preface of that Book, which begins Chap. 2. Verſ. 23. It is preceded by two Letters of the *Jews* at *Jeruſalem* to the *Jews* inhabiting *Egypt*, added by the Author of this Abridgment which he has made with a great deal of Liberty. Theſe two Books are called *The Books of the Maccabees*, from the Name of *Judas* the Son of *Mattathias*, Sirnamed *Maccabeus*, becauſe he had placed in his Banner the firſt *Hebrew* Letters of the Words of a certain Sentence in *Exodus* (*a a a*,) which being joyned together make that word. Theſe two Books contain the Hiſtory of the *Jews* under the Government of the *Greeks*, from the Reign of *Alexander* to that of *Demetrius Soter*, which comprehends the ſpace of Forty Years, or thereabouts, and they conclude an Hundred and Thirty Years before the Coming of our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt.

NOTES.

(*a*) *There is no Paradox more dangerous than the Opinion of thoſe who have preſumed to deny that the* Pentateuch *was compoſed by* Moſes.] I have already obſerved in the Firſt Edition, that this Paradox was ſtarted by Rabbi *Aben Ezra*, becauſe he is the firſt that raiſed theſe Objections, which have occaſioned ſome Perſons to believe, that *Moſes* was not the Author of the *Pentateuch*; and though he durſt not openly Declare his Opinion in this Matter, yet he expreſſes himſelf after ſuch a Manner, that it will evidently appear that he was not heartily perſwaded that the *Pentateuch* was written by *Moſes*. For in his Explication of theſe Words in *Deuteronomy*, *Behold what Moſes ſaid*

ſaid to the Iſraelites that were beyond Jordan, he not only makes uſe of that paſſage to ſhew that this Book was not *Moſes*'s, but he muſters up the moſt terrible Objections he could raiſe for this purpoſe. *You will know the Truth*, ſays he, *if you comprehend the Myſtery of the Twelve*: Moſes *wrote the Law*: *The* Canaanites *were then in the Land*: *In the Mountain of the Lord it ſhall be ſeen*: *Behold his Iron Bed*: Words which allude to ſome paſſages in the *Pentateuch*, and which he uſes to prove; that it was not written by *Moſes*. And 'tis principally upon the Authority and Reaſons of this Rabbi that *Hobbs*, *Peretius*, and *Spinoſa* eſtabliſhed their Doctrine, when they publickly maintain'd, that the *Pantateuch* was not written by *Moſes*. To theſe Authors we may add Monſieur *Simon*, who has wrote a Book, called, *A Critical Hiſtory of the Old Teſtament*. I was not willing to name him in the Firſt Edition of this Volume, though I took occaſion then to confute his Reaſons; but ſince he has been pleaſed to Declare that he was the Perſon, whom I meant, in a Letter to Monſieur *Lalve*, a Doctor of the Faculty, he ought not to reſent it as an injury, if I attack him by name, and endeavour to ſhew, that his Hypotheſis about the Book of *Moſes* is as raſh and dangerous as *Spinoſa*'s.

Monſieur *Simon* lays down his Opinion in the Firſt Chapter of the Firſt Book of his Critical Hiſtory, *p.* 3. of *Leer*'s Edition. *When we ſuppoſe that there have been ſuch publick Scribes, we aſcribe to them all the Hiſtorical part of the* Pentateuch, *and to* Moſes *all that belongs to the Laws and Ordinances; and 'tis this which the Scripture calls the Law of* Moſes. *And ſo one may ſay in this Senſe, that all the* Pentateuch *is really and truly written by* Moſes, *becauſe thoſe Perſons that made the Collection lived in his time, and what they did was by his particular* Direction. He ſays the very ſame thing in his 2 Chap. p. 17. *'Tis therefore not improbable that there were in* Moſes's *time ſuch ſort of Prophets, who were neceſſary to the State, becauſe they preſerved the moſt conſiderable Actions that paſſed in their Common-wealth. This being granted we ſhall diſtinguiſh in theſe Five Books of the Law that which was written by* Moſes, *from what was written by the Prophets and publick Scribes: We may attribute to* Moſes *the Commandments and Ordinances which he gave the People, in lieu of which we may ſuppoſe theſe ſame publick Scribes to have been the Authors of the greateſt part of this Hiſtory.* In the Seventh Chapter, p. 50. he adds: *As for what concerns the Book of* Moſes, *ſuch as they now are in the Collection which we have, the Additions which have been made to the ancient Acts hinder us from diſcerning what is truly his, and what has been added by thoſe who ſucceeded him, or by the Authors of the laſt Collection. Beſides, this Compilation being now and then Epitomized out of the ancient Memoirs, one cannot be aſſured, that the Genealogies there are ſet down in their full length and extent.*

From theſe Principles of Monſieur *Simon*, it follows in the firſt place, that *Moſes* is not the Author of the greateſt part of the *Pentateuch*, for the Controverſie here is not about ſome few Paſſages that are of ſmall conſequence, but even thoſe that make up the Body and principal Part of the *Pentateuch*; *Moſes* according to his Notions, being only concerned about the Laws and Ordinances, has no ſhare in any thing beſides, and ſo the Hiſtory of the Creation, and of the Deluge, in a word, all *Geneſis*, and whatever has a relation to the Hiſtorical part, is taken away from *Moſes*. It is to no purpoſe to ſay, as he has done already, *p.* 3. *That one may ſay, that all the* Pentateuch *is* Moſes's *becauſe they that made the Collection lived in his time, and did nothing but by his Order.* For would it not be a Jeſt to aſcribe to *Moſes* the Works of the publick Scribes of his time? If this were really true, a Man might aſcribe all publick Regiſters to thoſe Kings and Princes, in whoſe time, and by whoſe Order, they were compiled: But what is a great deal more ſurprizing, Monſieur *Simon*, or at leaſt one of his zealous Defenders, abandons this Hypotheſis as not to be maintained, and acknowledges that there is no convincing proof to make us believe there were ſuch publick Scribes divinely inſpired in the time of *Moſes*. This is taken notice of in the Marginal Note of the 17*th* Page of his Critical Hiſtory, and the ſame Edition that we cited before. *We find in truth*, ſays the Author of that Remark, *this ſort of publick Scribes in the time of the Kings amongſt the* Hebrews. .... *but we find no Foot-ſteps of them in the Book of* Moſes. The Author of the Anſwer to a Letter which Monſieur *Spanheim* wrote againſt F. *Simon* confeſſes the ſame thing. *If you now demand of me, what is my Opinion concerning theſe publick Scribes; I anſwer, That it would be very hard to reject 'em totally .... In the mean time I don't altogether agree with him as to the time, wherein he pretends, that theſe Prophets were Eſtabliſhed in the Jewiſh Commonwealth for the Reaſons he brings, and indeed the greater part of his Authorities clearly ſuppoſe, that this happened after* Moſes. If this Letter was Monſieur *Simon*'s, as the World was inclined to believe, he cannot poſſibly excuſe himſelf from having dealt very treacherouſly in a matter of the higheſt conſequence about Religion, ſince he has eſtabliſhed the Truth of the *Pentateuch* upon a ſuppoſition, which he himſelf acknowledges to be either falſe or uncertain. But ſuppoſe this Letter was not his, it ſhows at leaſt, that thoſe Perſons who are the moſt favourable to his Hypotheſis, freely own 'tis impoſſible to prove there were any of theſe publick Scribes Divinely inſpired in *Moſes*'s time; and conſequently that Monſieur *Simon*, who has grounded the validity of the *Pentateuch* upon this Hypotheſis, has done it upon a very weak Foundation, even in the judgment of thoſe Criticks who ſtand up the ſtrongeſt for him. Thus Monſieur *Simon* alledges this Conjecture as only a matter of probability. In the Second place, Monſieur *Simon* has of himſelf ruined whatever he ſays of the Antiquity and Authority of the *Pentateuch*, by confidently aſſerting, as he has done in the Third paſſage we quoted, that the *Pentateuch*, in the condition we find it in at preſent, is only an Abridgment of the Ancient Acts that were made in the time of *Moſes*, and that 'tis impoſſible to diſcern what is ancient, and what is not. Is not this formally to deny that *Moſes* was the Author of the *Pentateuch*, and that the Books which we now have are not ſo ancient, as is pretended?

In a word, he eſtabliſhes the Authority of the Books of Scripture upon the pretended Inſpirati-

on

on of certain Scribes or Keepers of the publick Regiſters, whom he believes to have been from time to time among the *Jews*. Now nothing is more uncertain than the Exiſtence or Inſpiration of theſe publick Scribes, as we ſhall ſhew in the following Pages.

(b) By expreſs Texts of Holy Scripture.] It is very certain that *Moſes* wrote the Law, and that in Scripture we are to underſtand the *Pentateuch* by the Law. *Exod.* 24. *v.* 4. and 7. Moſes *wrote all the Words of the Law, and took the Book of the Covenant, and read it in the Audience of the People.* *Deut.* 31. *v.* 19. and 22. Moſes *therefore wrote this Law, and gave it to the Prieſts the Sons of* Levi .... *and to all the Elders of* Iſrael. In *Exodus*, *chap.* 17. *v.* 14. God commanded *Moſes* to write the Law, and give it to *Joſhuah*. And in the Book of *Joſhuah*, *ch.* 1. *v.* 7 and 8. God tells him, That the Volume of the Law which he received from *Moſes* ought to be always in his mind; *This Book of the Law ſhall not depart out of thy Mouth, but thou ſhalt meditate therein day and night* ..... *that thou mayſt obſerve to do according to all the Law which* Moſes *my Servant commanded thee.* Now thô the Word *Law* may indeed be applied to one part of the *Pentateuch*, yet we ought to take notice, that it is generally taken in Scripture for the whole *Pentateuch*. And 'tis certain, that in the 31ſt *Chapter* of *Deuteronomy*, where it is ſaid, Moſes *therefore wrote this Law*, it is meant of all this Book, and the Paſſage of *Joſhuah* ought likewiſe to be underſtood of the whole Law. To this may be added, that in the other Books of the *Old Teſtament*, they always conſider the entire *Pentateuch* as the Work of *Moſes*. In the Firſt of *Kings*, *Chap.* 2. *v.* 3. *David* ſpeaking to *Salomon*, tells him, That the Ceremonies, Precepts, and Laws of the *Jews*, were written in the Law of *Moſes*; *Keep the Charge of the Lord thy God to walk in his Ways, to keep his Statutes and Commandments, and his Judgments, and his Teſtimonies, as it is written in the Law of* Moſes. It is therefore believed, that all the *Pentateuch*, which contains theſe Ceremonies, Precepts, and Judgments, was the Law of *Moſes*. All the Law is likewiſe attributed to *Moſes* in the Second Book of *Kings*, *ch.* 21, and 23. *v.* 8. *v.* 25. *If they obſerve all the Law of* Moſes in the Second Book of *Chronicles*, *Chap.* 23. *v.* 18. *To offer the Burnt-Offerings of the Law as it is written in the Law of* Moſes. Is not *Leviticus* therefore *Moſes*'s Book? That which is delivered in the 30*th*, 31*ſt*, and 35*th Chapters* of the ſame Book, is taken out of *Leviticus* and *Numbers*; Are they not therefore the Books of *Moſes*? In the 25*th Chapter*, *Deuteronomy* is cited as one of *Moſes*'s Books; *As it is written in the Law in the Book of* Moſes, *the Father ſhall not die for the Children*: Which Words are to be found in the 24*th Chapter* of *Deuteronomy*. *Leviticus* quoted by *Baruch*, *Chap.* 2. as a Book that was written by *Moſes*; *As thou ſpeakeſt by thy Servant* Moſes, *in the day when thou didſt command him to write thy Law, before the Children of* Iſrael, *ſaying, If ye will not hear*, &c. Which Words are in the 26*th Chapter* of *Leviticus*, *v.* 14. In the Second Book of *Kings*, *Chap.* 22, and 23. as alſo in the ſecond Book of *Chronicles*, *Chap.* 34. it is ſaid, that *Hilkiah* found a Book of the Law of *Moſes*'s written, perhaps, with his own hand, as theſe Words ſeem to imitate, *Per manum Moyſi*. This Book of the Law, according to *Joſephus*, is all the *Pentateuch*, according to others *Deuteronomy*. However it is, yet it follows from hence at leaſt, that *Deuteronomy* is his. Now *Deuteronomy* ſuppoſes, that the other Books of the Law were written, becauſe it is as it were an Abridgment, and upon that account is called *Deuteronomy*, or *The Second Law*. In the Ninth Chapter of *Daniel*, it is ſaid, that the Curſe, which is written in the Book of *Moſes*, is fall'n upon the *Jews*, and in the Tenth Verſe the words of *Deuteronomy* and *Exodus* are particularly cited. The Prophet *Malachi*, *chap.* 4. exhorts the *Jews* to remember the Law of *Moſes*. *Raguel*, in the 7*th Chapter* of *Tobit*, ſays, He will give his Daughter in Marriage to *Tobias*, to obey the Law of *Moſes*. The Law of *Moſes* is frequently repeated in the *Pſalms*; the 77*th*, 104*th*, 105*th*, 135*th Pſalms*, contain the Hiſtory of the *Iſraelites*, which is plainly taken out of the *Pentateuch*. The Law of *Moſes* is often cited in *Ezrah*; (*Ez.* 9. 10. 23.) the Paſſages cited in theſe places are to be found in the Books of the *Pentateuch*. In the 10*th. Chapter* of *Nehemiah*, *Ver.* 29. the *Iſraelites* oblige themſelves by a new kind of an Oath, to keep the Law and Precepts of *Moſes*. Now among theſe Precepts, there are ſeveral that are taken out of the Books of the *Pentateuch*. In the Second Book of *Maccabees*, *Chap.* 7. *Eleazar* ſaith, *I will not obey the King's Commandment, but that of the Law, which was given unto Our Fathers by* Moſes. Laſtly, whatever is taken out of the *Pentateuch* in the *New Teſtament*, is always cited under the name of the Law of *Moſes*. St. *James* in the 15*th Chapter* of the *Acts*, ſays, The *Jews* read *Moſes* every Sabbath-day in their Synagogues; Moſes *of old time hath in every City them that Preach him, being read in the Synagogues every Sabbath-day.* And St. *Paul* in his Epiſtles, ſays, That the *Jews* did not underſtand *Moſes*, although they read him; *Uſque in hodiernum diem cum legitur Moſes.* Therefore they did not in the leaſt doubt, that the *Pentateuch* was written by *Moſes*, ſince they tell us, that thoſe who read that Book, read *Moſes*. All theſe Paſſages make it very evident in the firſt place, that *Moſes* wrote the Law of the *Jews*. Secondly, That by the name of the Law we ought to underſtand, the *Pentateuch*. Thirdly, That not only *Deuteronomy*, but alſo all the other Books of the *Pentateuch*, have been cited in Scripture for the Books and Law of *Moſes*. Fourthly, That this has ever paſſed for a conſtant Truth, of which no body doubted. Fifthly, That they not only believed *Moſes* to be the Author of the things contained in theſe Books, but of the Books themſelves, ſo that when they read them, one might ſay, they read *Moſes*; as when we read the *Æneids*, we ſay, we read *Virgil*.

(c) By the Authority of Jeſus Chriſt.] In St. *John*, chap. 5. *There is one that accuſeth you,* (ſaith our Saviour) *even* Moſes *in whom ye truſt: For had you believed* Moſes, *you would have believed me, for he wrote of me.* 'Tis plain therefore that *Moſes* wrote, and that he wrote thoſe Books, which the *Jews* read for his. Now who doubts that theſe Books were the *Pentateuch*. And indeed ſince our Saviour does always diſtinguiſh the Prophets from the Law of *Moſes*, by the Law he can mean only

only the *Pentateuch*. In the first Chapter of St. *John*, *Philip* saith to *Nathaniel*, *We have found him, of whom* Moses *in the Law, and the Prophets did write*. There are many other places where our Saviour cites the Books of the *Pentateuch* under the name of the *Law*, and consequently we ought not to doubt, that he has assured us that these Books were written by *Moses*.

St. *Luke*, in the 24th Chapter of his Gospel, saith, That our Saviour beginning with *Moses*, and continuing with the Prophets, Expounded to his Disciples, who were going to *Emmaus*, the Things that were said concerning himself in the Scriptures. Therefore *Moses* was the most ancient Author of the *Jews*, and the *Pentateuch* was acknowledged to be written by him, as they owned the Books of the Prophets to be written by the Prophets.

(*d*) *The Consent of all Nations.*] 'Tis certain, that not only the *Jews* were always of opinion, that these Books were written by *Moses*, but also that all People have considered *Moses* as the Author of the Law and Religion of the *Jews*. 'Tis the unanimous Consent of all Nations, and all Men, no one ever questioning the Truth of it before these last Ages. *Huetius* maintains, that all Religions have borrowed their *Theology* out of the Books of *Moses*, whose History they have purposely altered and disguised, to accommodate it the better to their Fables. He pretends, for Instance, That *Adonis* of the *Phœnicians*; that *Mercury*, *Osiris*, *Serapis*, *Anubis*, and the other Gods of the *Ægyptians*; that *Zoroaster* of the *Persians*, and the Divinities of the Western Nations; that *Cadmus*, *Apollo*, *Priapus*, *Æsculapius*, *Prometheus*, and the other Gods of the *Græcians*; that *Janus*, *Faunus*, *Vertumnus*, *Evander* of the *Latins*; in a word, that all these Fabulous Deities, were taken out of the Books of *Moses*, but disguised according to the *Pagan* manner, and put into a new Dress. But these Conjectures being only Probabilities, and no more, cannot serve to demonstrate a Truth, which does not need such Supports, as being clearly established upon indisputable Principles.

(*e*) *And by the Authentick Testimonies of the most ancient Authors.*] That is, a continual Tradition of Authors from the Times that came nearest to *Moses* down to ours; and as we cannot doubt that *Homer*'s Poem is his, because all Writers that have appeared since his Age have attributed it to him; so neither can we reasonably doubt, that these Books were written by *Moses*. They commonly produce the Authority of *Sanchoniathon*, who, as they give out, lived before the *Trojan* War, and wrote the History of the *Phœnicians*, Translated afterwards into Greek by *Philo Byblius*, where he has borrowed several Passages out of the Books of *Moses*. But 'tis not certain that this Author is so ancient as they pretend. They likewise affirm, that *Homer* and *Hesiod* have taken many things out of him, and 'tis indeed extreamly probable. The same thing has been observed of the Philosophers, as *Thales*, *Pythagoras*, *Anaxagoras*, *Socrates*, and *Plato*, but all this is said by Conjecture. We ought therefore to rely principally upon the Testimony of those Authors, who tell us positively, that *Moses* was the Chief-Leader and Law-giver of the *Jews*, such as *Manetho*, cited by *Josephus* in his first Book against *Appion*, *Philochorus* the *Athenian*, whom the Author of the *Exhortation to the Gentiles*, commonly said to be St. *Justin*, mentions; *Eupolemus*, cited by the same Author; *Eupolemus*, cited by *Alexander Polyhistor*, mentioned by *Eusebius*; *Apollonius Molo*, cited by *Josephus*; *Castor*, cited by the Author of the *Exhortation to the Gentiles*; *Diodorus Siculus*, produced by the same Authors, and by St. *Cyril* in his first Book against *Julian*, though in our Copies he does not make mention of *Moses*, but of *Mnues*, who is the *Osiris* of the *Ægyptians*; *Chæremon* Author of the *Ægyptian* History, cited by *Josephus*; *Tregus Pompeius*, Epitomized by *Justin*, who makes *Moses* the Author of the *Jewish* Laws; *Nicolaus Damascenus*, cited by *Josephus*; *Mendesius*, cited by the Author of the *Exhortation to the Gentiles*, by *Tatian*, by *Eusebius*, and by St. *Cyril*. *Strabo*, who makes *Moses* the Author of the Religion and Laws of the *Jews*; *Appion*, who although an Enemy to the *Jews*, yet supposes that *Moses* gave 'em their Laws; *Juvenal*, who speaks of the Volumes of *Moses*, Sat. 14. *Tradidit arcano quodcunque volumine Moses*. *Ptolomy* of *Alexandria*, who calls him the Legislator of the *Jews*; *Pliny*, *Tacitus*, and *Justin*, who have observed the same thing; *Numenius*, who has taken notice that *Plato* was a Grecizing *Moses*; *Longinus*, who commends the beginning of *Genesis*, and produces a Passage in it as an Example of Sublimeness, calling the Author in these words, *The wise Law-giver of the Jews*; *Porphyry* and *Julian*, who wrote against the *Christian* Religion, yet acknowledged that the Books of the *Pentateuch* were written by *Moses*. To these we may add several Authors, who have delivered Histories down to Posterity, that were undeniably taken out of the *Pentateuch*, such as *Hecatæus*, *Berosus*, *Abydenus*, *Manetho*, *Eupolemus*, *Alexander*, *Polyhistor*, *Artapanus*, *Demetrius* the *Jew*, and many others, cited by *Josephus* in his first Book against *Appion*, by the Author of the *Exhortation to the Gentiles*, by *Clemens Alexandrinus*, by *Eusebius* in his Books *De Præp. Evang.* I have not mentioned *Philo*, *Josephus*, and the other *Jews*, because they all take it for granted that *Moses* is the Author of the *Jewish* Laws, meaning by these words, the five Books of the *Pentateuch*. The *Samaritan Pentateuch* affords us yet more convincing Proofs; for after the division of the People of *Israel*, which happen'd under *Roboboam* the Son of *Salamon*, the ten Tribes preserved the *Pentateuch* written in the *Samaritan* Character, which is the ancient Character of the *Hebrews*, from whence we may rationally conclude, that at that time they had the *Pentateuch* in the same condition, as it is in at present, which they constantly ascribe to *Moses*. One cannot with any tolerable pretence question the Antiquity of the *Samaritan Pentateuch*, since it is written in Characters, which were not in use after the *Babylonish* Captivity. The Version of the *Septuagint*, which is assuredly very ancient, is likewise another Proof that the Books of the *Peutateuch* are written by *Moses*. In a word, all those who have spoken of the *Pentateuch*, whether *Jews*,

Chriſtians, or *Pagans*, have taken it for granted, that theſe Books were written by *Moſes*. And certainly 'tis extravagant raſhneſs to oppoſe a few weak ill-grounded Conjectures to the Univerſal Conſent of all Mankind.

(*f*) *And conſequently Ruine the Foundation of our Religion.*] One of the great Proofs of the Truth of our Religion, is its Antiquity, which is principally ſupported by the Antiquity of the Books of the Law. Now if they are not *Moſes*'s and if they carry a falſe Name, what Proof can we give of their Antiquity? This is the ready way to give occaſion to *Libertines* to Ridicule 'em, and conſider 'em only as Fabulous Books, compoſed at pleaſure by the later *Jews* after the Captivity.

(*g*) *If what they alledged were true, yet they could only prove*] Here are the Objections which Rabbi *Aben-Ezra*, *Spinoſa*, the Author of the Book of the *Præadamites*, F. *Simon*, and ſome others, propoſe againſt the Antiquity of the Books of *Moſes*, and the Anſwers to them, from which we ſhall better diſcern their Weakneſs.

The *firſt Objection* is drawn from theſe words of *Deuteronomy*; *Behold the Words which Moſes ſpoke before all the Congregation of Iſrael beyond Jordan.* This could not be written, ſay they, by *Moſes*, who never paſſed the *Jordan* no more than the Children of *Iſrael* did, while he was alive. *Anſwer.* The *Hebrew* word, as *Vatablus* obſerves, may ſignifie *on this ſide*, as well as *on the other ſide*. *Pigninus*, *Buxtorf*, and all Perſons that are converſant in *Hebrew* are of the ſame opinion. It literally ſignifies, *In tranſitu*, *in tranſeundo*; *In their paſſage*, *being ready to paſs*. Thus this Objection that appeared ſo terrible at firſt ſight, carries indeed no difficulty with it.

Second Objection. In the *Pentateuch*, *Moſes* is always ſpoken of in the third Perſon. He is commended there in ſeveral places, as in *Numbers*, *ch.* 12. where he is called, *The meekeſt man upon earth*; as alſo in *Deuteronomy*, ch. 34. *And there aroſe not a Prophet ſince in Iſrael like unto Moſes.* And is it credible that *Moſes* would have thus commended himſelf? *Anſwer.* 'Tis ordinary for thoſe who compoſe a Hiſtory, where themſelves are concerned, to ſpeak of themſelves in the third Perſon. *Cæſar* in his Commentaries always ſpeaks of his own Actions in the third Perſon. *Joſephus* does the ſame thing in his Hiſtory of the Wars of the *Jews*. St. *John* in his Goſpel ſpeaks likewiſe of himſelf in the third Perſon; *The Diſciple*, ſays he, *whom Jeſus loved.* And in another place, *If I will that he tarry, what is that to you?* St. *Matthew* relating his own Converſion, ſpeaks of himſelf in the third Perſon, and ſome ſay, that St. *Luke* was one of the two Diſciples, whom our Saviour met going towards *Emmaus*. The Praiſes which *Moſes* gives himſelf are not exceſſive. It was neceſſary that in his own Books he ſhould take notice of the ſignal Favours which God had conferred upon him, as well as conceal none of his own Miſcarriages. *Joſephus* and *Cæſar* often commend themſelves after the ſame manner.

Third Objection. In the 12th Chapter of *Geneſis* the Author has this remarkable Parentheſis, *And the Canaanite was then in the Land.* Which makes it evident, ſay they, that this was written when the *Canaanites* were no longer in *Paleſtine*, otherwiſe this Advertiſement had been impertinent. Now 'tis plain, they were not chaſed out of that Land till a long time after *Moſes*'s death, and conſequently he is not the Author of this Book. *Anſwer.* Since theſe words, *Cananæus erat in terrâ illâ*, bear this ſenſe, it may be reaſonably ſuppoſed, that this Parentheſis was inſerted after *Moſes*'s time. This is an uſual thing, and it often happens that theſe ſorts of Explications, which at firſt were written in the Margin, to illuſtrate the Text, afterwards were inſerted into the Text by way of Parentheſis. But one may likewiſe ſay, that theſe words *Cananæus autem erat in terrâ*, don't ſignifie *Olim erat in terrâ*, but *Jam tum erat in terrâ*, *i. e.* That *Moſes* ſpeaking of the paſſage of *Abraham* through the Land of *Sichem*, obſerves, that the *Canaanites* were then in the Land. Thus the ſenſe is natural, and no ways forced.

Fourth Objection. In *Geneſis*, ch. 22. v. 14. the Mountain *Moria* is called *The Mountain of the Lord, who will provide*; *Appellavitque Abraham nomen loci illius, Dominus videt.* Now, ſay they, it had not this Name, till after it was ſet apart to make a Temple there. *Anſwer.* But how do they know this? For is not the contrary expreſly atteſted in that place of *Geneſis*? And does it not appear, that this Mountain received the name of *The Lord will provide*, becauſe of *Abraham*'s Anſwer to his Son, *My Son, God will provide?*

Fifth Objection. In *Deuteronomy*, *ch.* 3. *v.* 10. and 11. where mention is made of *Og*, King of *Baſan*, 'tis ſaid, That he alone was remaining of the Race of the Giants. *Behold his Bedſtead was a Bedſtead of Iron, is it not in Rabbath of the Children of Ammon? Nine Cubits was the length thereof, and four Cubits the breadth of it.* They ſay, theſe words make it evident, that the Author of *Deuteronomy* was of a later ſtanding than *Moſes*. For in the firſt place, why ſhould *Moſes* ſpeak of this Bed, to prove the Greatneſs of this Giant, ſince all the *Iſraelites* might have beheld it themſelves? 'Tis more probable to ſay, That this was written by an Author, who lived in a time when they had no knowledge of this King. Secondly, Why was not this Bed any longer in the Land of *Baſan*, but in *Rabbath* of the Children of *Ammon*? In ſhort, ſay they, this Bed was not diſcovered till the time of *David*, who ſubdued the *Ammonites*, and took *Rabbath*, as we find it related in the ſecond Book of *Samuel*, *ch.* 12. *v.* 13. *Anſwer.* Suppoſing all this to be true, 'tis eaſily anſwered, by ſaying that, as for what has a relation to *Og*'s Bed, it was added in a Parentheſis. But why might not *Moſes* give an account of that Bed, to prove the Greatneſs of that Giant, even when he addreſſed himſelf to the *Iſraelites*, ſince perhaps he was writing this Relation ſome conſiderable time after the King was ſlain, and 'tis not to be imagined that all the *Iſraelites* had ſeen the Bed? But admit the Matter was not ſo, yet *Moſes* might very well make uſe of this Proof to make the Matter of Fact credible to Poſterity. Thus the Hiſtorians of our Time, when they occaſionally diſcourſe of any extraordinary Thing, although it is never ſo well known to the World, yet they frequently ſay, We have ſuch and ſuch Proofs of it, the Monſter is ſtill kept in ſuch a,

place

place, *&c.* As for what follows, that this Iron Bed was in the Land of *Baſan*, and not in *Rabbath* this is all taken upon ſuppoſition, for why might not the *Ammonites* poſſeſs it in the time of *Moſes*?

Sixth Objection. The Author of the *Pentateuch*, ſay they, give ſuch Names to ſeveral Cities and Countries as they had not, till a long time after the Death of *Moſes*. In *Geneſis*, *ch.* 14. 'tis ſaid, That *Abraham* purſued the Kings, who had carried away his Nephew *Lot*, as far as *Dan*. Now the Name of *Dan* was not given to this Country till a long time after, when ſix hundred Men of the Tribe of *Dan* took the City of *Laiſh*, and, after they had taken it, gave it the Name of their Tribe, as we read in the Book of *Judges*, *ch.* 18. The ſame Author likewiſe ſpeaks often of the City of *Hebron*, which was not ſo call'd, till after the Death of *Moſes*, from *Hebron* the Son of *Caleb*, to whom *Joſhuah* gave it; formerly it was called *Kirjath-Arba*, as we are particularly informed in *Joſhuah*, *ch.* 14. *v.* 15. In *Deuteronomy*, *ch.* 3. *v.* 14. it is ſaid, That *Jair the Son of Manaſſeh took all the Country of Argob unto the Coaſts of Geſhuri, and Maachathi, and called them after his own name Baſhan-Havoth-Jair unto this day.* *Anſwer.* We may generally anſwer theſe Objections thus, by ſaying, That theſe Names were changed after *Moſes*'s time, to render the Hiſtory more intelligible to thoſe, to whom the ancient Names of thoſe Cities and Countries that *Moſes* uſed, would be altogether unknown. But the firſt Difficulty may be cleared otherwiſe, by ſaying, That the Name of *Dan* is more ancient than they pretend: That the River *Jordan* was ſo called, becauſe it had its Original from two Springs *Jor* and *Dan*. So we may ſay there was another City of that Name, called *Dan* or *Danna*, whereof mention is made in the 15th Chapter of *Joſhuah*, Verſe 49th, which was in the Tribe of *Judah*, in the Country of *Sodom*. To the ſecond Inſtance we may return this anſwer, That it is not clearly ſaid in the Book of *Joſhuah*, that *Hebron* gave his Name to the City of *Kirjath-Arba*, but only that the City of *Hebron* was formerly called by that Name. Which may be well enough underſtood of an ancient Name, which it had heretofore. The laſt Difficulty is not conſiderable, 'tis only in theſe Words, *Uſque in præſentem diem.* Now *Moſes* might uſe this Expreſſion to demonſtrate that Country more clearly, or perhaps it might be added after him.

Seventh Objection. The Author of the *Pentateuch* ſpeaketh of things that happen'd after the Death of *Moſes*, in *Exodus*, Chap. 16. Verſe 35. it is ſaid that the Children of *Iſrael did eat Manna, Forty Years, until they came to a Land inhabited; they did eat Manna, until they came to the Borders of the Land of Canaan.* Now this could not be written by *Moſes*, who died before the Forty Years were accompliſhed. After the ſame manner 'tis written in the 36th Chapter of *Geneſis*, Verſe 31. *And theſe are the Kings that reigned in the Land of Idom, before there reigned any King over the Children of Iſrael.* Which words put it beyond controverſie, that he who wrote this, was alive after the *Iſraelites* had Kings ſet over them. To this we may add, that after this Author has given us a Catalogue of the eight Kings of the *Edomites*, he ſpeaks of their Dukes. Now they had not Dukes in the place of their Kings till a long time after, as we may obſerve in the firſt Book of the *Chronicles*, Chap. 1. Verſe 5. In ſhort, 'tis ſaid in *Deuteronomy*, Chap. 2. Verſe 12. that *the Sons of Eſau dwelt in Seir, after they had driven out and deſtroyed the ancient Inhabitants called Horims, as the Children of Iſrael did unto the Land of their poſſeſſion.* Which paſſage, ſay they, ſeems to intimate, that the *Iſraelites* had ſubdued the *Edomites* when this was written. *Anſwer.* If all theſe places were to be taken in the ſenſe that is given them, yet we might anſwer, that ſome of them have been ſince added, or that *Moſes* ſometimes ſpoke by a Prophetick Spirit. But we need not run to ſuch Solutions. *Moſes* might ſay, that the *Iſraelites* ſhould eat Manna Forty Years, knowing, as he certainly did, that they were to tarry ſo long in the Deſart, as it appears in the 14th Chapter of the Book of *Numbers*. Moreover, God had revealed to *Moſes*, that the *Iſraelites* ſhould afterwards have a King, as is clearly foretold in the 17th Chapter of *Deuteronomy*, Verſe 14. The eight Kings of the *Edomites* there mentioned, might have reigned from *Eſau* to *Moſes*; and the Dukes, of whom he ſpeaks, did not ſucceed the Kings, but govern'd at the ſame time. Laſtly, theſe Words, *As the Iſraelites did to the Land in their poſſeſſion*, don't at all ſignifie or intimate the Land of the *Edomites*, but the Land which was promiſed to the *Iſraelites*. And let not any one ſay, that the *Iſraelites* were not as yet in poſſeſſion of the Land of Promiſe in *Moſes*'s time, ſince 'tis certain that the Tribes of *Reuben* and *Gad*, with a great part of that of *Manaſſeh*, had poſſeſſed themſelves of the Country of the *Amorites*, and of the Men of *Baſan*, after they had put 'em to the Sword.

Eighth Objection. The ſtrongeſt Argument at firſt view is the Death and Burial of *Moſes*, which is deſcribed at the end of *Deuteronomy*. To this there are two *Anſwers*. The firſt of thoſe, who ſay with *Philo* and *Joſephus*, That *Moſes* wrote it himſelf by a Spirit of Prophecy. The ſecond, which is the more common and ſolid of the two, That this Account was added either by *Joſhuah*, or by *Ezrah*; or laſtly, by the Synagogue of the *Jews*, to make the Hiſtory of the *Pentateuch* more perfect.

Ninth Objection. They ſay, That *Moſes* is ſo far from being the Author of the *Pentateuch*, that the Author there cites Books that were compoſed by *Moſes*; as *The Book of the Covenant*, Exod. 24. *The Book of the Wars of the Lord*, Numb. 21. 14. in which there was likewiſe written the War againſt *Amelek*, which is mentioned in *Exodus*, Chap. 17. Verſe 14. *The Book of the Law of the Lord* in *Deuteronomy*, Chap. 31. Verſe 9. And laſtly, a *Song*, which is referred to, in the two and thirtieth Chapter of *Deuteronomy*. From whence they coclude, that the *Pentateuch* was compoſed out of the ſeveral Books of *Moſes*. *Anſwer.* This Objection carries no force with it; for what ſhould hinder *Moſes* from citing the Books which he had formerly compoſed? Beſides, ſhould we grant that all theſe paſſages are to be underſtood of thoſe Books that were written by *Moſes*, it would not invalidate our Opinion. But this

cannot certainly be proved. For in the firſt place, we don't know, whether there was any ſuch Book or no that was intituled, *The Battels of the Lord*; for the *Hebrew* Text does not intimate that it was already written, but that it might be. Neither is it evident whether there is any Book mentioned: For the *Hebrew* Word may ſignifie any manner of Narrative, and ſo the Words that are cited may bear this ſenſe, *As it will be related when the Iſraelites deſcribe the Battels of the Lord.* Mr. *Simon* quarrels with this Interpretation, which, I ſay, theſe Words will naturally bear; but however, he does not demonſtrate that they cannot be thus applied. Others underſtand this place of a certain Song, which they uſed to ſing in honour of their Victories. It is not ſaid in *Exodus*, Chap. 17. that the War of *Amalek* was written in the Book of the Battels of the Lord, but only God commanded *Moſes* to write it, and 'tis that which he did in that Place. That paſſage in *Exodus*, Chap. 24. does not prove that *Moſes* wrote a Book of the Covenant, but only that being come down from the Mountain, he recited to the People the Laws which God had given him in the Mountain, which are ſet down in the preceding Chapters. And this it is which is called in that place, *The Book of the Covenant*. *The Book of the Law*, of which mention is made in *Deuteronomy*, is not different from *Deuteronomy* it ſelf. And after all, it is not improbable that *Moſes* referred to a Song, which he himſelf had compoſed.

Tenth Objection. There were (ſays Mr. *Simon*) amongſt the *Hebrews*, Prophets inſpired by God, who had a particular Charge given 'em to preſerve in Writing the moſt important Actions that happened in that Government. 'Tis probable, there were ſeveral of theſe Prophets in the time of *Moſes*, and then we may rationally ſuppoſe, that *Moſes*, as a Legiſlator, wrote only the Edicts and Commandments which he gave to the People, and that he left the care of collecting and tranſmitting to Poſterity the moſt conſiderable Paſſages of State to theſe above-mentioned Scribes or Prophets. *Anſwer.* This Suppoſition is founded upon very uncertain Conjectures, and precarious Principles. The *Egyptians*, ſay they, had ſuch Scribes or Regiſters to write down their Sacred Tranſactions, and therefore there were ſuch alſo amongſt the *Jews*. A very fine Conſequence this! 'Tis credible however, that *Moſes* eſtabliſhed ſuch an Order of Men. But what Proofs have they to ſupport this tottering Suppoſition? Why, *Joſephus* and *Euſebius* tell us, that amongſt the *Hebrews*, it was not lawful for every one to write their Hiſtory, but only for the Prophets who were inſpired by God. All this may be very true; but then *Joſephus* and *Euſebius* underſtand by theſe Prophets no other Perſons but *Moſes*, and thoſe after him, who wrote the Books of the Old Teſtament down to the Reign of *Artaxerxes*. We muſt paſs the ſame Judgment of *Theodoret*, ſay they, and the other Fathers: Now this, in my Opinion, is to make 'em ſpeak things they never thought of, and not to underſtand them aright. As for what they add farther concerning theſe Prophets, whom they have inveſted with an Authority to add or diminiſh from the Books of Scripture, this is ſtill more improbable than the other. They barely tell us inſtead of proving it, that in the Books of *Kings* ſeveral other Memoirs are quoted, from whence they draw this Concluſion, that all the Books of the *Bible*, which have come down to our Hands, are only Abridgments and Summaries of the ancient Acts. But does it follow from hence, that all the other Books of the *Bible* were uſed after this rate? Does it follow that they added to, or retrenched from them, after they were once made? Or laſtly, that they were compoſed by theſe Prophets? They would have it proceed from this Reaſon, that there are ſo many Contradictions in the Books of the Holy Scripture. They ſay that this is the Reaſon of the Differences between the *Chronicles* and other Hiſtorical Treatiſes of the *Bible*, of that variety of falſe Conjectures that ruine the Authority of the Scriptures; and what is yet more material, that 'tis not impoſſible to reconcile theſe ſeeming Contradictions. To this purpoſe they amaſs together a great quantity of other Conjectures of this Nature, very ſubtilely invented, but weak and ill-grounded, and yet upon the ſtrength of theſe, they make the Authority of the *Bible* to depend, after they have endeavoured to undermine the ſolid Foundations which bear it up. Thus by pretending to advance Criticiſm, they forſake the Rules of true Judgment, and follow the Fantaſtick Chimæra's of their own Imaginations. There is no weight in what they have invented themſelves, or what they have found ready invented to their Hands by ſome Rabbies; and yet at the ſame time they ſcruple and doubt of ſeveral things that are clearer and better eſtabliſhed.

Although I did not name Mr. *Simon* in my firſt Edition, yet he very well perceived that this reproach was addreſſed to himſelf. The manner wherein he anſwered me, ſufficiently ſhewed, that he was ſenſibly touched, however this his Carriage does not in the leaſt juſtifie him. For inſtead of demonſtrating by ſolid Reaſons, that the Reproaches I faſten'd upon him, weere undeſerved and ill-grounded, he has filled his Letter with nothing but Contumelies and ſcornful Reflections, which ſhews how heinouſly he reſented the Liberty I took in examining his Hypotheſis; and this all ſenſible Men obſerved as ſoon as ever his Letter appear'd in publick. But now to make it evident to the whole World, that I have Reaſon on my ſide, *viz.* that Mr. *Simon* is in the wrong for quarelling with me upon this occaſion, I ſhall only caſt my Eyes on the Preface of his Book, where he ſets down the Principles of his Work at length: *The World will obſerve*, (ſays he) *that having conſidered nothing in this Eſſay but the Profit of thoſe who have a mind to know the Grounds of the Holy Scriptures, I have inſerted abundance of Principles, very uſeful to reſolve the moſt weighty Difficulties of the* Bible, *and at the ſame time to anſwer thoſe Objections which are uſually made againſt theſe Holy Books.* Theſe Principles are reducible to three Heads: The firſt is, That there were always amongſt the *Hebrews* a ſort of Prophets, or Publick Regiſters, Divinely inſpired, who made what Alterations or Additions they thought fit, in the Books of the Old Teſtament. The ſecond is, That they heretofore wrote their Books upon little

little Leaves, which they rowled one over another, round a ſmall piece of Wood, without ſtitching them together; whence it happen'd ſometimes, that not taking ſufficient care to preſerve the order of theſe ancient Leaves or Volumes the things themſelves treated of, have ſometimes been miſplaced. The third is, That there is a great deal of Reaſon to believe, that thoſe Perſons who joyned theſe old Memoirs together, to keep up the Body of thoſe Canonical Books which are now remaining, made no ſcruple at all to cut off ſeveral Synonymous Terms, which were found in their Copies, and were perhaps inſerted only for a fuller Illuſtration. Theſe are the great and admirable Principles of Mr. *Simon*, his publick Regiſters, his Rolls and Synonyma's. Here is, according to him, a way to reſolve the moſt perplexed Difficulties of the Bible, and to defend its Authority againſt the Diſciples of *Spinoſa*. Here is an infallible Expedient whereby we may confound the Socinians and Proteſtants, and invincibly prove the Inſpiration of the Holy Books. And laſtly, here is a never-failing Salve to ſilence all the Objections that can be urged againſt the Scripture. I am of Opinion that Mr. *Simon* will find very few People who will be inclined to ſubſcribe to the Uſefulneſs of theſe Principles. But this is not the Buſineſs I deſign to examine, 'tis their Solidity I deſire to ſee, upon which he values himſelf ſo exceedingly. For if it be made evident, that theſe Principles are only eſtabliſh'd upon weak frivolous Conjectures, then adieu to all thoſe Advantages, ſay I, that may be drawn from thence. Let us therefore examine all the Proofs that Mr. *Simon* has brought together in his *Critical Hiſtory*, and other Books.

The firſt of his Principles, is that about the Scribes or Regiſters that were divinely inſpired. But he gives us no Proofs of this matter in his Preface; it ſeems that was not the proper place. In the firſt Chapter of his *Critique*, which is a ſort of a ſecond Preface, he contents himſelf with ſaying, That he gives the name of Prophets to the Authors of the Books of the Bible, and with repeating what he ſaid before in his Preface concerning the great advantage of theſe publick Scribes; as if it were enough for him barely to aſſert theſe things, without giving himſelf the trouble of proving them. But in the ſecond Chapter he endeavours to make this whole matter evident, and therefore let us conſider by what Reaſons he offers to do it. In the firſt place he obſerves, that the *Jewiſh* State acknowledged no other Chief or Head, but God. From this Principle he concludes that God himſelf gave 'em Laws by the Miniſtry of *Moſes*, and of the other Prophets who ſucceeded him. This Concluſion is undeniable, but it was not neceſſary to prove it by a Principle more obſure than the Concluſion that is drawn from thence. But we are not concerned to know, whether there were any of theſe Prophets amongſt the *Hebrews*, for that is a conſtantly received Truth; but 'tis our buſineſs to know, In the firſt place, Whether there were in all Ages amongſt the *Jews* thoſe Scribes or Regiſters whom he talks of, who looked after the Records and Hiſtories of the Affairs of that Nation. Secondly, Whether they were divinely inſpired. Thirdly, Whether they are the Authors of the Books of the Bible. 'Tis Mr. *Simon*'s buſineſs to prove theſe three Propoſitions, and not barely to tell us in general, that there were Prophets amongſt the *Jews*. The ſecond Remark made by Mr *Simon*, is this. *That in all well-regulated Kingdoms, and eſpecially in the Eaſtern Nations, they had always certain Perſons, who tooke care to ſee, that the moſt important Occurrences of State were preſerved in Writing.* I thought indeed that Mr. *Simon* would have concluded from this Obſervation, that they had ſuch Perſons likewiſe amongſt the *Jews*. He diſowns this Conſequence, and therefore this can only paſs for a Compariſon, and ſo we muſt look for other Arguments to ſhew there were ſuch publick Scribes amongſt the *Jews*. *It carries a great deal of Probability with it*, continues he, *that* Moſes, *upon the firſt eſtabliſhment of that State, ſet up this ſort of Scribes, whom we may call Publick or Divine ones, to diſtinguiſh 'em from particular Writers, who uſually engage to write the Hiſtory of their own Times from no Motives but thoſe of Intereſt.* However, 'tis not certain that *Moſes* ever did inſtitute theſe Scribes, 'tis a mere Conjecture and nothing elſe. But how does Mr. *Simon* endeavour to prove it? He gives us two Reaſons in a Parentheſis; the firſt is, *Becauſe* Moſes *was bred up in the* Ægyptian *Court, where they had Prieſts, to whom they gave the name of Scribes or Regiſters, of Sacred Things.* As if it were neceſſary, or indeed probable, that *Moſes* would appoint amongſt the Children of *Iſrael* whatever he ſaw practiſed by the *Ægyptians*. He ought to have produced ſome Reaſon, or at leaſt ſome Conjecture, to prove that *Moſes* imitated them in this. But Mr. *Simon* omits to do it. The ſecond Reaſon which he alledges to prove that *Moſes* eſtabliſhed this ſort of Scribes amongſt the *Jews*, is, *Becauſe he was a perfect Law-giver*; as if it was neceſſary for a perfect Law-giver to inſtitute ſuch a Cuſtom. Was not *Lycurgus* a perfect Law-giver? And yet, by the acknowledgment of Mr. *Simon* himſelf, he did not appoint any of theſe publick Scribes in his Commonwealth. But for what purpoſe I wonder ſhould *Moſes* ſet 'em up amongſt the *Jews*, when he himſelf had written their Laws and Hiſtory. Beſides, could Mr. *Simon* undeniably prove, that there were theſe publick Scribes in the time of *Moſes*, yet it would not follow from thence, that they were the Authors of the *Pentateuch*. And thus we ſee that all Mr. *Simon*'s admirable Conjectures to ſhew, that the Books of the *Pentateuch* were written by the Scribes divinely inſpired, fall to the ground, without doing what they were produced for.

Let us now ſee if he is more fortunate in his Citations. The firſt is from *Joſephus*, who tells us *That amongſt the* Jews *it was not lawful for every one to write their Annals but that this Province was only reſerved for the Prophets, who knew remote and future Things by Divine Inſpiration, and committed to Writing all the remarkable Paſſages of their time.* Now to this I formerly anſwered, *That* Joſephus *by the Prophets underſtands no more than* Moſes, *and thoſe that wrote the Books of the* Old Teſtament *after him.* Mr. Simon anſwers, *That the Reaſons of* Joſephus *are*

too

too general to be explained by ſuch a Reſtriction. But this is a matter where we need not wholly depend upon Conjectures: tis but reading the whole paſſage in *Joſephus*, and it will evidently appear, that in this place he only ſpeaks of thoſe Books that were received by the *Jews* for Canonical. The Words faithfully Tranſlated are theſe; *It is not lawful for every body amongſt us to write Hiſtory, there is no contrariety at all in our Hiſtories. They are the Prophets who write, either about ancient Things that happened along time ago, and which they learn by Divine Inſpiration, or about Things that happened in their own time, and thoſe they ſet down in order as they were Tranſacted. We have not Millions of Books that contradict one another, and only ſerve to perplex the Reader. We have only Twenty two, which contain the Hiſtory of all times, and to which we reſign our Belief with a great deal of Juſtice. Of theſe Books there are five by* Moſes .... *From* Moſes *down to* Artexerxes *King of* Perſia, *who lived after* Xerxes, *the Prophets in thirteen Books wrote the Hiſtory of their Times. The four following contain Hymns in praiſe of God, and ſeveral Moral Precepts. In ſhort, from* Artaxerxes *down to our Times we have our Hiſtory very well written, but theſe Books are not of the ſame Authority with the former, becauſe there has not been a continued and regular Succeſſion of Prophets.* Nothing in the whole World can be more directly oppoſite to Mr. *Simon*'s Hypotheſis than this paſſage of *Joſephus*. Mr. *Simon* ſuppoſes, that in *Moſes*'s time there were publick Scribes, who cited the Memoirs from whence they compoſed the *Pentateuch*; and *Joſephus* expreſly tells us, that theſe five firſt Books were written by *Moſes*. Mr. *Simon* ſuppoſes, that the following Books are only Abridgments of thoſe Ancient Memoirs, that were from time to time written by the publick Scribes, and afterwards collected together by others of the ſame Character; and *Joſephus* ſuppoſes they were written in the ſame manner as we now find 'em, by the Prophets that lived upon the ſpot when theſe things which they have delivered were tranſacted. Mr. *Simon* would needs have it, that in the *Jewiſh* Nation there were always publick Scribes divinely inſpired; and *Joſephus* plainly tells us, that the Succeſſion of Prophets failed after *Artaxerxes*. Now what can be more irreconcileable than all this? Beſides, 'tis obſervable that *Joſephus*'s Prophets are different from Mr. *Simon*'s publick Scribes. They were not Men intruſted with the Regiſters, and appointed to write Hiſtory: But Prophets, whom from time to time we find amongſt the *Jews* who took care to tranſmit the paſſages of their time to Poſterity; and their Books are not at all different from thoſe, which the *Jews*, acknowledged for Canonical in the time of *Joſephus*. From all which it neceſſarily follows, that this paſſage confirms my Hypotheſis, and utterly deſtroys Mr. *Simon*'s: For we maintain with *Joſephus* againſt Mr. *Simon*, That *Moſes* is the Author of the *Pentateuch*, and that the other Authentick Books of the *Old Teſtament* were written by Men Divinely inſpired, or by Prophets who lived near the times wherein thoſe Occurrences happened which they delivered, though we do not certainly know their Names: 'Tis to theſe Books, and not to the *Pentateuch*, that we are to apply the Words of *St. Gregory* upon *Job*, which Mr. *Simon* manifeſtly perverts and abuſes in his firſt Chapter, *Quis hæc ſcripſerit valde ſupervacue quæritur, cum tamen Auctor Libri Spiritus Sanctus fideliter credatur.* For this Father ſpeaks this only with relation to the Book of *Job*, whoſe Author is unknown to us.

The Second Author that Mr. *Simon* alledges in his *Critical Hiſtory* to prove theſe Scribes divinely inſpired, is *Euſebius*: *Euſebius*, ſays he, *confirms this Opinion, when he takes notice, that amongſt the* Jews *it was not allowed for all ſorts of People to paſs their judgment upon thoſe Men that were inſpired by the Holy Spirit to write Holy Books.* He cites in the Margin, *Euſebius de præparatione Evangelicâ*; that is to ſay, a great Book in *Folio*; I have diligently hunted after this paſſage there, but have not been ſo happy as to meet with it. But let the matter be how it will, I don't ſee what Aſſiſtance it brings to Mr. *Simon*'s Hypotheſis; The *Jews* had Writers that were divinely inſpired; Who queſtions it? As alſo, That it did not belong to all the World to judge who they were, that were thus divinely inſpired; but this Province was reſerved for thoſe Perſons, who had the ſame Inſpiration themſelves. Well then, ſuppoſe it were ſo, does it therefore follow that the Books of *Moſes* were compoſed by the Keepers of Regiſters? Does it follow that thoſe who were appointed to write Hiſtory, and that too out of the publick Memoirs, were divinely Inſpired? Or laſtly, That all the Books of Scripture which we now have, are but ſo many Abridgements extracted out of theſe Memoirs. As for what remains, Mr. *Simon* could not have cited any Author more contrary to his own Hypotheſis, than *Euſebius*, and that even in this very Book *De Præpartione Evangelicâ*. For one of the great Principles, which he there eſtabliſhes in ſeveral places, is the Authority and Antiquity of the Books of *Moſes*, which he always ſuppoſes to have been written by that Prophet in the ſame manner as we have 'em at preſent. The Truth of this Aſſertion he confirms by theſe three Propoſitions which he lays down in the beginning of the 14th Book. The firſt is, That *Moſes* is ancienter than any *Greek* Author. The ſecond, That he has written what he had learned of his Anceſtors. The third, That the *Jews* have neither added nor diminiſhed from the Writings which he left them. And now I'll leave the World to judge whether theſe Principles of *Euſebius* agree with thoſe of Mr. *Simon*.

The third Author cited by Mr. *Simon* is *Theodoret*. It muſt be confeſſed, that this Father owns, (as well as ſeveral other Authors have done) that the Books of *Kings* and *Chronicles* were compoſed from very ancient Memoirs. But this is not the point in Queſtion. We confeſs, we are not aſſured of the Authors of theſe Books. We acknowledge they are a Collection drawn out of old Memoirs. But we demand of Mr. *Simon*, whether it follows from hence, that the *Pentateuch*, and other Books of the *Bible*, are of the ſame Nature. This is a thing which *Theodoret* wou'd beware of ſaying, becauſe he owns *Moſes* to be the Author of the *Pentateuch*. 'Tis with

with this Aſſertion he begins his Preface to the Books of *Kings*, from whence Mr. *Simon* has drawn theſe paſſages which he quotes. *After having explained the Books of* Moſes, &c. To theſe three Authors has Mr. *Simon* in his Letter to Monſieur *L'Abbe*, added the Author of the *Synopſis*, attributed to St *Athanaſius*. This Author follows the Opinion of *Joſephus*, and after having obſerved that the five firſt Books of the *Bible* do without diſpute belong to *Moſes*, he ſays, that all the following Books are not written by thoſe whoſe Names they bear, but that *they were compoſed by Prophets who lived from time to time.* Laſtly, he obſerves, when he is ſpeaking concerning the *Chronicles*, that one finds ſeveral Hiſtorical Books of the Prophets quoted there. And what does all this make for Mr. *Simon*'s Hypotheſis? Have not we ſaid the very ſame thing? Does not all the World agree as to this particular? Had Mr. *Simon* kept himſelf here, no body would have fell upon him.

The laſt Author whom Mr. *Simon* cites to juſtifie his Hypotheſis, is the Author of the *Chronicon Alexandrinum*. This Author in the place tranſcribed by Mr. *Simon* tell us, that there were ſome Prophets *who wrote their own Prophecies themſelves, as* David *the Book of* Pſalms, *and* Daniel *his Prophecy; and that there were others who did not write themſelves, but that they had Scribes in the Temple, who wrote down, as it were in a Journal, the Words of each Prophet* ..... *That the Books of* Kings *were thus compoſed by Parts, that under* Saul's *Reign they wrote whatever paſſed in his time, and ſo likewiſe in* David's *time, and the other Kings; That the* Chronicles *are but a Collection of Regiſters, and ſeveral Papers of their Kings; That* Moſes *wrote the* Pentateuch; *That* Joſhuah *is the Author of the Book which bears his Name; That the Book of* Judges *was written by the Scribes in the Temple from time to time, as well as that of* Ruth; *That* Solomon *compoſed the* Proverbs *the* Canticles, *and* Eccleſiaſtes. This Author's Hypotheſis is extreamly different from that of Mr. *Simon*. 1. He ſuppoſeth for a certain truth, that *Moſes* was the Author of the *Pentateuch*, and does not attribute his Works to the Publick Scribes or Abbreviators. 2. He does not ſay, that theſe publick Scribes were inſpired by God, or that they wrote the Hiſtory of themſelves. He ſuppoſes the Prophets dictated that to them as well as their Prophecies. 3. He believes that the Books of *Kings* and *Judges* were the very Originals from the Prophets, which were joyned together. Inſtead of which Mr. *Simon* believes, that theſe Books are Abridgments. I won't loſe ſo much time as to anſwer the Rabbi's, and other Authors of that ſtamp, whom Mr. *Simon* has muſtered up in his laſt Letter. 'Tis viſible there's not one ſingle Author he quotes that is of the ſame Opinion with himſelf. For, In the firſt place they all of 'em acknowledge, That the Books of the *Pentateuch* ought not to be attributed to Scribes or to Prophets Divinely Inſpired, but to *Moſes* himſelf. Secondly, they ſay, That the following Books were written by Perſons divinely Inſpired, to whom they gave the name of Prophets, but they don't tell us, that theſe Prophets were Superviſors of the Regiſters, or publick Scribes. Thirdly, they acknowledge, that there were ancient Memoirs, or ancient Hiſtories often quoted in the Books of *Kings*, and the *Chronicles*. No body doubts this, I have frequently obſerved it, and have made a Catalogue of the Books that are quoted in the *Old Teſtament*. But it does not follow from hence, that all the Books of the Bible are extracted from theſe Memoirs, and Compiled a long time after. Mr. *Simon* has given theſe publick Scribes authority to change, to enlarge, and abridge theſe Sacred Books as they ſee convenient. To prove this, he quotes Don *Iſaac Abarinbel*, a Learned *Spaniſh Jew*, as if we were obliged to take all for Goſpel that theſe Rabbi's have been pleaſed to deliver. He joyns *Procopius* and *Theodoret* to this *Jew*, as Men that have obſerved, that the Books of *Kings* and *Chronicles* were drawn out of ſeveral other Hiſtorical Books. Not to diſpleaſe Mr. *Simon*, he has mightily altered the Point, for this is not the Queſtion under debate. We agree with him, that the Authors of the Books of *Kings* and the *Chronicles*, compiled their Hiſtories out of Memoirs and particular Hiſtorians whom they found, as *Livy* and *Mezeray* made uſe of the ancient Hiſtorians to compoſe their Hiſtories: But for all this, we dare not ſay, they have changed or diminiſhed the ancient Hiſtories, that always continued in the ſame condition they were in, nor that they had a Priviledge to do this, much leſs that they have made any conſiderable Alterations or Additions to the Books of *Moſes*. Mr. *Simon* at laſt brings in a very dangerous Maxim, though he covers it under a ſpecious appearance of Uſefulneſs: *It would be dangerous*, ſays he, *to pretend to Correct one Book of Scripture by another, becauſe they don't agree altogether themſelves.* 'Tis very truly ſaid, that we ought not to Correct one Book of Scripture by another: But it is not true, that two Books of the Scripture don't altogether agree with each other. There is not any real Contradiction between the Books of the Bible; if there are any apparent ones, the fault does not lie in the Authors but in our want of Underſtanding them. 'Tis a piece of extraordinary Raſhneſs and Preſumption to ſuppoſe with Mr. *Simon* that there are real Contradictions in the Books of the Bible, that the Author of the *Chronicles* has reported Matter of Fact otherwiſe than it is in other places, or that the Genealogies and Chronology of the Scriptures are faulty, and the like, *I know*, ſays Mr. *Simon*, *that it is expreſly forbidden in* Deuteronomy *to add or diminiſh a Tittle from the Word of God.* Here then there is an expreſs Text againſt Mr. *Simon*'s Hypotheſis. Now to anſwer this Paſſage, he ought to alledge ſome other place of Scripture, which reſtrains and limits this Prohibition to private Perſons, or gives Permiſſion to the Prophets and publick Scribes to do the contrary. But Mr. *Simon* thinks it enough to quote the Author of the Book *Cozri*, who is of the ſame Opinion; but by a peculiar Misfortune that attends him, we find, that a certain Commentator towards the bottom of the Page, where this Book is quoted, obſerves, *That the Author of the Book* Cozri *does not ſpeak of the Scripture in that place, but only of the Explication of the Commandments, which depended upon the Judges of the* Sanedrim.

Sanedrim, *who had power to extend or limit them according to the circumſtances of Time and emergent Occaſions.* What becomes then of Mr. *Simon*'s Anſwer? It ſtood only upon the Authority of the Author of the Book *Cozri*, and now we ſee, that this very Author will not be brought to ſay what he would have him. After all, Mr. *Simon* quotes *the Common Opinion of the Fathers, who believe, that the Collection of the Old Teſtament, ſuch as it now is, was compoſed by* Ezrah, *which confirms,* ſays he, *what I am now maintaining; for* Ezrah *could not correct and reſtore theſe Books, which, according to them, had been corrupted during the time of the Captivity, but in the Quality and Character of a Prophet and publick Scribe, and therefore he is called a Scribe by the way of Excellence in the Bible.* I would willingly know what neceſſity there was, that *Ezrah* ſhould reſtore the Holy Scripture in quality of Publick Scribe, or Maſter of the Rolls. Is it not infinitely more probable to imagine he did it, becauſe he was commanded to reſtore the Religion and Laws of the *Jews* in their ancient Purity, as being their Chief and High-Prieſt. Whenever he is called a Scribe in Scripture, 'tis not in Mr. *Simon*'s Senſe, but becauſe he was well skill'd and knowing in the Law of the Lord. We need only give our ſelves the trouble to read this paſſage, *Ezra* 7. v. 6. Ezra *went up from Babylon, and he was a ready Scribe in the Law of Moſes, which the Lord God of Iſrael had given.* That is to ſay, he perfectly nnderſtood the Law, the Word *Scribe* being taken in the ſame Senſe in *Jeremiah*, Ch. 8. v. 8. And it does not ſignifie any thing elſe in the *New Teſtament*, where this Name is given to all the Doctors of the Law.

The Second Principle of Mr *Simon* depends upon the changing of the Rolls or Volumes in which theſe Sacred Books are written. I ſaid before, that *this Conjecture is only pleaſant becauſe it is new, and that it was a* Chimæra, *that had nothing at all to do with the Argument in hand.* Mr. *Simon* anſwers me immediately, That what I call a *Chimæra, was a very ancient Opinion, and likewiſe taken notice of by the moſt ancient Criticks.* It was therefore his buſineſs to look after his Proofs. But I have no Exceptions to make to the Antiquity of Rolls, (for 'tis very plain that they formerly wrote upon Leaves which they Rolled together) but only to the ill uſe he makes of 'em. He ought to have ſhewn by convincing Inſtances, that theſe Rolls frequently occaſioned Tranſpoſitions, and he ought likewiſe to have applied this Conjecture to ſome Examples in Scripture which had ſuffered by this diſorder. But this I defie him to do after all his attempts, he dares not undertake any thing of that nature, but contents himſelf to ſay in general terms, That it may be ſo. I ſaid alſo, That this Conjecture had nothing to do with the Subject, becauſe if we ſuppoſed, that *ſome little confuſion might accidentally happen in the Rolling of theſe Leaves, yet the Abridgers might eaſily rectifie 'em and ſet 'em in order.* To this Mr. *Simon* replies, that *'tis to no purpoſe to talk of the Abridgers, becauſe theſe Leaves were diſordered long after the Collection of the Abridgments* I did indeed believe Mr. *Simon* had ſpoken of the Leaves of the Originals or Memoirs, out of which, as he pretends, they made an Abridgment of the Bible, and I am ſtill of Opinion, that he is thus to be underſtood, where he ſays, *pa.* 35. *I much doubt whether we are to attribute to* Moſes *and the publick Scribes, that lived in his times, the diſorder and confuſion which we find in ſeveral places of the* Pentateuch: *There is great probability for us to believe, that as they wrote their Books then upon little Rolls, or ſingle Leaves, which they rolled one upon another, the order of theſe Leaves has been changed.* Now it was very probable, that this *then* had a relation to *Moſes*, and the publick Scribes: But ſince Mr. *Simon* is willing to have it underſtood of the Times that followed theſe Abridgments, he ought to inform us, that the little Order which we find, as he pretends in the *Pentateuch*, proceeded from the changing of theſe Rolls. But this he can never be able to do, and I challenge him to apply this Conjecture to the Examples which he produces; as one may readily rectify a printed Sheet of Paper which was tranſpoſed in binding a Book. Hence it follows that this ſecond Principle of Mr. *Simon* is ſo very far from being well grounded, that 'tis indeed wholly uſeleſs. As for what concerns his third Principle, which is the Repetition of the Synonymous Terms, from whence he pretends to conclude, that the Books of the Bible are compoſed from ſeveral ancient Memoirs, 'tis a falſe and frivolous Conjecture; for there is much greater reaſon for a Man to believe, that theſe Repetitions came from one Author, who wrote theſe Things as Memoirs at firſt, than from an Epitomizer, who has weaved one continued Hiſtory without making any repetition of the ſame Things, or the ſame Words: Beſides, that theſe Repetitions which Mr. *Simon* produces as Examples, are not abſolutely needleſs, but ſerve either to Illuſtrate what has been ſaid, or elſe to Corroborate ſome Circumſtance or other, or laſtly, to give more Force and Efficacy to what is written. 'Tis no unuſual thing to meet with Repetitions of that nature in moſt Authors, and principally in thoſe, that write the Hiſtory of their own times with an air of Simplicity and Unaffectedneſs.

Eleventh Objection. 'Tis pretended that the Repetitions, which we meet with in the *Pentateuch*, were not in all probability made by *Moſes*, but rather by them who made a Collection of the Holy Books, and have joyned together ſeveral Precepts or Explications of the ſame Words. There are abundance of theſe Repetitions which they produce. They ſay moreover, that there are many Repetitions of the ſame thing differently related, and this makes it appear, that this Hiſtory is drawn from ſeveral different Memoirs. They add, That we cannot rationally attribute them to *Moſes*, becauſe of the little Order or Regularity we find them in. They produce upon this occaſion a Conjecture that is pleaſant enough, becauſe new. *There is reaſon to imagine,* ſay they, *that as they wrote their Books in thoſe times upon Rolls, or ſeparate Leaves, which they rolled one upon another, the order of the Leaves has been changed and inverted.* And ſo they pretend, that the diverſity of Style, which is to be found in the Books of the *Pentateuch*, is a ſatisfactory Proof, to ſhew that the ſame Writer was not the Author. *Anſwer.* All theſe Objections

jections are extremely weak and impertinent, and rather deſtroy, than contribute any thing to the Hypotheſis they are produced to eſtabliſh. For can any Man in the World believe, that an Author, who had abridged any Hiſtory, would ſo often repeat the ſame things, that he would preſerve no order, and not write in the ſame ſtyle throughout. On the contrary, Don't all Abbreviators make it their buſineſs to make their Relations in as few Words as poſſible, regularly, and after an uniform manner? The contrary Faults more frequently belong to the firſt Authors of Hiſtory, who naturally and ſimply recount all Affairs which they know. This ſort of Repetition is very familiar and common among the Ancients, and particularly amongſt thoſe, who wrote an Hiſtory or Fable firſt; and they are rarely found in Hiſtorians, who compile their Works out of the Memoirs of other Men, the reaſon is, becauſe the firſt write naturally, juſt as they ſpeak, without Meditation and Study, and the others on the contrary, having all their Matter ready fitted to their hands, are only at the Expence of ranging, and digeſting it Methodically. The Repetitions, which we find in the *Pentateuch*, are often neceſſary to explain the Particularities of thoſe Things, which at firſt they were forced to relate in general; for this reaſon it is, that the particular Circumſtances of the Creation of the World, which were ſet down in the firſt Chapter of *Geneſis*, were afterwards told over again, more particularly in the ſecond. 'Twas the Genius and Cuſtom of the *Hebrews* to repeat the ſame Words, as it was indeed the faſhion of all the Ancients.

But we are not to believe, that there is ſo little order, as they would make us believe, in the *Pentateuch*, and if there were leſs than there really is, that would be rather an Argument to ſhow it belongs to *Moſes*, who wrote without Art, Method, and Affectation, as thoſe People generally do, who leave Memoirs behind them of thoſe Paſſages, wherein themſelves bore a ſhare. The conjecture about the Rolls is an extravagant Whimſie, that makes nothing at all to the purpoſe, for if there were any confuſion of the Leaves, the Abbreviators might without any great difficulty ſet them right in their true order. Laſtly, what they pretend about the conſiderable difference of ſtyle in the *Pentateuch*, is notoriouſly falſe: On the contrary, a Man may obſerve all along the Genius of the ſame Author; and if he ſometimes does not happen to enlarge upon the Affairs, which he relates, 'tis becauſe his Matter required ſhortneſs, or becauſe he did not judge it convenient to uſe that liberty. Now we cannot in juſtice call this a Difference of Style, when all the reſt is agreeable, and of a piece.

But let us leave Mr. *Simon* to anſwer his Adverſary, who pretends, as well as himſelf, that the *Pentateuch* does not belong to *Moſes*, but to a *Jewiſh* Prieſt ſent from *Babylon* to inſtruct the *Chriſtians*. His Conjectures, which are eaſily anſwered, are theſe:

In the firſt place, he ſays, That the 11th and 12 Verſes of the ſecond Chapter in *Geneſis* could not be written by *Moſes*. *The name of the firſt is Piſon, that is it which compaſſeth the whole Land of Havelah, where there is Gold. And the Gold of that Land is good, there is Bdellium, and the Onyx Stone.* Theſe Remarks, ſays Mr. *Simon*'s Adverſary, ſeem to proceed from an Author who had been in that Country, that is to ſay, in *Chaldea*, for *Piſon* is an Arm of *Euphrates*, that diſcharges it ſelf into the *Perſian* Gulf. It is by no means probable, that *Moſes*, who never went far from *Ægypt*, ſhould be able to give ſo particular a relation of a Country ſo remote and diſtant, in a time when ſuch Voyages were very rare, and attended with abundance of Difficulties. But I would willingly underſtand what would hinder *Moſes* from knowing, that this Country was watered with the River *Piſon*, and how was it poſſible for him to give a Deſcription of the Place, unleſs he had given the moſt publick and commonly known Marks. We ſee plainly, that ſome Countries, though never ſo remote, are yet known well enough for thoſe excellent and precious Commodities that are found there, which are to be met with no where elſe, and which are tranſported from thence to others places. 'Tis not neceſſary for a Man, to go to *Potoſi*, to be informed, that the Gold of that Country is very fine, and in great plenty; or to make a Voyage to the *Indies*, to know that Pearls and precious Stones, are found there; nor is there any more ſtrength in the ſecond Reaſon, which ſuppoſeth, that the exactneſs wherewith this Author deſcribes the erecting of the Cities of *Meſopotamia* and *Aſſyria*, *v.* 18. of the 10th Chapter of *Geneſis*, is a clear indication, that the Writer thereof had been in that Country. For is it neceſſary that an Hiſtorian ſhould have been in all the Places he mentions? On the other hand, Was there ever any Hiſtorian in the World that has ſeen all the Countries which he gives an account of?

Theſe are this Author's private Gueſſes: We have already anſwered thoſe which have been ſtarted by *Hobbs*, *Spinoſa*, and Mr. *Simon*, as well as himſelf, but don't think it worth the while to throw away any time in refuting thoſe extravagant Whimſies he makes ſo much noiſe about, to prove that the *Pentateuch* was written by a *Samaritan* Prieſt. They are ſo weak and pitiful that they deſerve no body's Conſideration, and indeed if ſuch Reaſonings were to be allowed, I don't know one ſingle Book in the World which might not upon as good Grounds be taken away from the true Author, and beſtowed upon another. From hence we may ſee, of what ill conſequence it is to give ones Imagination too large a Scope, and miſtake bare Conjectures for eternal Truths.

[*h*] *They would only prove, that the ſame thing has happened to the Books of* Moſes, *which has almoſt happened to all the ancient Authors*, viz. *That ſome few Words, Names, and Terms, have been added or altered to render the Narrative more intelligible.*] If one examines all theſe Objections that I have already anſwered, he will be convinced they prove no more, and that one might have anſwered almoſt all of them by this very Remark. Mr. *Simon*, who cannot contradict me in this Point, is mighty deſirous to ſet upon me another way, by objecting, that in my Preface, and other places of my Book, I have laid down Rules which ſeem to prove from theſe Additions, that the *Pentateuch* is a ſuppoſititious Work: For it ſeems I had

affirmed in the firſt part of my Preface, *That impoſtors for the moſt part relate Matters of Fact that happened after the Death of thoſe whom they ſpeak of, and they give an Account of Cities and People that were not known in the time of thoſe Authors whoſe Names they aſſume.* From whence Mr. *Simon* draws this Conſequence, that ſince I own there are ſeveral ſuch Additions in the *Pentateuch*, a Diſciple of *Spinoſa* may thence conclude, that according to my Rule 'tis a ſuppoſititious Work. To this I anſwer, that this Objection of Mr. *Simon* ſhews, that he has not ſo great a ſhare of good Senſe, and cloſeneſs of Arguing, as he has Rabbinical Learning For if he had only conſidered the General Remark which I made in my Preface about the Rules of Criticiſm there laid together, he could not have been guilty of ſo manifeſt a Soleciſm as this. I deſire him to mind theſe Words a little: *A Man may ſay, that all theſe Rules which I have here laid down, are convincing and probable in different degrees, but that the Sovereign and Principle Rule is the Judgment of Equity and Prudence, which inſtructs us to ballance the Reaſons* of this and t'other ſide, *in diſtinctly conſidering the Conjectures that are made* of both ſides. Now this is the General Rule of Rational Criticiſm, and we abuſe all the reſt if we don't chiefly make uſe of this. Let us now apply it to the preſent Queſtion. There are in the *Pentateuch* ſome Terms, and Names of Cities, and other Paſſages that could not come from *Moſes*; muſt we therefore haſtily conclude, that it was not written by *Moſes*, becauſe 'tis a certain ſign that a Book is ſpurious, when one finds ſuch Occurrences in it, as have happen'd after the Death of the Author to whom it is attributed, and becauſe we there meet with ſome Names of Cities and People that were not known in his time? Or on the other hand, Does it follow, becauſe the *Pentateuch* was writ by *Moſes*, notwithſtanding ſome Additions which are there to be found, does it I ſay thence follow, that the above-mentioned Rule is falſe? Theſe two Conſequences are very indiſcreetly drawn, but the Rule is ſtill good, and the Books of the *Pentateuch* may yet be written by *Moſes*. The Rule is good, but we ought to make a good uſe of it. When there are no certain Proofs of the Antiquity of a Book, and beſides there are other Conjectures to incline us to doubt of it, we may in purſuance to this Rule, conclude it ſpurious. But when it is paſt Diſpute that ſuch a Book is written by ſuch an Author, and there is an infinite number of evident Arguments to demonſtrate the truth of it; then we are neceſſarily to conclude, that theſe Words, and Terms, and Names, were afterwards added. After all, where there are Reaſons on one ſide, as well as on the other, we ought carefully to ballance them, to weigh one againſt the other, and at laſt to determine the matter on that ſide, where the greateſt appearance of probability lies. Theſe are the true Rules of Criticiſm, which it ſeems Mr. *Simon* is ignorant of, or at leaſt does not rightly examine, otherwiſe he could never have forgot himſelf ſo far, as to accuſe me wrongfully for giving favourable Rules to the Diſciples of *Spinoſa*. The fault is by no means to be imputed to theſe Rules, which almoſt every Critick has given before me, but 'tis his way of Arguing, and drawing of Inferences that has been favourable to the *Spinoſiſts*. His Conjectures, and Objections, and in ſhort his Hypotheſis, has ſerved to confirm thoſe Perſons in their Errors, beſides that ſeveral places of his Book give the greateſt Blow imaginable to the Authority of the Holy Scripture; When he asks me, *What anſwer I will return to a* Spinoſiſt, *who to prove that the* Pentateuch *was not written by* Moſes, *ſhall uſe my own Reaſons to ſhew that the Liturgy of St.* James, *as 'tis commonly received by the Oriental Nations, was not made by him?* I will anſwer him, that there are not the ſame Reaſons to induce a Man to believe that St. *James* was the Author of that Liturgy, which goes under his Name, as that the Books of *Moſes* were written by him: That this was never affirmed in any of the Epiſtles of the Apoſtles, that the Ancients never ſpeak of it, that this Liturgy does not agree with the Diſcipline that was in uſe in St. *James*'s time. Whereas the Scripture informs me that *Moſes* was Author of the *Pentateuch*, and Jeſus Chriſt and his Apoſtles have aſſured me of the truth of it, and all the ancient Writers have teſtified ſo much, beſides the Univerſal Agreement of all People in this matter. 'Tis therefore a manifeſt Injuſtice and Calumny in Mr. *Simon* to accuſe me for *deſigning to deſtroy the Books of* Moſes, *under a pretence of defending them againſt the* Spinoſiſts.

Nor does Mr. *Simon* reaſon better in applying what I have ſaid with regard to the Book of *Joſhuah*, to the Books of the *Pentateuch*; 'tis but comparing the Arguments I brought to prove that the Books of the *Pentateuch* belonged to *Moſes*, with thoſe that are commonly produced to prove that the Book of *Joſhuah* was written by *Joſhuah*, and any Man will ſoon perceive the mighty difference between one and the other, and that the Reaſons that are alledged in favour of *Moſes*, are infinitely ſtronger than thoſe that are urged to prove that *Joſhuah* compoſed the Book that bears his Name. No Man ever yet doubted that the *Pentateuch* was written by *Moſes*, but 'tis not the ſame caſe with the Book of *Joſhuah*. Mr. *Simon* ſuppoſeth there is as much evidence for one, as the other; in order to prove this, he imagines that all thoſe former places of Scripture that are produced to ſhew that *Moſes* was Author of the *Pentateuch*, reduce themſelves to this Head, *viz.* That *Moſes* wrote the Law; and he pretends there is the ſame reaſon to affirm, that *Joſhuah* added the Book of his Hiſtory to the Books of the Law. But if any one will give himſelf the trouble to conſider the paſſages that are to be found in the Notes (*b*) and (*c*), he will be perſwaded that they are very poſitive as well as numerous, and don't lie in ſo narrow a compaſs as thoſe which are brought in behalf of *Joſhuah*: Beſides, 'tis but reading the 24th Chapter of the Book of *Joſhuah*, where we find this laſt paſſage, and we ſhall ſee that it may be very well underſtood of the Moral and Ceremonial Precepts that are mentioned in that place. From hence it evidently appears, that there's a vaſt difference between the Reaſons that prove *Moſes* to be the Author of the *Pentateuch*, and thoſe that ſeem to intimate that *Joſhuah* compoſed the Book which contains this Hiſtory; and that a Man without incurring the guilt of raſhneſs, may doubt whether he

he is the Author of that Book; but that he cannot doubt whether *Moſes* wrote the *Pentateuch*, without being guilty of that crime to the higheſt degree. At the ſame time I will not abſolutely deny that *Joſhuah* was Author of the Book that carries his Name; I have only obſerved, that it is not abſolutely certain, and 'tis an eaſie matter to take notice, that I rather incline to that Party which aſſigns it to *Joſhuah*.

(*i*) *We don't certainly know when theſe Books were written by* Moſes.] Some ſay that *Geneſis* was written by *Moſes*, after the departure out of *Egypt*; ſo *Pererius* and *Tena*. 'Tis moſt probable, that all of them were written after the departure out of *Egypt*, and particularly that *Geneſis* was compoſed after the Promulgation of the Law. This is the Opinion of *Euſebius* and the Ancients, and indeed we find in *Geneſis* ſeveral Alluſions to the *Law*; as for example, in Chap. 2. there is mention made of the Law of the Sabbath; and in the 7th and 8th Chapters of clean and unclean Beaſts: Which are ſufficient Intimations that *Moſes* wrote thoſe things, when his Thoughts were full of the Law then newly made. *Deuteronomy* is the laſt, for beſides that it is a Repetition of what we find in the Law, it plainly tells us, that *Moſes* ſpoke thoſe things to the People of *Iſrael* when they were ready to go over *Jordan*. To this we may add, that he there relates whatever happen'd towards the end of his Life; and laſtly, that the Account of his Death is inſerted there, as being his laſt Work.

(*k*) *Though 'tis commonly believed that this Book was written by* Joſhuah.] Moſt of the Modern Writers are of this Opinion, as was alſo *Iſidore* in the 6th Book of his *Origines*, *Junilius*, and *Dorotheus*, *Vatablus*, *Abulenſis*, *Driedo*, and *Bellarmine* ſay the ſame, as do likewiſe the *Talmudiſts Babatra*, c. 1. This Opinion is chiefly ſupported by theſe Words in the laſt Chapter, Verſ. the 26th, where it is ſaid, that *Joſhuah wrote all theſe things in the Book of the Law of God*. However, this paſſage may have a relation only to what is written in this Chapter, or elſe perhaps *Joſhuah* might have written another Book, of which this was an Abridgment. 'Tis ſaid in *Eccleſiaſticus*, Chap. 46. that *Joſhuah was the Succeſſor of Moſes in Prophecies*; But this does not prove that he wrote any thing. *Theodoret* aſſures us, that the Book of *Joſhuah* is nothing elſe but an Extract out of the *Book of Jaſher*, which is mention'd in the 10th Chapter, Verſe 13.

The Reaſons that are brought to prove that this Book was not written by *Joſhuah*, are generally theſe. In the firſt place, ſay they, it is obſerved there in the 10th Chapter, Verſe 13. that the Book of *Jaſhar*, where the Wars of *Joſhuah* were written, is quoted, therefore the Book of *Joſhuah* is later. 2. We meet there this faſhion of ſpeaking, *Uſque in præſentem diem, unto this day*, frequently repeated: As for inſtance, when it's ſaid in the 4th Chap. Verſe 9. *That the twelve Stones which Joſhuah took out of the midſt of Jordan, continue there unto this day*. And in the 5th Chap. Verſe 9. *The name of the place is called Gilgal, unto this day*. 3. The taking of the City of *Lachiſh* is related Chap. 10. Verſe 35. thô it happen'd not till after the Death of *Joſhuah*, as we may ſee, *Judges*, Chapter 18. Verſe 19. So likewiſe, Chap. 11. Verſ. 14. and the following, there is an account of *Caleb* and his Daughter *Achſah*, which paſſage did not fall out till after the Death of *Joſhuah*, as it is written in the firſt Chapter of the Book of *Judges*. In the ſame Chapter, Verſe 28. there is mention made of the Land of *Cabul*, which received this Name from *Hiram* King of *Tyre*, as we may find it in the 9th Chapter of the firſt Book of *Kings*. Laſtly, in the 9th Chapter, Verſe 23. and the laſt, it is ſaid, *That Joſhuah made the Gibeonites Drawers of Waters and Hewers of Wood in the Houſe of his God*, which is probably to be underſtood of the Temple, that was not built long after the death of *Joſhuah*. Theſe Arguments are not wholly unanſwerable. Firſt, We don't know what manner of Book *the Book of Jaſher* was; 'tis not ſaid that all the Wars of *Joſhuah* were ſet down there, but only the relation of the Sun's ſtanding ſtill. Some think that *Geneſis* is there called the *Book of Jaſher*, where, as they pretend, this memorable Event was foretold. Others believe 'tis the *Pentateuch*; *Grotius* ſays, it was a Song compoſed upon that occaſion. *Huetius* ſuppoſes that it is a Book of Morality. Laſtly, others imagine it to have been a Book of Annals. If this laſt Opinion were the only true one, yet it by no means follows, that *Joſhuah* was not Author of that Book where theſe Annals are quoted. Secondly, Suppoſing that *Joſhuah* wrote this Book towards the end of his Life, as is moſt reaſonable to think he did, when he had occaſion to ſpeak of thoſe things that happen'd at the beginning of his Miniſtry, he might very well make uſe of that Expreſſion, *Uſque in præſentem diem, unto this day*, even as St. *Matthew* himſelf, who wrote a little after the Death of our Bleſſed Saviour, tells us, that the Field *Aceldama* was called, *The Field of Blood unto this day*. Theſe, and the following Objections, may be anſwered, by ſaying, that theſe things have been added ſince, and particularly the taking of the City of *Lachiſh* by the *Danites*: Or at leaſt we may ſay that the City of *Lachiſh*, mentioned in *Joſhuah*, is a different place from *Laiſh* in the Book of *Judges*. The ſecond Objection may be anſwered by ſaying, That whatever is ſaid concerning *Othoniel* and *Achſa* in the Book of *Judges*, is only a Recapitulation of what happened in the time of *Joſhuah*. The Land of *Cabul*, mentioned in *Joſhuah*, is different from that in the Book of *Kings*: *Joſephus* has diſtinguiſhed them; one is a Country, the other a Village. The Houſe of God, mentioned in the Ninth Chapter, may be underſtood well enough of the Tabernacle and Ark, which was in the time of *Joſhuah*.

(*l*) *Be it as it will, the Book of* Judges *is ancient.*] To prove that this Book was not compoſed till after the Captivity, they commonly inſtance in theſe words in Chap. 18. Verſe 30, 31. *Until the day of the Captivity of the Land*; and in theſe, *In thoſe days there was no King in Iſrael*. Words, ſay they, which demonſtrate that this Book was written after the Captivity, and in the time when they had Kings in *Iſrael*. But the Captivity ſpoken of in this place, is not that of *Babylon*, but the Captivity that happened in

the time of *Heli*, when the Ark was taken by the *Philiſtines*, and the Idol of *Micah* was deſtroyed, as it is obſerved in this place of the Book of *Judges*. And as for theſe words, *In thoſe days there was no King in Iſrael*, they don't neceſſarily ſuppoſe that there were any when this Author lived, and perhaps they were added by *Ezrah*.

(m) *Which has made Men think, that the Books of* Samuel *were written by that Prophet.*] This Opinion is not certain, becauſe Chap. 9. Verſe 9. it is ſaid, That *he that is now called a Prophet, was before-time called a Seer*, which *Samuel* could not ſay. In the fifth Chapter, Verſe the fifth, the Author of this Book, relating the Hiſtory of the taking of the Ark, tells us, that the Prieſts of *Dagon* did not tread upon the Threſhold of *Dagon* unto this day. But this might well enough be ſaid by *Samuel*, becauſe that happen'd when he was young, and he wrote not this Book till towards the end of his Life.

(n) *Ezrah ſpeaks there in the firſt Perſon.*] He ſpeaks of himſelf in the firſt Perſon, *Ezrah*, Chap. 7. Verſe 27, and 28. *God hath extended his Mercy towards me before the King, and I*, &c. And Chap. 9. Verſe 5. *I fell upon my Knees, and ſpread out my Hands.*

(o) *The Conjecture of* Huetius *is not ſo ſtrong as to make us quit the common Opinion.*] He ſays, that the Author of the ſix firſt Chapters was at *Jeruſalem* in the time of *Darius*, as it appears by theſe words in the fifth Chapter, *ad quod reſpondimus eis quæ eſſent nomina.* Now *Ezrah* came not to that City till after *Darius*'s Reign under that of *Artaxerxes*, as is eaſily proved by the beginning of the ſeventh Chapter. But 'tis no hard matter to refute this Conjecture, by obſerving that when *Ezrah* ſaid, *Reſpondimus eis*, he only ſpoke in the Name of the *Jews*; and 'tis an uſual thing with the Hiſtorians of any Nation to cry, We did ſuch or ſuch a thing, although the Hiſtorian had no ſhare in the doing it.

(p) *The ſecond Book is conſtantly attributed to* Nehemiah.] He begins thus, *The Words of* Nehemiah; and after the ſame manner, *Herodotus*, *Thucydides*, and *Timæus*, &c. begin their Works, not to mention the Prophets. The Author of *Eccleſiaſticus* ſpeaks of the Actions of *Nehemiah*, Chap. 40. and the Author of the ſecond Book of the *Maccabees* commends his Writings.

(q) *'Tis commonly believed, that* Tobit *and* Tobias *wrote their own Hiſtory.*] This Opinion is principally founded upon the Angels commanding them in the 12th Chapter, Verſe 20. *Narrate omnia mirabilia ejus.* In the *Greek* Interpreter it is γεγράπται, that is, *Write all his wonderful Works.* Secondly, becauſe in the *Greek* and *Hebrew* Editions they ſpeak of themſelves in the firſt Perſon.

(r) *The time wherein the Hiſtory of* Judith *happen'd is no leſs uncertain.*] Some ſay this Hiſtory happen'd before the Captivity, and prove it, firſt, becauſe it is ſaid in this Book, that it happen'd a little after the City of *Ecbatana* was built by *Arphaxad* King of the *Medes*. Now that City, according to *Euſebius* and *Herodotus*, was built by *Dejoces*, who lived a long time before the Captivity. Secondly, King *Nebuchadnezzar*, who ſent *Holofernes* into *Judea*, reigned in *Ninive*, which City was deſtroyed before the Captivity of *Babylon*. Thirdly, This *Nebuchadnezzar*, they tell us, is *Saoſduchinus*, Grandſon of *Sennacherib*, and Son of *Aſſaradon* King of the *Babylonians*, who gave the Name of *Nebuchadnezzar* to their King. Fourthly, They ſay that *Eliachim*, or *Joachim*, was High-Prieſt under *Manaſſes*, as we may ſee in the 22d Chapter of *Iſaiah*. Thoſe who are of the contrary Opinion, return the following Anſwers to theſe Conjectures. To the firſt they reply, That *Ecbatana* was ſeveral times rebuilt. To the ſecond, That *Ninive* was reſtored to its ancient Splendor by the Kings of *Perſia*. To the third, That the Name of *Nebuchadnezzar* was common to the Kings of *Babylon* and *Aſſyria*. To the fourth, That *Eliachim*, of whom mention is made in *Iſaiah*, and in the ſecond Book of *Kings*, Chap. 18. was not High-Prieſt. The Reaſons which they alledge for this Opinion are as follows: Firſt, That this Hiſtory happen'd at a time when there were no Kings at *Jeruſalem*, and the High-Prieſts had the whole Authority in their Hands: Now this was not before the Captivity. Secondly, We read that there was one *Eliachim*, or *Joachim*, High-Prieſt after the Captivity. Thirdly, *Achior*, Prince of the *Edomites*, being ask'd by *Holofernes*, Chap. 5. Verſe 3. Who the People of *Iſrael* were? He tells him, That they were lately carried away Captives into a ſtrange Land, but now poſſeſſed the City *Jeruſalem*. *Et plurimi eorum captivy abducti ſunt in terram non ſuam, nuper autem reverſi ad Dominum Deum ſuum, ex diſperſione quâ diſperſi erant adunati ſunt, & aſcenderunt Montana hæc omnia, & iterum poſſident Jeruſalem.* And in the *Greek* it is added, Καὶ ὁ ναὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀυτῶν ἐφωδιάσθη εἰς Ἐδαφος. *Et Templum Dei eorum factum eſt in ſolum.* Words that ſhew, that this paſſage ought to be underſtood of the Captivity, and Deſtruction of the Temple. Laſtly, They add, that it is ſaid in the 16th Chapter that *Judith*, who lived an Hundred and five Years, ſaw no more War in *Iſrael*; and in the 8th Chapter, that when ſhe went to find out *Holofernes*, ſhe was young and beautiful. Hence they ſay it evidently follows, that this Hiſtory did not happen during the Reign of *Manaſſes*, becauſe from the War which *Pharoah Necho* made in the time of King *Joſiah*, it was but Forty five or Forty ſix Years to the Captivity, ſo that by this account ſhe muſt have been Sixty four Years old, when ſhe went to meet *Holofernes*, which is by no means probable. Theſe Reaſons, I confeſs, are not unanſwerable; but however, this Opinion ſeems to me to be moſt agreeable to Truth. The greateſt part of the Proteſtant Criticks, as *Luther*, *Chytræus*, *Beroaldus*, *Scaliger*, and *Grotius*, believe that this Hiſtory is a Fiction, or Allegory, which *Grotius* has very handſomely explained; but this is a raſh Opinion, and ought not to be followed.

(ſ) *The time and Author of the Hiſtory of* Heſter *are ſtill uncertain.*] *Scaliger* aſſures us that it happened under *Xerxes*. Firſt he ſays, that the Name of *Aſſuerus*, in *Greek* Ὀξυάρης, reſembles that of *Xerxes*: That *Xerxes*'s Queen, whoſe Name is *Ameſtris* according to *Herodotus*, is the ſame with *Heſter*: That the Feaſt whereof mention

mention is made in this Book, is that which is related by the ſame Hiſtorian, which *Xerxes* made before his Expedition againſt *Greece*. This Opinion is eaſily confuted, becauſe from hence it would follow, that *Heſter* was very old when ſhe was married to *Xerxes*, and that her Uncle *Mordecai* was an Hundred and ſixty years old; for being one of thoſe who were carried away Captives into *Babylon* in the time of King *Jeconiah*, when he was Ten Years old, if we thereto add the Seventy Years of Captivity, and the Years of the Kings of *Perſia* after *Cyrus*, it will by the leaſt Computation make up an Hundred and fifty Years. Secondly, *Ameſtris* was Married to *Xerxes* a long time before his Expedition into *Greece*, as it appears by the joint Teſtimonies of *Herodotus* and *Cteſias*. The Father of *Ameſtris* was *Onophes* a *Perſian*, and no *Jew*. In ſhort, that Queen was ill-natured and cruel. The Opinion of thoſe, who place this Hiſtory under *Artaxerxes*, is confuted by the ſame reaſon that is urged againſt the former; for 'tis preciſely ſaid in the ſecond Chapter, Verſ. 6. that *Mordecai* was of the number of thoſe who were carried away by the King of *Babylon* along with *Jeconiah*. The third Opinion of thoſe, who believe it was *Cyaxares*, is no leſs improbable. For firſt of all, the King who is mentioned in that Book, is called King of the *Perſians*, and not of the *Medes*. Secondly, It is ſaid that he Ruled from *India* to *Æthiopia*; now the *Medes* were never ſo powerful. Thirdly, *Ahaſuerus* commonly reſided in the City of *Suſa*, which as *Solinus*, *Diodorus*, and *Plutarch* teſtifie, was the place of reſidence of the Kings of *Perſia*, and not of the *Median* Kings. Laſtly, it could not happen under *Cyaxerxes* the Father of *Aſtyages*, as the Authors of this Opinion are agreed. As for *Cyaxaris*, who is ſuppoſed to be the Son of *Aſtyages*, he is altogether unknown to *Herodotus*, and other ancient Hiſtorians. None mention him but *Xenophon*, and all the World knows he is no exact Hiſtorian in his *Cyropædia*. So that after all, the Opinion of thoſe who believe that *Ahaſuerus* was the ſame with *Darius* the Son of *Hiſtaſpes*, as it is by far the moſt probable, ſo it carries no difficulty with it. The firſt Reaſon alledged againſt the other Opinions, makes it evident that it could not be any of the *Perſian* Kings after *Darius*; and as for what is ſaid of him in this Book, that he Ruled from *India* to *Æthiopia*, it excludes all the Kings before *Cambyſes*, and at the ſame time excludes *Cambyſes* himſelf, who never conquered *Egypt*, and conſequently belongs to none but *Darius*. It is ſaid there that *Ahaſuerus* reſided in the City of *Suſa*, which agrees very well with *Darius* the Son of *Hiſtaſpes*, becauſe as *Ælian* has obſerved, that King built himſelf a Palace in that City; and beſides *Herodotus* adds, that he kept his Treaſure there. The ſame Hiſtorian tells us, that he paſſionately loved one of his Wives, whom he calls *Artiſſone*, and that he put a Diadem upon her Head. This paſſage ſuits mightily with the Hiſtory of *Heſter*, and the Name too bears ſome Conformity, for *Heſter* is likewiſe called *Hadaſſa*. King *Ahaſuerus* made all the Iſles of the Sea Tributary to him. Now according to *Thucydides*, *Darius* the Son of *Hiſtaſpes* conquered them, as it is alſo obſerved by *Plato* in his *Menexenus*, and after him none of the *Perſian* Kings brought them under their Command. They object, That *Ahaſuerus* was deſcended of the *Perſian* Kings, as it appears in the 16th Chapter, whereas *Darius* was the Son of *Hiſtaſpes*, who was no King. But *Herodotus* aſſures us, that he was of the Royal Family. They likewiſe tell us, that it is witten in the ſame Chapter that *Haman* would have tranſlated the Empire to the *Macedonians*. Now, ſay they, the *Macedonians* were not known till a long while after the time of *Darius*. Some People ſay, that *Haman* was no *Macedonian*, and that in ſtead of Μακεδὼν, we ought to read Ἀμαληκίτην, becauſe he was of the Race of *Agag*, but this Conjecture is not ſolid. *Anſwer*, The Hiſtory of *Heſter* could not happen after this King, as we have already ſhewn, and the contrary Opinion is very weak. It was Natural for *Haman*, who was a *Macedonian*, to endeavour to Tranſlate the Empire to his own Nation, which was very Famous and Powerful at this time, as *Juſtin* has informed us. Laſtly, they ſay, That *Ahaſuerus* is alſo called *Artaxerxes* in the 16th Chapter; Now there were but three Kings of that Name, *viz.* one Sirnamed *Longimanus*, another *Mnemon*, and the laſt *Ochus*. *Ahaſuerus* therefore was one of theſe three. *Anſwer*, *Artaxerxes* is a Name that might perhaps be given to all the Kings of *Perſia*, as *Cæſar* to all the Roman Emperors.

(*t*) *The greateſt part make* Mordecai *the Author of it.*] It ſeems that *Mordecai* was the Author of this Book, by Chap. 9. Verſ. 20. and 23. and by Chap. 12. Verſ. 4. where it is ſaid, That he wrote down all that happened. In the Septuagint, Chap. 9. *Heſter* is joyned to *Mordecai*, which made *Serrarius*, and ſome others, believe, that *Heſter* and *Mordecai* compoſed it together. Thoſe that pretend it was done by the Synagogue, draw their Conjecture from hence, becauſe the Original and Ceremonies of the Feaſt of the *Jews*, called *Purim*, are there largely deſcribed, upon which occaſion the Book ſeems to have been written.

(*u*) *The Author of the Book, that recounts the Hiſtory of* Job, *is no leſs uncertain.*] Thoſe that attribute it to *Job* ground their Opinion chiefly upon this, that he twice wiſhes in the 19th and 31ſt Chapters, that his Words were written down: But 'tis eaſie to obſerve, that he does not here ſpeak of an ordinary Book, and that 'tis only a Figure, to ſhew how well he was ſatisfied of the Truth of them. *Quis mihi tribuat ut ſcribantur Sermones mei: Quis mei det ut exarentur in libro Stylo ferreo, & plumbi laminâ, vel certè ſculpantur in ſilice?* Thoſe that make *Moſes* the Tranſlator of it, as particularly the Author of one of the Commentaries upon *Job*, commonly aſcribed to *Origen*, does ſay, That he Tranſlated it out of the Arabick or Syriack. The Talmudiſts and Rabbins make *Moſes* the Author of it; and this is likewiſe the Opinion of the Author of the ſecond Commentary upon *Job*, attributed to *Origen*, of *Methodius* in *Photius*, of *Polychronius*, of *Julianus Halicarnaſſeus* in the *Catena*, and of *Nicetas* upon *Job*. St. *Jerome* alſo ſeems to be of the ſame Judgment. The only

Reaſon

Reaſon they alledge to ſupport this Opinion, is the reſemblance of the Style, but for my part, I profeſs I cannot find it out. The Style of the Book of *Job* is Figurative, Poetical, Obſcure, and full of Sentences. One finds there an infinite number of Arabick or Syriack Terms, and 'tis extreamly different from the Style of the *Pentateuch*. *Origen* rejects the Opinion. *Tom.* 5. *in Johannem*, where he formall denies that *Moſes* wrote any other Books beſides the *Pentateuch*. St. *Gregory*, who attributes it to *Salomon*, brings nothing to prove this conjecture of his. Thoſe that aſcribe it to *Jeremiah*, juſtifie themſelves by the Conformity of the Style, and the Syriack Words that occur ſo frequently there. *Coducus* makes an Edomitiſh Prophet Author of it, but upon very frivolous idle Surmiſes. Some attribute it to the Captive Jews in *Babylon*, without any Foundation, ſo that we can ſay nothing of the Author of this Book, but that he is altogether unknown.

(*x*) *Who ſay that the Hiſtory of* Job *is wholly feigned.*] This is the Opinion of the Talmudiſts, of *Maimonides*, and ſeveral Rabbins; but *Ezekiel*, *ch.* 14. *v.* 14. *Tobit*, *ch.* 2. *v.* 12. and St. *James* in his Epiſtle, ſpeaks of him as a Man that really was. The proper Names of *Job*, of his Friends, of his Country, of the Number of his Children, ſerve to ſhew that it is a true Hiſtory. St. *Cyprian* in his Treatiſe of *Patience*, St. *Jerome* in his Ep. 103. St *Baſil*, Homily the 4th, St. *Auſtin* in his Sermon 103. and all the Fathers, ſpeak of him after this manner. 'Tis alledged againſt this Opinion, that the proper Names of this Book have Myſtick Significations; That *Job* ſignifies a Man in Grief; עץ, Counſel; *Zophar*, one that is Watchful; *Eliphaz*, the Law of God; *Elihu*, God himſelf. To this it is anſwered, That moſt Hebrew Names have ſuch ſort of Significations. All the other Objections only prove, That this Hiſtory is deliver'd Poetically. This is really true in this Hiſtory, that there was a certain great Perſon named *Job*, who was reduced to the extremity of Miſery, by the loſs of his Goods. and his Children, heighten'd by a very ſevere fit of Sickneſs; that he ſupported himſelf under all theſe Afflictions with incredible Patience; and at laſt was reſtored to a proſperous Condition. Upon the occaſion of this remarkable Event, ſome one or other compoſed the Book of *Job*, the Diſcourſes of his Friends, the Anſwers of *Job*, &c.

(*yz*) *Some Perſons make* Job *to have deſcended from* Nahor *the Brother of* Abraham.) This is the Opinion of *Bellarmine*, who makes him the Grandſon of *Nahor*, and older than *Moſes*. He concludes, that 'tis probable he lived long, and that he lived not in *Moſes*'s time, but he produces no Authorities to back this Opinion. Amongſt the Grand-Children of *Eſau* there is one called *Jobab*. which Name is eaſily formed into that of *Job*. Hence it is, that ſome People believe he was one of the Deſcendants of *Eſau*, and an *Edomite*. This is particularly obſerved in the Greek Addition, which is without queſtion very ancient, ſince *Theodotion* has acknowledged it. *Grotius* believes, that in Chap. 26. Verſ. 12. there is mention made of the Drowning of the *Ægyptians* in the *Red Sea*, but that is not certain. *Caſtellio* aſſures us, that in Chap. 28. Verſ. 28. there is a paſſage taken out of *Deut.* chap. 4. verſ. 56. but theſe two paſſages are different. The firſt is, *Ecce timor Domini ipſa eſt Sapientia.* The ſecond is, *Hæc eſt enim vera Sapientia & Intellectus.* *Grotius* adds, That this Book was written after *David* and *Salomon*, but before *Ezekiel*, pretending, that as it is quoted by that Prophet, ſo there are ſeveral paſſages in it drawn out of the *Pſalms*, and the Books of *Salomon*; but this is not evident, and it ſhould rather ſeem, that *David* and *Salomon* borrowed ſome of their Thoughts out of *Job*, although it is not neceſſary either to ſay one or the other.

(*aa*) *'Tis certain, as St.* Jerome *has obſerved, that all the Pſalms were not written by* David.] St. Jerome, Epiſt. ad Cypr. *Scimus errare eos qui Pſalmos omnes David arbitrantur, & non eorum, quorum nominibus Inſcripti ſunt.* Epiſt. ad Sophronium. *Pſalmos eorum Teſtamur Autorum, qui ponuntur in titulis; ſcilicet Aſaph, Idithum, filiorum Chore, Emon Eſraitæ, Moſes, Salomonis, & reliquorum quos Eſdras uno volumine comprehendit.* This is alſo the Opinion of *Origen*, of St. *Hilary*, and the Author of the Abridgment attributed to St. *Athanaſius*. St. *Auguſtine* in his Expoſition of the Second *Pſalm* ſeems to be of that opinion: But in his *Book of Hereſies*, *Hereſie the* 26*th*, he takes the other Opinion to be the more probable of the two. *Theodoret* alſo is doubtful in the matter, as he teſtifies in his Preface upon the *Pſalms*. Some others of the Fathers ſeem to have been perſuaded, that they were all compoſed by *David*, as St. *Chryſoſtome*, *Euthymius*, *Caſſiodorus*, and particularly *Philaſtrius*, who in *Hereſie* the 126*th* reckons all thoſe for *Heretick*s that doubt the truth of it. Nevertheleſs it is very certain, that they were not all written by *David*, for in the firſt place, there are ſome of them that bear other names; and ſecondly, ſome paſſages are to be found there, which happened after *David's* death, as in *Pſalm* the 137th, where mention is made of the Captivity of the *Jews* in *Babylon*. One may obſerve the ſame thing in *Pſalm* the 64th and 124th.

(*bb*) *It is difficult to name the Authors of them.*] St. *Jerome* pretends, that theſe *Pſalms* belong to thoſe whoſe names they carry; but this is not certain. 'Tis believed, that the *fifty* next immediately after that carries for its Title *the return of Haggai* and *Zechariah*, were written by thoſe Prophets. The Author of the *Abridgment*, commonly attributed to St. *Athanaſius*, believes, that all the *Pſalms* entituled to *David*, *ipſi David*, are nevertheleſs done by ſome other hand. Our Bleſſed Saviour cites the hundred and tenth, *Dixit Dominus*, which is found to have that Title under the name of *David*, *Matt.* 22. *v.* 42. The hundred and thirty ſeventh *Pſalm* carries the name of *David* and *Jeremiah*, τω Δαβιδ Ιερεμιε, which makes it apparently thus to be underſtood. A *Pſalm* of *Jeremiah* compoſed in imitation of *David*. The 64th *Pſalm*, in the Vulgar Tranſlation, bears the name of *Iſaac* and of *Ezekiel*; the 70th that of the Sons of *Jonadab*

[*I believe it ſhould be* 5 *inſtead of* 50, *becauſe the* 146*th Pſalm has this Title in the* LXX, *of Haggai and Zechariah.*

dah, and the chief Captives. The *Jews* make *Salomon* the Author of the 92d, and of ſeveral others. *Origen* ſays, that the 90th was compoſed by *Moſes*, whoſe name it bears; and the *Jews* tells us, he made it upon the occaſion of a Sedition that happened amongſt the Children of *Iſrael*, upon the return of thoſe that were ſent to diſcover the Land of Promiſe. St. *Jerome* is of the ſame opinion. The ten following *Pſalms* are alſo attributed to *Moſes*, not only by the *Jews*, but even by St. *Hillary* and *Jerome*. This cannot poſſibly hold true of the 99th, where mention is made of *Samuel*. Some of the Rabbies attribute the 92d, to *Adam*, as the *Talmudiſts* do ſome to ſeveral of the ancient Patriarchs. There is a *Greek Pſalm*, which is not of the number of the 150 attributed to *David*, but written by ſome *Helleniſt* who has borrowed it out of *David*, *Iſaiah*, and *Ezekiel*.

(*cc*) *They have been cited as Books inſpired by God both in the Old and New Teſtament.*] The 105th, the 96th, and the 136th *Pſalms* are to be found in the 16th Chapter of the Firſt Book of *Chronicles*, and in the 7th of the Second Book it is ſaid, that the Prieſts did ſing the *Pſalms* which *David* had compoſed for the Lord, ſinging, *For his mercy endureth for ever*. This is the 136th *Pſalm*, which is yet to be found quoted in Chapters 5, and 20, of the ſame Book, in the 3d of *Ezrah*, in the 13th of *Judith*, in the 33d of *Jeremiah*, and the 3d of *Daniel*, [according to their Computation, who eſteem the Song of the Three Children to be part of the Canonical Scripture.] In *Eccleſiaſticus*, Ch. 47. v. 9. it is ſaid that *David* praiſed God with all his Heart, and ſet Singers before the Altar, *In quorum ſono dulces fecit modos*. I have not leiſure to ſpeak of thoſe many paſſages in the Prophets which allude to ſeveral places in the *Pſalms*. In the Second of *Maccabees*, *Ch.* 2. *v.* 13. there is mention made of the Pſalms of *David*; St. *Matthew*, *Ch.* 13. *v.* 35. and 27. *v.* 35. recites the Prophecies about our Bleſſed Saviour, contained in the *Pſalms*. Jeſus Chriſt himſelf cites the Pſalm *Dixit Dominus*, *&c.* under the name of *David*; and in *St. Luke*, *Ch.* 24. it is ſaid, that all things muſt be fulfilled which were written in the Law of *Moſes*, and in the Prophets, and in the *Pſalms* concerning him: The *Acts*, and the *Epiſtles of the Apoſtles*, are full of Citations out of the *Pſalms*.

(*dd*) Grotius *has pretended upon ſlight conjectures it was compoſed by* Zorobabel.] This Opinion is not ſupported by any ſolid Reaſon. He ſays, that the Shepherd mentioned towards the end of the laſt Chapter is *Zorobabel*, and his Son *Abiud*, but he brings no Proofs to recommend this Opinion. They commonly object when they would prove that this Book was not written by *Salomon*, that there are abundance of *Chaldee* words to be found in it, that are only to be met in *Daniel*, *Ezrah*, *&c.* but perhaps theſe words might be in faſhion amongſt the *Jews* towards the end of *Salomon*'s Reign, or it may be they were added ſince. One might alſo object this paſſage of *Ch.* 2. *v.* 8. *Os regis obſerva*, which makes it credible that it is not a King that ſpeaks; but we ought to read *obſerva*, as it is in the *Septuagint*. [It looks alſo a little ſtrange that *Salomon* ſhould ſo often ſay, that he did ſo or ſo, *above all that were before him in Jeruſalem* (*Eccleſ.* 1. 16. 2. 7. 9.) ſince his Father *David* was the firſt King that ever Reigned in *Jeruſalem*.]

(*ee*) *This Book of Wiſdom is commonly attributed to* Salomon.] This is St. *Cyprian*'s Opinion in his Book of Morality, of St. *Auguſtine* in his ſecond Book of the Chriſtian Doctrine, *Ch.* 8. The ancient Verſions, the Rabbins, *Origen*, St. *Chryſoſtome*, St. *Clement* of *Alexandria*, St. *Cyprian* have likewiſe attributed it to *Salomon*. The moſt ancient Fathers call the *Proverbs*, *The Wiſdom of* Salomon.

(*ff*.) St. Jerome *ſays, he ſaw in his time an Hebrew Copy*.] *Munſter* and *Fagius* ſtill make mention of an *Hebrew* Copy of this Book: *Buxtorf* tells us, he ſaw one that was Printed at *Conſtantinople*, but 'tis probable that that Text was made upon the *Greek*.

(*gg*) *Some of the Ancients have attributed this Work to* Salomon.] St. *Cyprian* and St. *Ambroſe* have cited it under his name. St. *Hilary* teſtifies, that ſeveral Perſons in his time attributed it to him. This Opinion is impoſſible to be maintained, not only becauſe we know who is the Author, but alſo becauſe in *Ch.* 47. there is mention made of the Prophets that lived after *Salomon*. *Euſebius*, St *Jerome*, the Author of the Abridgment attributed to *Athanaſius*. St. *Epiphanius*, St. *Chryſoſtom*, St. *Auſtin*, *Cæſarius* of *Arles*, and many others, have acknowledged the true Author of it, who was Jeſus the Son of *Syrach*. St. *Jerome* ſays, he lived under the High Prieſt *Simon* the Son of *Onias* the Second, and that he wrote this Book after the Verſion of the *Septuagint*, or at leaſt, that he lived in their time: And firſt he proves it by the Preface of his Grandſon, who ſays he collected theſe Books of his Grandfather in the time of *Ptolomy Euergetes*, who immediately ſucceeded *Ptolomy Philadelphus*. Secondly, becauſe he commends the High Prieſt *Simon* the Juſt, Son of *Onias* the Firſt, *Ch.* 50. and afterwards the Tranſlator praiſes *Jeſus* the Son of *Sirach*, as one that lived in the time of that High Prieſt. Thirdly, becauſe, *Ch.* 2. he ſeems to ſpeak of the Perſecution, which the *Jews* ſuffered under *Ptolomy* the Son of *Lagus*, and in the firſt year of *Ptolomy Philadelphus*. *Huetius* believes, that *Joſeph* the Son of *Syrach* is the ſame with a certain *Jew* named *Ben Sira*, who has written the *Proverbs* in *Hebrew*, but this Opinion does not appear to be well grounded.

(*hh*) *The Son of one* Amos, *whom we muſt not confound with the Prophet that bears this name.*] The name of the Prophet is *Amos*, and that of the Father of *Iſaiah*, is *Amots*. The firſt was a Shepherd, the ſecond was of Royal Extraction. The firſt lived in the time of *Uzziah* King of *Judah*, the later is more ancient. St. *Jerome in Ch.* 1. *Iſaiæ*, St. *Auſtin* in the 18th Book *De Civitate Dei*, *Ch.* 27. St. *Cyril* in his Preface upon *Amos*, and others, have diſtinguiſhed between theſe two. *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *l.* 1. *Strom.* the Author *of the Life and Death of the Prophets*, attributed to St. *Epiphanius*, and the Rabbins, have confounded them. St. *Jerome* tells us, that the Father of *Iſaiah* was Father-in-law to *Manaſſes*.

(*ii*) *By whoſe Command, they ſay, he was cruelly put to death, and ſawn aſunder with a Wooden Saw.*] This is a common Tradition amongſt the *Jews*, and is confirmed by the Teſtimonies of *Tertullian*. St. *Jerome*, and St. *Baſil*.

(*kk*) *The*

(*kk*) *The Conjectures they bring to prove it are very frivolous.*] They ſay, that the Prophecy of *Iſaiah* does not begin before the 6th Chapter, when, after he has ſaid that he held his Tongue, he ſays, *I heard a voice of the Lord, ſaying, whom ſhall I ſend?* In the ſecond place they pretend, that what he ſays in the firſt Chapter concerning the deſolation of *Judah*, does not at all agree with the Reign of *Uzziah*, and therefore 'tis not the beginning of his Prophecy. Thirdly, we don't find, ſay they, in this Book, the Life and Actions of *Uzziah* that were written by *Iſaiah*, as we are informed in the *Chronicles*. Fourthly, *Iſaiah* propheſied alſo under *Manaſſes*, but there are no Prophecies under his Name, that have any Relation to the Reign of that King. Fifthly, the order of things frequently reverſed as well in *Iſaiah*, as in the other Prophets. *Anſwer.* To the firſt Objection we return this anſwer, That the Prophet does not ſay, he had as yet wrote nothing, but only that he tarried a long time without writing, and at laſt God commanded him to write. 'Tis believed, he wrote this in the laſt year of King *Uzziah*. To the ſecond we reply, That he might foretel a future deſolation, even at a time before it happened. Tis an eaſie matter to anſwer the Third, by ſaying, that the Book of the Actions of *Uzziah* mentioned in the *Chronicles*, is different from that of his Prophecies. In order to anſwer the fourth, it ſufficeth to obſerve, that it is no where ſaid, that *Iſaiah* wrote thoſe things which he propheſied under *Manaſſes*. Laſtly, as for the fifth, we ſay, that we ought not to expect a continued Hiſtorical ſtyle from the Prophets. On the contrary, their Prophecies are generally written without connexion and order. There was formerly another Prophecy of *Jeremiah* mentioned by *Origen*, where theſe words were to be found, *Appenderunt mercedem meam*, &c, The *Nazarens* made uſe of it, as St. *Jerome* teſtifies *in cap.* Matth. 27.

(*ll*) *We don't certainly know at what time.*] Some are of Opinion, that *Baruch* went not to *Babylon* till after the death of his Maſter *Jeremiah*, to whom he was too far engaged ever to quit him, and they confirm this Opinion by the 2d Verſe, where mention is made of the burning of *Jeruſalem*. Others ſay, he wrote his Book before the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*, becauſe he there ſpeaks of Sacrifices and Conſecrated Veſſels, which makes them believe, that he was one of thoſe that were deputed in the fourth year of *Zedekiah*, of whom *Saraiah* the Brother of *Baruch* was chief. They affirm therefore, that having carried the Book of *Iſaiah* thither, he compoſed his Prophecy the year following to comfort the Captives, and that the fifth year after the taking of *Jeruſalem*, which is mentioned in the ſecond Verſe, ought to be computed from the Captivity of *Jechoniah*.

(*mm*) *Which ſeems to be confirmed by a certain paſſage in his Book.*] In the firſt Chapter, *verſe* 3. *Et ait rex Aſphenes præpoſito Eunuchorum ··· fuerunt ergo inter eos Daniel*, &c. *Origen* and *St. Jerome* are of this Opinion. The Author of the *Life and Death of the Prophets* attributed to St. *Epiphanius*, and the falſe *Dorotheus*, are of the contrary opinion.

(*nn*) *The truth and antiquity of the two laſt Chapters, that contain the Hiſtory of* Suſanna *and of* Bel, *are mightily doubted.*] *Africanus*, *Euſebius*, and *Apollinarius*, reject both theſe Stories as fabulous, and maintain, they were not written by *Daniel*, but that they make a part of the Prophecy of *Habakkuk*. St. *Jerome* ſeems to be of this opinion in his Preface upon *Daniel*. *Origen* has defended the truth of this Hiſtory, without being willing to affirm that it was Canonical. The Author of the Book of *the Wonderful things in Scripture* attributed to St. *Auſtin*, *Tom.* 3. *lib.* 2. *chap.* 32. does not mention the Hiſtory of *Suſanna*, and rejects that of *Bel*. *Theodoret* in his Comments upon *Daniel* ſpeaks not a word of theſe Hiſtories. *Nicephorus* places the Hiſtory of *Suſanna* amongſt the *Apochryphal* Books. The Action of *Suſanna* is related and commended by *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *l.* 4. *Strom.* by *Tertullian*, *libr. de Corona*, *c.* 4. by St. *Cyprian*, *Ep.* 4. by St. *Auſtin* in his 18th Sermon, and in ſeveral other places; by St. *Baſil*, *lib.* 3. *de Spir. ſancto. cap.* 7. by St. *Ambroſe*, *lib.* 2. *de Spir. Sancto*; by St. *Chryſoſtome* in an Homily which is in *Tom.* 5. by *Gregory Nazienzene* in his 29th Oration; by *Avitus* in his Epiſtle to his Siſter; by St. *Fulgentius* in his Anſwers to *Ferrandus*; and by *Bede*. The Author of the *Abridgment* attributed to S. *Athanaſius*, and *Ruffinus*, ſeem to own it for a Canonical Book, as well as St. *Ambroſe*, and *Sulpitius Severus*. The Objections that are urged againſt this Hiſtory are theſe. In the firſt place they tell us, that the Hiſtory of *Suſanna* could not happen when *Daniel* was a youth, as he is called in that Story. For in the 13th *Chapter*, *Verſe* 65. it is obſerved, that *Aſtyages* was dead, and *Cyrus* reigned in his place. Now *Daniel* was then well in years. *Anſwer.* This Hiſtory happened a long time before, and as for the above-mentioned paſſage it is put out of its place. For in the ancient Verſions it is placed at the beginning of the Book of *Daniel*, and 'tis therefore ſet at the end of it in the Vulgar Edition, becauſe it is not to be found in the *Hebrew* Text. Wherefore theſe words of the 13th *Chapter*, *verſe* 65. *And King* Aſtyages *was gathered to his Fathers*, do not at all concern the Hiſtory of *Suſanna*, but that of *Bel*, which immediately follows, and accordingly in the Edition of *Sixtus Quintus* it is joyned to it.

Africanus objects, that it is not credible that *Joachim* the Husband of *Suſanna* was ſo rich and powerful in the Captivity, as he is ſaid to be in that Book; nor that the Captive *Jews* had authority to condemn their own Criminals. To this *Origen* anſwers, That the *Jews* that were carried away Captives into *Babylon* were not plundered, but that they were both rich and powerful, and that there is a great deal of reaſon to believe they had authority to judge and condemn their Malefactors by their own Laws, as they had afterwards, when they were conquered by the *Romans*. In the ſecond place, *Africanus* raiſes an Objection about an alluſion that is to be found in this Hiſtory, where *Daniel* is introduced diſcourſing to the Elders in certain words, that allude to the *Greek* names of the Trees, under which they found *Suſanna* committing wickedneſs. For the firſt of them having ſaid, that it was under a Maſtick Tree, in *Greek* σχῖνος, he anſwer'd him, that an Angel ſhould cut him in two, becauſe the word

σχίζειν

πρῖνον ſignifies in *Greek* to cut aſunder; and the other having ſaid, that it was under a Holm-Oak πρῖνος, he makes uſe of the word πρίζειν which alluſions, ſays *Africanus*, makes it appear, that it was a *Greek* that wrote theſe things. On the other hand *Origen* anſwers, that *Daniel* never made uſe of theſe terms, or names of Trees, but of ſome other *Hebrew* or *Chaldee* word, to which the Verb that ſignifies to *cut aſunder*, anſwered, and that the *Greek* Interpreter endeavoured to render this ſenſe by finding out ſome names of Trees, which alluded to thoſe *Greek* Verbs that ſignifie to *cut aſunder*: And thus in *Geneſis*, when it is ſaid in the *Hebrew*, that a Woman is called *Iſha*, the feminine of the word *Iſh* that ſignifies a Man, the *Latin* Tranſlation has render'd it *hæc vocabitur virgo*, and in the *Greek*, *Symmachus* has tranſlated it ἀνδρὶς, which is a better word than γύνη that the Septuagint have uſed.

'Tis commonly objected againſt the Hiſtory of *Bel*, that the ancient Title in the Septuagint attributes it to *Habakkuk*, and that the *Daniel* mentioned in that Hiſtory was a Prieſt; 'tis therefore another *Daniel* to whom all this happened. *Anſwer.* St. *Jerome* obſerves, that the *Greek* Interpreter of *Daniel*, whoſe Verſion goes under the name of the *Septuagint*, has allowed himſelf a great deal of liberty. Secondly, 'tis ſaid, that *Habakkuk*, who lived in the time of *Manaſſes*, was dead about that time. Likewiſe 'tis replied by way of anſwer, that we ought to diſtinguiſh between the two *Habakkuks*, one that was a Prophet and lived in the time of *Manaſſes*, and the other who is ſpoken of in this place of *Daniel*, the laſt was of the Tribe of *Levi*, the former of *Simeon*. Laſtly, they tell us, that in the Hiſtory of *Bel* and the *Dragon* it is ſaid, that *Daniel* was ſix days in the Lions Den, whereas in the ſixth Chapter, *v.*19. we are told that he continued there but one Night. But to this they anſwer, that *Daniel* was twice caſt into the Lions Den, under *Darius*, becauſe he prayed to his God contrary to the expreſs command of that King, and under *Cyrus* upon occaſion of the Dragon. The Prophecy of *Daniel* is quoted by *Ezechiel*, *ch.*14. *v.*14. in the firſt Book of the *Maccabees*, *ch.* 2. *v.*59. and 60. *Matth.* 24. *v.*15.

(*oo*) Hoſea *the Son of* Beeri *is the firſt.*] 'Tis believed, that he is the moſt ancient not only of the twelve Minor, but alſo of all the Prophets. The falſe *Epiphanius*, and falſe *Dorotheus* report, that he was of the Tribe of *Iſſachar*, and the City of *Balenor*, but theſe two are not very credible Authors.

(*pp*) *The Prophet* Joel *follows* Hoſea.] This order is obſerved in the *Hebrew* Text, but the *Greeks* place *Amos* and *Micah* between them.

(*qq*) *'Tis not certainly known at what time* Joel *propheſied.*] *Huetius* pretends, that he propheſied after the Captivity of the ten Tribes, becauſe it is ſaid, *chap.* 3. *v.* 2. *that they have ſcattered the People of* Iſrael *amongſt the Nations.* But why might not he ſpeak of a future thing, as if it were already done? He likewiſe ſays, that there is not a word ſpoken of the Kingdom of *Iſrael* in the whole Prophecy, but this is not certain. Thoſe Perſons that ſay he propheſied before *Amos* ground themſelves principally upon his prediction of a Famine towards the end of the firſt Chapter, whereof *Amos* ſpeaks as of a thing already paſt in the 4th Chapter of his Prophecy. But *Huetius* thinks, that theſe are two ſeveral Famines, that the Famine mentioned in *Amos* happened naturally, whereas the other, which *Joel* foretold, was to be occaſioned by the incurſions of Enemies.

(*rr*) *The time of* Obadiah *is uncertain.*] 'Tis not probable, that this Prophet was he, of whom mention is made in the Book of *Kings*, for he is only called there *one that feared God.* 'Tis more probable, that he lived in the time of *Ahaz*, when the *Edomites*, in conjunction with the *Iſraelites*, made War upon the Tribe of *Judah*, becauſe he perpetually declaims againſt the *Edomites*.

(*ſſ*) Jonah *the Son of the Prophet* Amittai.] The *Hebrews* ſay, he was the Widows Son of *Sarepta*, but this is only a groundleſs fancy.

(*tt*) *He that was the Son of* Hiſtaſpes.] This is the opinion of *Joſephus*, of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, of St. *Jerome* and *Theodoret*. *Scaliger* thinks, that it was *Darius Nothus*, becauſe there is mention made here of *Ahaſuerus* and *Artaxerxes* his Predeceſſors, whom he takes to be *Xerxes* and *Longimanus*; but it is an eaſie matter to anſwer him, by ſaying, that theſe names are given in Scripture, without any diſcrimination, to all the Kings of *Perſia*; and that by them we may underſtand *Cyrus* and *Cambyſes* the Predeceſſors of *Darius* the Son of *Hiſtaſpes*, or *Cambyſes* and *Smerdis*, or, if we pleaſe, *Cambyſes* himſelf, to whom the Scripture gives two Names. *Scaliger*'s others Argument is ſtronger; he ſays that *Zechariah* and *Haggai* Propheſied at the ſame time. And *Zechariah* in the firſt Chapter, verſ.12. and in the 17, verſ.5. teſtifies, That when he wrote, the People of *Iſrael* had been Threeſcore and Ten years in Affliction, and that God was Angry with them. Now the Second year of *Darius*, the Son of *Hiſtaſpes*, is not the 70th year of the Captivity. To this it is anſwered, That the Prophet *Zechariah* does not ſay, that it was 70 years ſince the Children of *Iſrael* were in Captivity; neither that they were then in Captivity, but he only ſays in general Terms, that they had been in Affliction, and that God had poured down his Indignation upon them for the ſpace of Threeſcore and Ten years, which ought to be underſtood of the 70 years of the Captivity, although it was already paſt. The Hebrew and Greek Phraſe in this paſſage no more denotes the preſent time, than the paſt. One undeniable Argument to prove, that *Haggai* wrote in the time of *Darius*, the Son of *Hiſtaſpes*, is this, that ſpeaking of the ſecond Temple, in ch. 2. ver. 3. he ſays, *Who is left amongſt you that ſaw this Houſe in her firſt Glory? Quis in vobis eſt derelictus, qui vidit Domum iſtam in Gloriâ ſuâ Primâ?* Now if this had been Written under *Darius Nothus*, theſe Perſons ought to have been 176 years old, or thereabout; and it wou'd follow, that *Ezrah* was 100 years old, *Zorobabel* and *Joſhua* 140, for ſo great a ſpace of time there is from the firſt year of *Cyrus* down to the time of *Darius Nothus*.

(*uu*) *Grandſon of* Iddo.] He is called in *Ezrah* the Son of *Iddo*; in the Septuagint; and St. *Jerome*'s Verſion, the Son of *Barachiah*, the Son of *Iddo*. St. *Jerome* is of Opinion, that he was the Natural Son of *Barachiah*, and the Son of *Iddo* by

Imitation; Others ſay he was the Son of the latter, according to the Law, but 'tis far more probable that he was his Grandſon, as it is obſerved in our vulgar Tranſlation. St. *Jerome* is miſtaken in confounding this *Iddo* with him, that was ſent to *Jeruſalem* in the time of *Jeroboam*, ſince there were 240 years from *Jeroboam* to *Darius*, a time too long to allow between Grandfather and Grandſon.

(*xx*) *He is different from* Zechariah, *mentioned by* Iſaiah.] By Chronology it appears, that this was not the Prophet, no more than he who is mentioned in the *Chronicles*, and died in the time of *Joaſh*. The Firſt was the Son of *Barachiah*, the Second of *Jehoiada*. That which has occaſioned this difficulty, is the ſaying of our Saviour, in St. *Matthew*, chap. 25. *That* Zechariah *the Son of* Barachiah *was Slain between the Temple and the Altar*; which agrees with what is related in the *Chronicles*, with *Zechariah* the Son of *Jehoiada*; and this introduced St. *Jerome* to believe that our Bleſſed Saviour ſpoke of him, and that we ought to Read, as we find it in the Goſpel of the *Nazarens*, the Son of *Jehoiada*, and not of *Barachiah*. *Origen* on the contrary, and ſeveral others, underſtand this place of the Prophet, who, they ſay, was Slain after the ſame manner. They have this Text of the Goſpel on their ſide; and beſides our Saviour ſpeaks of a Prophet, which cannot be underſtood of the Son of *Jehoiada*.

(*yy*) Malachi, *whoſe Name in the Hebrew, ſignifies*, My Angel.] And this has made *Origen* and *Tertullian* believe, that he was an Angel Incarnate. He is called *an Angel* by the greateſt part of the Fathers, and in the Verſion of the Septuagint, but he was *Angel* by *Office* and not by *Nature*, as he himſelf calls the Prieſts *Angels*. Some Perſons, as *Jonathan* the Chaldee Paraphraſt, St. *Jerome*, and ſeveral Jews believed, that it was an Appellative Name which *Ezrah* aſſumed, and that he was Author of this Book, but this Opinion is eſtabliſhed upon very weak Conjectures; and beſides, *Ezrah* is no where in Scripture called a Prophet. St. *Jerome* proves his Opinion in this firſt place, becauſe *Malachi* and *Ezrah* lived at the ſame time; Secondly, Becauſe what is in *Malachi* is very like what we find in *Ezrah*; And laſtly, Becauſe in chap. 2. verſ. 7. he ſeems to point at *Ezrah* by theſe Words, *Verba Sacerdotis cuſtodiunt Scientiam, &c.* But theſe Conjectures are light and frivolous. For the firſt only proves that *Malachi* and *Ezrah* lived at the ſame time, not that they were one and the ſame: The ſecond is not true, and if it were, it would prove juſt nothing. The Words quoted in the third ought to be underſtood of *Levi*, and all the Prieſts of the Law. He adds, that in *Eccleſiaſticus*, chap. 49. where mention is made of all the Prophets, the Name of *Malachi* is not to be found. To this it is anſwered, That we ought not to be ſurprized, becauſe he is not Named there, ſince in the ſame place there is no mention made of *Daniel*, and ſeveral others.

(*zz*) *The difference of the Style, of the Chronology, and of the Hiſtory make it appear.*] The firſt Book of *Maccabees* was written by an Hebrew, the ſecond by a Greek; the ſecond begins the Hiſtory a great deal higher than the firſt. One follows the Jewiſh Account, the other that of *Alexandria*, which begins Six Months after. Some Perſons attribute the firſt to *Joſephus*, others to *Philo*, others to the Synagogue, and others to the *Maccabees*. The Phraſe of the firſt is Jewiſh; and St. *Jerome* tells us, he had the Hebrew Copy of it. It was Intituled, *The Scepter of the Rebels againſt the Lord*, or rather, *The Scepter of the Prince of the Children of God*. The ſecond was Written by *Jaſon*, as it is obſerved in the Preface. *Huetius* believes, that the third and fourth Chapter, as well as the two laſt, don't belong to *Jaſon*, becauſe it is ſaid in chap. 2. verſ. 20. that he wrote down all that paſſed under *Antiochus* and *Eupator*, but then the remainder, which is the end and the beginning of that Hiſtory, ought to be underſtood.

(*aaa*) *From a Sentence in* Exodus.] This Sentence is in Hebrew, *Mi Camacha Be Elim Jehovah: Who is like to the Lord amongſt the Powers?* Now taking the firſt Letters of each Word we make *Maccabee*: Others give a different Etymology of this Name, but this is the moſt probable.

SECT. II.

The Canon of the Books of the Old Teſtament, of Books Doubtful, Apocryphal, and Loſt, that belonged to the Old Teſtament.

WE call the Books of the Bible Canonical Books, becauſe they are received into the Canon, or the Catalogue of Books, that we look upon as Sacred (*a*). Oppoſite to theſe are thoſe Books, we uſually call Apocryphal (*b*), which are not acknowledged as Divine, but rejected as ſpurious. The firſt Canon or Catalogue of the Holy Books was made by the Jews; 'tis certain they had one, but 'tis not ſo certainly known who it was that made it. Some Perſons reckon upon three of them, made at different times by the Sanedrim, or the great Synagogue of the Jews (*c*); But 'tis a great deal more probable, that they never had more than one Canon (*d*), or one Collection of the Holy Books of the Old Teſtament, that was made by *Ezrah* after the rebuilding of *Jeruſalem*, and was afterwards approved

proved and received by the whole Nation of the Jews, as containing all the Holy Books. *Joſephus*, ſpeaking of this buſineſs, in his firſt Book againſt *Appion*, ſays; 'There is nothing in the World that 'can boaſt of a higher degree of certainty, than the Writings Authorized amongſt us, for they are not 'ſubject to the leaſt Contrariety, becauſe we only receive and approve of thoſe Prophets, who wrote 'them many years ago, according to the pure Truth, by the Inſpiration of the Spirit of God. We 'are not therefore allowed to ſee great numbers of Books that contradict one another. We have 'only Twenty two that comprehend every thing of moment that has happen'd to our Nation, from 'the beginning of the World till now, and thoſe we are obliged firmly to believe. Five of them 'are Written by *Moſes*, that give a faithful Relation of all Events, even to his own Death, for about 'the ſpace of Three Thouſand years; and contain the Genealogy of the Deſcendants of *Adam*. The 'Prophets that ſucceeded this admirable Legiſlator, in Thirteen other Books, have Written all the 'memorable Paſſages that fell out, from his Death until the Reign of *Artaxerxes*, the Son of *Xerxes*, 'King of the *Perſians*. The other Four Books contain Hymns, and Songs, compoſed in the Praiſe 'of God, with abundance of Precepts, and Moral Inſtructions, for the regulating of our Manners. 'We have alſo every thing Recorded that has happen'd ſince *Artaxerxes* down to our own Times; 'but becauſe we have not had, as heretofore, a Succeſſion of Prophets, therefore we don't receive 'them with the ſame Belief as we do the Sacred Books, concerning which I have diſcourſed already: 'and for which we preſerve ſo great a Veneration, that no One ever had the boldneſs to take away, 'or add, or change, the moſt inconſiderable thing in them. We conſider them as Sacred Books, and 'ſo we call them; we make ſolemn Profeſſion inviolably to obſerve what they Command us, and to 'die with Joy if there be occaſion, thereby to preſerve them. *Origen*, St. *Jerome*, the Author of the Abridgment attributed to St. *Athanaſius*, St. *Epiphanius*, and ſeveral other Chriſtian Writers do teſtifie, that the Jews received but Twenty two Books into the Canon of their Holy Volumes. The Diviſion that St. *Jerome* has made of them, who diſtributes them into three Claſſes, is as follows. The firſt comprehends the Five Books of *Moſes*, which is called, The Law; The ſecond contains thoſe Books that he calls the Books of the Prophets, which are nine in number; namely, the Book of *Joſhuah*, the Book of *Judges*, to which, ſays St. *Jerome*, they uſe to joyn the Book of *Ruth*; the Book of *Samuel*, which we call the firſt and ſecond Book of *Kings*; the Book of *Kings*, which contain the two laſt. Theſe Books are followed by Three great Prophets, *viz. Iſaiah*, *Jeremiah*, and *Ezekiel*, which are three different Books, and by the twelve Minor Prophets, which make up but one Book. The third Claſs comprehends thoſe Books that are uſually called, the *Hagiographa*, or *Holy Scriptures*; the firſt of which is the Book of *Job*; the ſecond the *Pſalms* of *David*; the three following are the Books of *Salomon*, which are, the *Proverbs*, *Eccleſiaſtes*, and the *Canticles*; the ſixth is *Daniel*, the ſeventh the *Chronicles*, the eighth *Ezrah*, which is divided into two Books by the Greeks and Latins, and the laſt is the Book of *Eſther*. 'Thus, *ſays St.* Jerome, all the Books of the Old Teſtament 'amongſt the Jews, juſt make up the number of Twenty two, five whereof were Written by *Moſes*, 'eight by the Prophets, and nine are the Hagiographa. Some Perſons make them Twenty four in 'number, by ſeparating *Ruth*, and the *Lamentations* of the Prophet *Jeremy*, and placing them amongſt 'the Hagiographa. This Prologue to the Bible, *continues he*, may ſerve as a Preface to all thoſe Books, 'that we have Tranſlated out of the Hebrew; and we ought to underſtand, that whatſoever Book 'is not to be found in this number is Aprocryphal. From hence it follows, that the Book of *Wiſdom*, 'commonly attributed to *Salomon*, the *Eccleſiaſticus* of *Jeſus* the Son of *Syrach*, *Judith*, *Tobit*, and the 'Paſtor, don't belong to the Canon no more than the two Books of *Maccabees* do; one of which was 'originally Written in Hebrew, and the other in Greek, as the ſtyle ſufficiently ſhews. Thus we ſee how St. *Jerome* has clearly explained the Canon of the Scriptures, as they are received by the Jews; yet we have reaſon to doubt, whether he has been very exact in this Catalogue, ſince in ſome particulars it does not agree with *Joſephus*. For although they are agreed about the number of the Books, yet they notoriouſly differ in the manner of diſtributing them. *Joſephus* places all the Hiſtorical Books, to the number of Thirteen, amongſt the Prophets, adding to St. *Jerome's* nine, *Daniel*, the *Chronicles*, *Ezrah*, and *Job*. And conſequently he ſets only thoſe in the third rank that are purely Moral Treatiſes, as the Pſalms of *David*, and the Three Books of *Salomon*. But beſides this difference, we may probably ſuppoſe, that *Joſephus* has not reckon'd the Book of *Eſther* in the number of the Canonical Books. For he is opinion, that they were all written before the Reign of *Artaxerxes*, but as for the Hiſtory of *Eſther*, he believed it fell under the Reign of that King, as we may ſee in his Antiquities.

'Tis therefore very likely, that he never conſidered that Book as Canonical, but that to make up the number of the 13 Books of the Prophets, he reckoned the Book of *Ruth* ſeparately from that of the *Kings*. 'Tis in purſuance of this Canon, that *Melito*, and the Author of the *Abridgment of the Scriptures*, attributed to St. *Athanaſius*, reject the Book of *Eſther*, and ſeparate the Book of *Ruth* from that of the *Kings*. Some Perſons pretend, that he has not owned the Book of *Job*, becauſe he makes no mention of that Hiſtory, but we ought not to wonder, that he paſſes it by, ſince it has no relation to the Nation of the Jews, and he only deſigned to ſpeak of them in his Antiquities. Others imagine, that he acknowledged *Eccleſiaſticus* for a Canonical Book, becauſe he has cited a paſſage out of it in his ſecond Book againſt *Appion*. But it is viſible, as *Pithœus* has remarked, that this Citation, which is not to be found in the ancient Verſion of *Ruffinus*, has been ſince inſerted into the Text of *Joſephus* (*e*).

The ancient Chriſtians have followed the Jewiſh Canon in the Books of the Old Teſtament. There are none quoted in the New Teſtament (*f*), but thoſe that were received into the Canon of the Jews, and the greateſt part of theſe (*g*) are frequently cited there. The firſt Catalogues of the Canonical

Books made by the Eccleſiaſtick Greek and Latin Authors, comprehend no more, but at the ſame time we ought to affirm, that even thoſe Books, that have been ſince added to the Canon, have been often quoted by the Ancients, and indeed ſometimes under the Name of Scripture.

The firſt Catalogue, we find of the Books of Scripture amongſt the Chriſtians, is that of *Melito* Biſhop of *Sardis*, ſet down by *Euſebius* in the 4th Book of his Hiſtory, *chap.* 26. It is entirely conformable to that of the *Jews*, and contains but twenty two Books, in which number *Eſther* is not reckon'd, and the Book of *Ruth* is diſtinguiſhed from that of the *Judges*. *Origen* alſo in a certain paſſage drawn out of the Expoſition of the Firſt *Pſalm*, and produced by *Euſebius* in his 6th Book, *chap.* 25. reckons twenty two Books of the Old Teſtament, but he places the Book of *Eſther* in this number, and joyns the Book of *Ruth* with that of *Judges*. The Council of *Laodicea*, which was the firſt Synod that determined the number of the Canonical Books, St. *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem* in his fourth Catechetick Lecture, St. *Hilary* in his Preface to the *Pſalms*, the laſt Canon falſly aſcribed to the *Apoſtles*, *Amphilochius* cited by *Balſamon*, *Anaſtaſius Sinaita* upon the *Hexameron*, *lib.* 7. Saint *John Damaſcene* in his fourth Book of *Orthodox Faith*, the Author of the *Abridgment of Scripture*, and of the *Feſtival Letter*, attributed to St. *Athanaſius*, the Author of the Book *of the Hierarchy*, attributed to St. *Dionyſius*, and the *Nicephori*, follow the Catalogue of *Melito*. *Gregory Nazianzen* is of the ſame opinion in his Thirty third Poem, where he diſtributes the Books of Scripture into the three Claſſes, *viz.* Hiſtorical, Poetical, and Prophetical (*h*). He reckons up twelve Hiſtorical Books, namely, the five Books of *Moſes*, *Joſhuah*, *Judges*, *Ruth*, the two Books of *Kings*, the *Chronicles*, and *Ezrah*; The five Poetical Books are *Job*, *David*, and the three Books of *Salomon*; and there are likewiſe five Prophetical Books, *viz.* the four Great, and the twelve Minor Prophets. *Leontius* in his Book of Sects follows this Catalogue and Diſtribution, only he reckons the Book of *Pſalms* by it ſelf. St. *Epiphanius*, in his *Eigth Hereſie*, counts Twenty ſeven Canonical Books of the Old Teſtament; nevertheleſs, he adds nothing to *Origen's* Canon, but he ſeparates the Book of *Ruth* from that of *Judges*, and divides into two the Book of *Kings*, the *Chronicles*, and the Book of *Ezrah*. Several of the Latines reckon twenty four Books, whether it be that they add *Judith* and *Tobit*, as Saint *Hilary* has obſerved of ſome in his time, or whether they ſeparate *Ruth*, and the *Lamentations of Jeremiah*, as St. *Jerome* has obſerved. *Victorinus* upon the *Apocalypſe*, St. *Ambroſe* upon the ſame Book, *Primaſius* the Author of the Poem againſt *Marcion*, *Bede*, and the Author of the Sermons upon the ſame Book, attributed to St. *Auſtin*, and ſeveral others, reckon twenty four Books of the Old Teſtament, and ſay, they are repreſented by the twenty four Elders in the *Revelations*. The firſt Catalogue of the Books of the Holy Scriptures, where they added ſome Books to the Jewiſh Canon, is that of the third Council of *Carthage*, held *Anno Dom.* 397. when the Books of *Judith*, *Tobit*, the *Wiſdom of Salomon*, *Eccleſiaſticus*, and the two Books of the *Maccabees* were reckon'd in the number of Canonical Books. There is at the end of this Canon a Poſtil that is very remarkable: *Let the Church beyond the Sea be conſulted (to confirm, or) before this Canon is confirmed. De confirmando iſto Canone Eccleſia Tranſmarina Conſulatur.* This Catalogue of Canonical Books is confirmed by the Authority of Pope *Innocent* the Firſt, in an Epiſtle to *Exuperius*, and by that of a Roman Council held under *Gelaſius*, *Anno Dom.* 494. (*i*), and is followed in the Decree of *Eugenius* to the *Armenians*, and by the Holy Council of *Trent*. All theſe Catalogues ſerve to acquaint us in general, what were the Books that were not received to be certainly Canonical, and which they are, whoſe Authority have been queſtioned by Antiquity. But nevertheleſs we ought to ſpeak of them particularly, for although they were not received in the firſt Ages by all Churches, nor reckoned by all Authors in the Canon of the Books of the Bible, yet they were frequently cited by the Ancients, and ſometimes too as Books of Scripture, and for this reaſon were afterwards admitted into the Canon along with the firſt.

The Book of *Eſther*, according to ſome, was in the Jewiſh Canon, but others ſay, it was not reckoned at all. It is placed in the Canon, as we have already obſerved, by *Origen*, by the Council of *Laodicea*, by St. *Jerome*, by St. *Epiphanius*, by St. *Hilary*, by St. *Cyril*, not to mention the Council of *Carthage*, or the Deciſions of Pope *Innocent* and *Gelaſius*. *Joſephus*, *Melito*, St. *Athanaſius*, and the Author of the *Abridgment of the Scripture*, *Gregory Nazianzen*, *Leontius*, the Author of the Book of *the Hierarchy*, and *Nicephorus*, reject it. The Action of *Eſther* is commended by *Clemens Romanus* in his Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*, and by *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *lib.* 1. *Pædag.* and *l.* 5. *Strom.* which makes it appear, that this Book was known and eſteemed by the firſt Chriſtians. The ſix laſt Chapters of this Book are not to be found in the *Hebrew*. *Origen* is of opinion, that it was formerly extant in that Language, and has been ſince loſt. But it is very evident, that they are taken out of ſeveral places, and that they contain ſome Pieces that were probably collected by the *Helleniſt Jews*. And for this reaſon *Dionyſius*, *Carthuſianus*, *Nicolaus de Lira*, *Hugo Cardinalis*, and afterwards *Sixtus Senenſis*, and ſeveral of the Moderns, turn them out of the Canon of the Holy Books.

The Book of *Baruch* is not to be found by name in the Jewiſh Canon, but perhaps it was joined together with *Jeremiah*. *Melito*, *Origen*, St. *Hilary*, *Gregory Nazianzen*, and St. *Epiphanius*, don't make any mention of it, confounding it perhaps with *Jeremiah*, but St. *Jerome* expreſly rejects it out of the Canon in his Preface to *Jeremiah*. On the contrary, the Council of *Laodicea*, St. *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem*, St. *Athanaſius* in his *Feſtival Letter*, and the Author of *the Abridgment*, annex it to *Jeremiah*, along with the Lamentations of that Prophet. It is cited under the name of *Jeremiah*, and as a Book of Scripture by *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *lib.* 1. *pedag. ch.* 2. by St. *Cyprian* in the Fourth Book of his Teſtimonies to *Quirinus*, *ch.* 6. by *Euſebius* in his Books of *Demonſtration*; by St. *Baſil* in his Fourth Book againſt *Eunomius*; by St. *Ambroſe* in his Firſt Book of Penance, as alſo in his Firſt

Book

Book of *Orthodox Faith*, *ch.* 2. by St. *Auſtin*. *lib.* 18. *de Civ. Dei*; by St. *Chryſoſtom* in his Homily of the *Trinity*, and by many other Church-Writers that are more modern. It is not neceſſary to take notice, that it was received by the Council of *Carthage*, by Pope *Innocent*, by the Roman Council under *Gelaſius*, by the Decree of *Eugenius*, and by the Canon of the Council of *Trent*.

The Book of *Tobit* is rejected in all the ancient Catalogues of the Books of the Bible, and not received into the number of the Canonical Books. *Origen* in his 27th Homily upon the *Numbers* ſays it is one of thoſe Books that were read to the *Catechumens*, but that it is not Canonical (*k*.) St. *Jerome*, who frequently rejects it as an Apocryphal Book, that was neither to be found in the Jewiſh or Chriſtian Canon, yet gave himſelf the trouble to Tranſlate it, ſpeaks of it very advantageouſly in his Preface, and calls it a Sacred Volume in his Hundred and fortieth Epiſtle. *Ruffinus* in his Expoſition of the Creed expreſly rejects it as an Apocryphal Book. But beſides that it is received by the Council of *Carthage*, and by Pope *Innocent* and *Gelaſius*, it appears, that in *Ireneus*'s time it was reckoned amongſt the Books of the Prophets, becauſe this Author, *l.* 1. *ch.* 34. has obſerved, that the *Gnoſticks*, who diſtributed the Prophets into ſeveral Claſſes, and attributed them to their pretended Divinities, aſſign the Prophets *Haggai* and *Tobit* to *Eloi*. This Book is often cited by St. *Cyprian*, who likewiſe calls it Holy Scripture in his Book of *Alms and Good Works*. It is alſo cited by St. *Hilary* upon the 129th *Pſalm*, where he makes uſe of the Authority of this Book to prove the Interceſſion of Angels. The ſame Father making a Catalogue of the Canonical Books, obſerves, that ſeveral Perſons have made the number of them twenty four, by adding the Books of *Tobit* and *Judith*. St. *Ambroſe* explained it throughout as a Book of Scripture, and cited it in his *Hexameron*, and ſo has St. *Chryſoſtome* in his 13th Homily to the People of *Antioch*, and the Author of the *Apoſtolick Conſtitutions* in the 8th Book, chap. 45.

The Book of *Judith* is not only rejected in all the ancient Catalogues of the Canonical Books, but it is alſo ſcarcely mentioned by the Ancients, though *Clemens Romanus* in his Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *l.* 4. *Strom Tertullian* in his Book of *Monogomy*, and in his firſt Book againſt *Marcion*, commend the Heroick Action of *Judith*, which makes it evident, that they had all of them an eſteeem for that Book. St. *Jerome*, after having ſeveral times rejected it as an Apocryphal Book, and obſerved in his Preface before it, that we ought not to prove any conteſted Doctrines out of it, adds, that we read, that the Council of *Nice* reckoned it in the number of the Holy Scriptures; *Sed quia hunc librum Synodus Nicæna in numero Sanctarum Scripturarum legitur computaſſe*. We ought to believe that St. *Jerome* reported this paſſage upon the Faith of another, there being not the leaſt appearance of its truth. For beſides, that we find nothing like it in the Creed, in the Canons, and Letters of the Council of *Nice*, and that it is highly probable, there are no other Acts of that Aſſembly, Is it to be imagined, that if they had made a Canon concerning the Sacred Books, not ſo much as one Man, that aſſiſted in that affair, would make mention of it? Is it to be thought that St. *Athanaſius*, St. *Epiphanius*, St. *Cyril*, who cou'd not be ignorant of the Deciſions of the Council of *Nice*, wou'd have rejected the Book of *Judith* as Apocryphal, if it had been reckoned amongſt the Canonical Volumes by the Authority of a Council they ſo highly reverenc'd? In ſhort, wou'd St. *Hilary* have contented himſelf with ſaying, that ſome Perſons added this Book to the Canon, and not rather have openly declared, when he was ſpeaking of the Canonical Books, that the Church received it? St. *Jerome* himſelf, if he had been aſſured of this buſineſs, wou'd he have rejected this Book ſo often, and not alledged this Catalogue of the Council of *Nice*, which ought to have been the infallible rule for him to follow? We muſt therefore ſay, that this Father received this Information from another. But if the Council of *Nice* reckoned not this Book of *Judith* in the number of Canonical Books yet the Latine Church has ſince done it by the Council of *Carthage*, by the Mouth of *Innocent* the Firſt, by the Roman Council under *Gelaſius*, and by the Council of *Trent*, which followed the Decree of *Eugenius*.

The Book of *Wiſdom* and *Eccleſiaſticus* (*l*,) in the ancient Catalogues are placed in the number of thoſe Books that are very profitable, but not Canonical; Nevertheleſs, theſe Books are cited by St. *Barnabas*, by *Clemens Romanus*, by *Tertullian* in his third Book againſt *Marcion*, and in his Book of *Preſcriptions*, by *Clemens Alexandrinus*, by St. *Cyprian* in ſeveral places; likewiſe frequently by *Origen*. by St. *Hilary* upon the 140th *Pſalm*; and according to ſome by St. *Baſil*, by St. *Ambroſe*, by St. *Jerome*, and St. *Auſtin*; but it does not follow, that all theſe acknowledged them for Canonical. On the contrary, *Origen*, St. *Jerome*, and St. *Hillary*, ranked them amongſt the Apocryphal Books; And St. (*m*) *Baſil* plainly ſays, in the Preface to his Commentary upon the *Proverbs*, That there are but three Books of *Solomon*; and he ſufficiently ſhews in ſeveral other places, that he did not own the Books of *Wiſdom* and *Eccleſiaſticus* for Canonical Books. *Philaſtrius* and *Ruffinus* reject them as well as St. *Hilary*, who has written a Letter about them to St. *Auſtin*. *Theodoret* is of the ſame Opinion in his Preface to the *Canticles*. One cannot ſay that of St. *Cyprian*, St. *Ambroſe* and St. *Auſtin*, who ſeem to own them for Canonical, as it has been determined by the Council of *Carthage*, by *Innocent* the Firſt, by the Roman Council under *Gelaſius*, by the Decree of *Eugenius*, and by the Council of *Trent*.

To conclude the two Books of *Maccabees* are not entred into the Canon of the Books of the Holy Scripture in the Catalogues of *Melito*, of *Origen*, of the Council of *Laodicea*, of St. *Cyril* of St. *Hilary*, of St. *Athanaſius*, of St. *Jerome*, and others whom we have Named. In *Euſebius*'s *Chronicon*, they are oppoſed to the Canonical Books, in theſe words, *That which we have hitherto reported of the Annals of the Jews, is drawn out of the Holy Scripture; that which follows is taken out of the Books of the* Maccabees, Joſephus, *and* Africanus. *Tertullian* in his Book againſt the Jews, relates the Hiſtory of the

the *Maccabees*, but yet he does not cite the Books of the *Maccabees* as Books of Scripture. St. *Cyprian* quotes them very often under that Character, and ſo does St. *Ambroſe* and St. *Chryſoſtome*. St. *Jerome* himſelf, who rejects them in ſeveral places, cites them ſometimes as Books of Scripture. St. *Auſtin* quotes them in his Book *of the concern which we ought to have for the Dead*, to prove that we may offer Sacrifice for the Deceaſed; and he aſſures us, *l.*18. *de Civit. Dei*, that although theſe Books were never received as Canonical by the Jews, yet they were acknowledged for ſuch by the Church. But in his firſt Book againſt *Gaudentius*, taking occaſion to ſpeak of the action of *Razias*, who killed himſelf, he thus delivers his Thoughts about the Books of the *Maccabees*; *The Jews don't receive theſe Books of the* Maccabees *as they do the Law, the Prophets, and the Pſalms; but the Church receives them, and they are not unprofitable, provided one reads and underſtands them with ſome ſort of Moderation, and they deſerve eſteem particularly for the Hiſtory of the Seven* Maccabees. In the laſt Canon attributed to the Apoſtles, we find the three Books of *Maccabees* reckoned amongſt the Canonical Books, but there is reaſon to believe, that this paſſage has been added, becauſe they are not acknowledged for Canonical Books by *Nicephorus*, *Johannes Damaſcenus*, and ſeveral others, who have owned the Authority of the Apoſtolical Canons. They are received by the third Council of *Carthage*, and by *Innocent* the Firſt. There is but one of them approved by the Roman Council under *Gelaſius*. It is a very ſurprizing thing, that after all theſe Authorities, St. *Gregory* the Great ſhould thus ſpeak of them in the Nineteenth Book of his Morals; *We don't without Reaſon*, ſays he, *produce Teſtimonies drawn out of thoſe Books that are not Canonical, ſince they have been Publiſhed for the Edification of the Church.* We ought to make the ſame Reflection upon all the reſt of the Greek and Latin Eccleſiaſtical Writers, whom we have cited, and who ſince the Deciſions of the Councils of *Carthage* and *Rome*, and the Declaration of *Innocent* the Firſt, reckon but Twenty two or Twenty four Canonical Books of the Old Teſtament. Which makes it evident, that theſe Definitions have not been followed by all Authors, and all Churches, till at laſt it was intirely determined by the Council of *Trent*.

I ſhall not ſpeak of the Hiſtory of *Suſanna* and *Bel*, that are in *Daniel*, and have been rejected as falſe, or as Apocryphal, by ſeveral of the Ancients, ſince I have already diſcourſed largely about them.

Beſides theſe Books, that were at laſt received into the Canon of the Books of the Old Teſtament, there are many others, that either were not admitted into the Jewiſh Canon, although they were more Ancient, or that having been compoſed ſince, have been eſteem'd and cited by ſome Chriſtian Authors, but never found any place in the Canon, or thoſe laſtly that were ſuppoſititiouſly obtruded upon the World by Hereticks, and by conſequence were always rejected.

In the firſt place, there are ſeveral Books cited in the Old Teſtament, that have been totally loſt long ſince, and are not Named in the Jewiſh Canon. The firſt of theſe Books, as they commonly pretend, is the Book of *the Battels of the Lord*, that is cited in the 21ſt Chapter of *Numbers*, verſ. 24. But it is not certain, as we have elſewhere obſerved, that there is any mention made of a Book in this place: we ought to paſs the ſame Judgment upon the Book of the Covenant, that is mentioned, as they aſſert, in *Exodus*, chap. 24. but is in reality nothing elſe, but the Body of the Laws which *Moſes* received from God, and delivered to the People. Neither is there any greater certainty, that the Book of *Jaſher*, cited by *Joſhuah*, chap. 10. verſ. 13. and in the ſecond Book of *Samuel*, chap. 11. verſ. 18. was an Hiſtorical Book, although I confeſs there is ſome reaſon to believe it was. But one cannot hardly doubt, that the Books of *Nathan*, of *Gad*, of *Shemaiah*, of *Iddo*, of *Ahijah* and *Jehu*, cited frequently in the Books of the *Chronicles*, were Memoirs compoſed in all probability by theſe Prophets. We muſt ſay the ſame thing of the Book of the Sayings and Acts of the Kings of *Iſrael*, oftentimes cited in the *Kings*, which is different from the *Chronicles*, as we have already obſerved. To theſe muſt be added the Book of *Samuel*, cited in the firſt Book of *Chronicles*, and the laſt Chapter. The Diſcourſes of *Hoſai* [or *of the Seers*] that are mentioned in the ſecond Book of *Chronicles*, chap. 33. verſ. 19. The Hiſtory of *Uzziah*, written by the Prophet *Iſaiah*, and cited in the ſecond Book of *Chronicles*, chap. 26. verſ. 22. The three Thouſand Parables written by *Solomon*, as it is ſaid in the firſt of *Kings*, chap. 4. verſ. 32. The Five Thouſand, or rather the Thouſand and Five Songs, with the ſeveral Volumes concerning all manner of Plants and Animals, that were likewiſe compoſed by *Solomon*, as we are informed in the ſame place. The Deſcriptions of *Jeremiah*, that are mentioned in the ſecond Book of *Maccabees*, chap. 2. verſ. 1. The Prophecy of *Jonas* that is loſt The Memoirs of *Johannes Hircanus*, [mentioned 1 *Maccab.* 16. 23, 24.] and the Books of *Jaſon*, that are mentioned in the ſecond Book of *Maccabees*.

'Tis uſually Ask'd, Whether theſe Books cited in the Old Teſtament were Canonical or no? This Queſtion in my Opinion is asked to no purpoſe, ſince we have not any remainders of them at preſent; but however, certain it is, that they are not Canonical in the ſame Senſe as we uſually take the Word; that is to ſay, they were never received into the Canon, either of the Jewiſh or Chriſtian Church; and no body knows whether they ought to have been admitted there, in caſe they had been ſtill preſerved. Neither can we poſitively tell, whether they were written by the Inſpiration of God, or were the mere Works of Men, only the later Opinion ſeems to be more probable. In the firſt place, becauſe the greater part of them having been compoſed before *Ezrah*, he had without queſtion reckoned them in the Jewiſh Canon, if he had looked upon them to be Divine Books. Secondly, becauſe we muſt otherwiſe be obliged to ſay, that the Church has loſt a great part of the Book of God. Thirdly, becauſe the Apoſtles never cited any other Books, than what we now have, as Books of Scripture. Fourthly, becauſe the Fathers are all agreed, that theſe Books were Apocryphal,

phal, and place the Book of *Enoch*, cited by St. *Jude*, in the ſame rank. This is the Opinion of *Origen*, of St. *Jerome*, St. *Auſtin*, and indeed of all the Fathers except *Tertullian*. For although *Theodoret*, and ſome other Greek Fathers, give the Title of Prophets to the Authors of theſe Books that are cited in Scripture; yet it does not follow from thence, that they compoſed theſe ancient Memoirs by the Inſpiration of God. It is not neceſſary, that all the Writings and Diſcourſes of a Prophet ſhould be inſpired by Heaven. Upon this account St. *Auſtin* has very Judiciouſly obſerved, *cap.* 38. *l.* 18. *de Civit. Dei*, that although theſe Books cited in the Holy Scriptures, were written by Prophets that were Inſpired by the Holy Ghoſt; yet it is not neceſſary to ſay, that they were Divinely Inſpired: For, ſays he, theſe Prophets might one while write like particular Men, with an Hiſtorical Fidelity, and another while like Prophets that followed the Inſpiration of Heaven: *Alia ſicut homines Hiſtoricâ diligentiâ, alia ſicut Prophetas Inſpiratione Divinâ ſcribere potuiſſe.*

Let us now go on to the Books that are not in the Canon of the Old Teſtament, and which we have at preſent. The Catalogue of them is as follows. The Prayer of King *Manaſſes*, who was Captive in *Babylon*, cited in the ſecond Book of *Chronicles*, where it is ſaid, that this Prayer was written amongſt the Sayings of *Hoſai*, who has Tranſlated into *Greek* the Diſcourſes of the Seers, or Prophets. It is to be found at the end of the ordinary Bibles, there is nothing lofty in it, but it is full of pious Thoughts. The Latin Fathers have often quoted it: It is neither in Greek nor Hebrew, but only in Latin.

The third and fourth Books of *Ezrah* are alſo in Latin in the common Bibles, after the Prayer of *Manaſſes*. The third, which is to be found in the Greek, is nothing but a Repetition of what we find in the two former; it is cited by St. *Athanaſius*, St. *Auſtin*, and St. *Ambroſe*, St. *Cyprian* likewiſe ſeems to have known it. The fourth, that is only to be had in the Latin, is full of Viſions and Dreams, and ſome Miſtakes. 'Tis written by a different Author from that of the third; for beſides the great difference of Style, one of them reckons Nineteen Generations from *Aaron* down to him, and the other but Fifteen.

The third Book of *Maccabees* contain a miraculous Deliverance of the Jews, whom *Phiſcon* had expoſed in the Amphitheatre at *Alexandria*, to the fury of Elephants. *Joſephus* relates this Hiſtory in his ſecond Book againſt *Appion*. This Book of the *Maccabees* is to be found in all the Greek Editions. It is reckoned in the number of Canonical Books, in the laſt Canon attributed to the Apoſtles, but perhaps that has been added ſince; it's alſo mention'd in the Chronicle of *Euſebius*, and in the Author of the *Abridgment of Scripture*, attributed to St. *Athanaſius*. This Hiſtory, if it be true, happened about Fifty years before the Paſſages that are related in the other two Books, and therefore ought to be the firſt; It is without any Reaſon called the Book of *Maccabees*, ſince it does not ſpeak of them in the leaſt.

The fourth, containing the Hiſtory of *Hircanus*, is rejected as Apocryphal by the Author of the *Abridgment of Scripture*, attributed to St. *Athanaſius*. It is mentioned by ſcarce any of the Ancients Perhaps it was taken out of the Book of the Actions of *Johannes Hircanus*, mentioned towards the end of the firſt of *Maccabees*. *Sixtus Senenſis* aſſures us, that this account very much reſembles *Joſephus*'s, but that he has abundance of his Hebrew Idiotiſms there.

There is towards the end of *Job* in the Greek Edition, a Genealogy of *Job*, that makes him the fifth from *Abraham*, with the Names of the Edomitiſh Kings, and of the Kingdoms of his Friends. This Addition is neither in the Latin nor in the Hebrew. There is likewiſe in the Greek a Diſcourſe of *Job*'s Wife, that is not in the Hebrew, rejected by *Africanus* and St. *Jerome*. Towards the end of the *Pſalms* in the Greek Editions, we find a *Pſalm* that is not of the number of the Hundred and Fifty, made in the Perſon of *David*, when he was yet a Youth, after he had Slain the Giant *Goliah*. The Author of the *Abridgment of Scripture*, attributed to St. *Athanaſius*, cites it, and places it alſo in the number of the Canonical Pſalms. To conclude, at the end of *Wiſdom* there is a Diſcourſe of *Solomon* drawn from the eighth Chapter of th. firſt Book of *Kings*.

We have not the Book of *Enoch*, ſo celebrated by Antiquity, and cited by St. *Irenæus*, by St. *Clement* of *Alexandria*, by *Tertullian*, by *Origen*, by *Athenagoras*, by St. *Jerome*, and ſeveral other Fathers: But we learn from thoſe paſſages of it which the Fathers have quoted, and which ſtill remain in the Teſtament of the Twelve Patriarchs, and in the Chronography of *Syncellus*, that it principally treated of the Stars, and their Virtues, of the Deſcent of Angels to the Earth to entertain a Commerce with the Daughters of Men, of the original of Giants occaſioned by this correſpondence, of Things that were to befall the Jews, of our Saviour, of the Deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*, of the Diſperſion of the Jews, and the laſt Judgment. It contains a World of Fictions upon theſe Subjects; For which Reaſon all the Fathers, except *Tertullian*, have look'd upon it as an Apocryphal Book, that does not belong to the Patriarch *Enoch*. That which has cauſed all the difficulty, is that this Book ſeems to have been cited under *Enoch*'s Name by St. *Jude*, in his Canonical Epiſtle, verſe 14. *And of this*, ſays he, Enoch *the Seventh from* Adam *Propheſied? ſaying, Behold the Lord cometh*, &c. from whence one may conclude, That we ought either to reject the Epiſtle of St. *Jude*, or believe that the Book of *Enoch* truly belonged to that Patriarch. St. *Auſtin* avoids this difficulty, by ſaying, That the true Book of *Enoch*, cited by St. *Jude*, is loſt, and that a ſpurious one has been ſince Father'd upon him. But it is not probable, that the Book of *Enoch*, cited by St. *Jude*, is different from that which was known to St. *Irenæus*, to St. *Auſtin*, and the other Fathers that lived in the firſt Ages of the Church; And therefore St. *Jerome*, after *Origen* anſwers, That St. *Jude* might cite an Apocryphal Book if he pleaſed, and that this hindered not his Epiſtle from being Canonical, that even in the other Books of the New Teſtament, we find ſome paſſages that are drawn out of Apocryphal Books, which

which ought not to diminiſh the Authority of the Canonical Books, or give any new power to the Apocryphal ones. Some of the Modern Criticks have pretended to unravel this difficulty with greater eaſe, by maintaining, that St. *Jude* does not here ſpeak of the Book of *Enoch*, but only of a Prophecy of that Patriarch, which he had learnt by Tradition, as St. *Paul* reports the Names of *Jannes* and *Jambres*, the Egyptian Magicians of *Pharoah*, from the common Tradition of the Jews; but this Opinion being contrary to the Determination of all the Ancients, is in my Judgment very improbable and ill grounded, and we had much better relie upon St. *Jerome*'s Solution.

The Book of the Aſſumption of *Moſes*, from whence, as they pretend, St. *Jude* took the Relation of *Michael* the Archangels Diſputing with Satan about the Body of *Moſes*, is not ſo famous in Antiquity; nevertheleſs it is cited by *Origen*, *l.* 3. *Princ.* and by St. *Clement*, *l.* 3. *Strom.* who there gives us an account of a Viſion of *Joſhuah* and *Caleb*, that was taken out of this Book. *Oecumenius* in his Commentary upon the Epiſtle of St. *Jude*, recites theſe words of the Archangel to the Devil, *the Lord rebuke the Satan: Increpet te Deus O Diabole*; as quoted from hence. St. *Jerome* tells us, it is an hard matter to ſay from whence St. *Jude* took this paſſage; only he obſerves, that there is ſomething like it to be found in the Prophecy of *Zechariah*, chap. 3. verſ. 2.

Origen likewiſe cites a Book, Entituled, *The Aſſumption*, *the Apocalypſe*, *or the Secrets of* Elias. *Syncellus* after him, pretends, that out of this Apocryphal Book, St. *Paul* has taken this Sentence in his Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*; *The Eye hath not ſeen, nor the Ear heard the good Things that God hath prepared for them that love him*: As alſo that in the Epiſtle to the *Galatians*; *Circumciſion availeth nothing*, &c. Moreover he is of Opinion, that this Sentence in the *Epheſians*, *Awake thou that ſleepeſt*, is taken out of the Apocryphal Book of *Jeremiah*. But it may ſo happen ſometimes, that like Sentences may be found in two different Books, and yet it is not neceſſary to ſay, that one Author borrowed them from the other.

Some Jews have Forged and Counterfeited thoſe Books, that are by ſome attributed to the Patriarchs; as for Example, the Books Intituled, *The Generations*, *and the Creation*, aſcribed *to Adam*, The Revelation of the ſame, cited by St. *Epiphanius*. 'Tis alſo commonly believed, that he compoſed a Book about the Philoſophers Stone; and that there was a Book of Magick extant, ſaid to have been written by *Cham*, as we find in *Caſſian*'s eighth Conference, chap. 21. The *Abridgement of Scripture* that goes under the Name of St. *Athanaſius*, makes mention of the Book of the *Aſſumption of* Abraham. The Author of the Homilies upon St. *Luke*, attributed to *Origen*, in the 15th Homily, and ſome others quote the Book of the Twelve Patriarchs. The ſame Author in the 35th Homily, cites an Apocryphal Book, where Angels and Devils Diſpute about the Salvation of *Abraham*. The Author of the above-mentioned *Abridgment of Scripture*, ſpeaks of two Apocryphal Books, one of which is the Prophecy of *Habakkuk*, from whence, as they pretend, the Hiſtory *Bel*, that is in *Daniel*, was taken; and an Apocryphal Book that carries the name of *Ezekiel*. *Hermas*, one of the moſt ancient Chriſtian Writers, in his *Paſtor*, ch. 2. cites the Propheſies of *Eldad* and *Medad*, that are mentioned in chap. 11. of *Numbers*. *Origen* and St. *Ambroſe* cite a Book of *Jannes* and *Jambres*, the Magicians of *Pharaoh*, that is rejected by *Gelaſius*, as an Apocryphal Book. There is alſo a Book of King *Og* placed in the number of Apocryphal Books by *Gelaſius*.

The Ebionites have impoſed a Book upon the World, Entituled, Jacob's *Ladder*, as *Epiphanius* teſtifies. *Manes* compoſed a Genealogy of the Sons and Daughters of *Adam*, as we are informed by St. *Auſtin*, and Pope *Gelaſius*. In ſhort, there were abundance of ſuch kind of Books formerly to be found, compoſed either by the Jews, who had an admirable Talent at Fiction, or elſe by the Hereticks, who made uſe of them to give the greater Reputation to their Errors, ſo that it wou'd be an unprofitable, as well a tedious Thing, to make an exact Catalogue. But I ought not to omit two paſſages cited in the New Teſtament, as if they were in the Prophets, which upon ſtrict ſearch are not to be found there, and which have given occaſion to ſome Perſons to imagine they were taken from other Books; The firſt is in St. *Matthew*, ch. 2. v. 23. *Jeſus*, ſays he, *dwelt in a City called* Nazareth, *that it might be fulfilled which was ſpoken by the Prophet. He ſhall be called a* Nazarene. Now theſe Words, *He ſhall be called a* Nazarene, are not to be found in any of the Prophets that we now have, which has induced St. *Chryſoſtome* to imagine, that they are taken out of ſome other Prophet that is loſt. Others pretend, that they are cited out of the 11th Chapter of *Iſaiah*, verſ. 1. where it is foretold, *That a branch ſhall grow out*, which they call in Hebrew *Netzer*. *Huetius* thinks, that this paſſage is taken from the 13th Chapter of the Book of *Judges*, verſ. 5. where it is ſaid, that *he ſhall be a Nazarite from the Womb*. But the moſt probable Opinion is that of St. *Jerome*, who ſuppoſes, that St. *Matthew* does not cite any Prophet in particular, but only all the Prophets, who have predicted, that our Bleſſed Saviour ſhould be Holy, and Conſecrated to God, as the Nazarites were.

The ſecond paſſage is cited in the ſame Goſpel, chap. 27. verſ. 9. *Then*, ſays he, *was fulfilled that which was ſpoken in* Jeremy *the Prophet, ſaying, And they took the Thirty pieces of Silver, the price of him that was valued, whom they of the Children of* Iſrael *did value, and gave them for the Potters Field, as the Lord appointed me.* This Propheſie is not to be found in *Jeremiah*, but there is ſomething that ſeems to reſemble it in *Zechariah*, chap. 11. verſ. 13. *Origen* in his 35th Treatiſe upon St. *Matthew*, pretends, that it ought to be ſaid, that this paſſage is taken out of an Apocryphal Book called, *The Secrets of* Jeremiah, or elſe that we muſt affirm, that in this Goſpel, the Name of one Prophet is uſed for that of another. Some other Authors ſay, that this Propheſie has been ſtruck out of the Book of *Jeremiah*. Others run to Tradition, which, as they give out, preſerved this Propheſie of *Jeremiah* down to the time of St. *Matthew*. It is very probable, ſay ſome others, that this Propheſie being compoſed of the Words of *Jeremiah*, and the Thought of *Zechariah*, has been cited only under the

Name

Name of *Jeremiah*, as in another Place a Prophecy of *Malachi* being joyned to one of *Iſaiah*, is attributed to the latter: But yet 'tis a great deal more probable, that St. *Matthew* having only wrote, *as it is ſpoken in the Prophet*, without Naming any one, they added in the Text of the Goſpel, the Name of *Jeremiah*, that Evangeliſt not being accuſtomed to Name the Prophets, whom he cites. This is St. *Jerome*'s Solution of the Matter, which ſeems to be by far the Solideſt. +

NOTES.

(*a*) WE *call the Books of the* Bible *Canonical*,&c.] Some Perſons ſay that they are thus called, becauſe they are the Rule of Faith; but the other Opinion is far more probable.

(*b*) *Books that are called Apocryphal.*] We don't know well why they are ſo called. This word comes Originally from the Greek, where it ſignifies to *hide* or *conceal*. St. *Auſtin*, *L.* 15. *de Civit. Dei*, *Ch.* 23. ſays, they are ſo called, becauſe the Original of them is not known. Others, as St. *Jerome* and *Gelaſius*, believe they had this Name given them, becauſe they contained the hidden Myſteries of the Hereticks. St. *Epiphanius* imagines this diſtinguiſhing Appellation was ſet upon them, becauſe they were not kept in the Ark. The Signification alſo of this word is doubtful, one while they give this Name to all Books that are not in the Canon, another while only to erroneous or ill Books. Some of the Fathers make three Diſtinctions of Books, *viz.* The Canonical, the Doubtful, and the Suppoſititious. Conſult *Origen* upon the 4th Chapter of St. *John*. St. *Athanaſius* in his Feſtival Letter, St. *Gregory* in the Poem to *Seleucus*. *Euſebius*, and the other Fathers, divide them but into two ſorts, Canonical and Apocryphal: But then they diſtinguiſh the Canonical into two Claſſes. Indeed generally ſpeaking they are ranged into three Claſſes, the Canonical of the firſt Rank, the Canonical of the ſecond Rank, and the Apocryphal.

(*c*) *Some Perſons diſtinguiſh three Canons made at ſeveral times by the Sanedrim, or the great Synagogue of the* Jews.] *Serarius* makes only two: The firſt made by *Ezrah*, and the Synagogue in his time: The ſecond, either when they ſent the LXX Elders to Tranſlate the *Bible*, or when the Diſpute about the Reſurrection was ſo warmly diſcuſſed between the *Sadducees* and *Phariſees*: *Genebrard* ſuppoſes there were three; The firſt, compoſed by *Ezrah*, and approved of by the Synagogue; The ſecond, appointed by a Grand Aſſembly of the Synagogue, when they ſent the LXX, at which time, as he pretends, *Tobit*, *Judith*, *Eccleſiaſticus*, and the Book of *Wiſdom*, were added to the Canon; The third, at the time of the famous Controverſie between the Sadducees and Phariſees, when the Books of the *Maccabees*, according to him, were Solemnly approved and received.

(*d*) *But 'tis a great deal more probable, that they never had but one Canon.*] It is unqueſtionably true, that *Ezrah* received, and collected the Sacred Volumes, and conſequently that he was the Author of the Canon amongſt the Jews. Neither they, nor the ancient Chriſtians acknowledged any other. As for the Books, which, as they pretend, were inſerted into the other Canons, 'tis certain they were never owned by the Jews; and what they talk about the two great Aſſemblies of the Synagogues, that were Convened upon that Occaſion, is all a Chimera and Fiction. The Ancients themſelves never make the leaſt mention of the Approbation of the Synagogue or Sanedrim of the Jews, which our Moderns boaſt of ſo mightily. Some are of Opinion, That *Nehemiah* added the two Books of *Ezrah* to the Canon, and found their Notion upon what is ſaid in the 2d. Book of *Maccabees*, ch. 2. v. 13. that he gathered together the Books of *David*, and the Prophets, and the Books of the *Kings*, &c. But this only proves, that he erected a Library, as it is intimated in that place, and not made a Collection of the Sacred Books. Others ſay, that we ought to attribute this Canon to *Judas Maccabeus*, becauſe it is ſaid in the firſt of *Maccabees*, Chap. 1. Verſe 56. that *Antiochus* and his Miniſters burnt and tore to pieces the Books of the Law: And in the ſecond Book, Chap. 2. Verſe 13, 14. the *Jews* of *Jeruſalem* acquaint their Brethren that were in *Ægypt*, that *Judas Maccabeus* had gathered together all thoſe things *that were loſt by reaſon of the War*. This does not prove that *Ezrah*'s Canon was intirely loſt, and that *Judas* compoſed another, but only that he got other Copies of thoſe Sacred Books that were burnt and torn under *Antiochus*, and made a Collection of ſeveral pieces relating to the Hiſtory of their Wars, which was never received into the Jewiſh Canon. Our Opinion is invincibly proved by the Concurring Teſtimonies of *Joſephus* and St. *Jerome*.

(*e*) *But it is viſible, that this Citation has been ſince inſerted into the true Text of* Joſephus.] The paſſage which, as they pretend, is cited by *Joſephus*, is in Chap. 42. of *Eccleſiaſticus*, Verſe 14. *Better is the Churliſhneſs of a Man, than a Courteous Woman.* 'Tis beyond diſpute, that it was afterwards added, for *Joſephus* propoſes in that place to cite the Laws of *Moſes*, and this paſſage makes nothing at all to the purpoſe. In the Ancient Verſion of *Ruffinus* this Quotation is not to be found, which makes it evident, that it has been added ſince.

(*f*) *There are no others cited in the* New Teſtament, *but thoſe that were received into the Canon of the Jew.*] Some Perſons ſay, that the Book of *Wiſdom* is cited by St. *Paul*, *Rom.* 11. in theſe words, *Who hath known the Mind of the Lord? Or who hath been his Counſellor?* Which they ſay are the very ſame in effect with thoſe in *Wiſdom*, Chap. 9. *For what Man can know the Counſel of God?* But this paſſage cited by the Apoſtle is to

be found word for word in *Iſaiah*, Chap. 40. Verſ. 13. where the *Greek* Terms are the ſame that are uſed by St. *Paul*, St. *Baſil*, *L. de Spir. Sancto, Ch.* 5. *Tertullian* in his fifth Book againſt *Marcion*, Ch. 14. St. *Ambroſe*, or rather the Author of the Commentaries upon St. *Paul*, that are falſly attributed to him, *Peter Lombard*, and ſeveral others obſerve, that it is taken out of *Iſaiah*. 'Tis alſo pretended, that the paſſage in his Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, where it is ſaid, that *Enoch* was tranſlated, that he might not taſte of Death, is taken out of that Book. But it is in *Geneſis*, Chap. 5. Verſ. 25. It is likewiſe ſaid, that there are ſeveral Alluſions in the Goſpel and the Epiſtles of the Apoſtles to ſome places in *Eccleſiaſticus*, the Book of *Wiſdom*, *Judith*, and *Tobit*. Every one abounds in his own ſenſe, and can find out what Reſemblances or Alluſions he pleaſes; but it is not neceſſary that two Perſons that have happen'd upon the ſame thought, ſhould take it one from the other. S. *Juſtin*, and the Ancients, don't accuſe the *Jews*, for not acknowledging all the Books of Holy Scripture for Canonical. *Theophilus* ſays, that *Zechariah* is the laſt of the Prophets, and concludes the Holy Scripture with *Ezrah*.

(*g*) *A great part of theſe are quoted there.*] Theſe are all Books that are cited there; *Geneſis*, *Exodus*, *Leviticus*, *Numbers*, *Deuteronomy*, *Joſhua*, the ſecond Book of *Samuel*, the firſt of *Kings*, *Job*, the *Pſalms*, the *Proverbs*, *Iſaiah*, *Jeremiah*, *Ezekiel*, *Daniel*, *Hoſea*, *Joel*, *Amos*, *Jonah*, *Micah*, *Haggai*, *Habakkuk*, *Nahum*, *Zechariah*, *Malachi*.

(*h*) Gregory Nazianzen *diſtributes the Books of Scripture into Hiſtorical, Poetical, and Prophetical.* This Diſtribution in my Opinion, ſeems to be the juſteſt, and moſt natural.

(*i*) *By that of the* Roman *Council held under* Gelaſius, Anno Dom. 494.] There is mention made in this Catalogue but of one Book of *Ezrah*, and one Book of *Maccabees*, although the Number of Books is not exactly diſtinguiſhed in all the reſt. For Example: *Regnorum libri quatuor* —— —— —— *Eſdras liber unus*, *Maccabæorum liber unus*. In ſome Manuſcripts *Job* is not mentioned there, and they read *Maccabæorum libri duo*.

(*k*) *St.* Jerome, *who frequently rejects it as Apocryphal, and puts it out of the Canon, not only of the* Jews, *but the* Chriſtians *alſo.*] Every time that St. *Jerome* treats expreſly about the Canonical Books in his Prologue to the *Kings*, to the Books of *Salomon*, *Ezrah*, and *Eſther*, in his *Epiſtles* 7 and 103 to *Paulinus*, in his *Commentary* upon *Ezekiel* in *l.* 17. *ch.* 43. he always rejects thoſe Books that are not to be found in the Canon of the *Hebrews* as Apocryphal, and only fit to be conſidered as ſuch. But when he ſpeaks without making any manner of reflection, he frequently cites theſe very Books as parts of the Holy Scripture, and attributes the ſame Character to the Book of the *Wiſdom of Salomon*, although it is certain, that he believed the contrary. In his *Prefaces* before *Judith* and *Tobit*, as if he had a Mind to reſtore the Reputation of theſe Books, he ſpeaks very advantageouſly of them.

(*l*) *The Book of* Wiſdom *and* Eccleſiaſticus.] Beſides ſeveral Alluſions to the Scripture, which might be produced, but don't prove, that they were cited from thence, St. *Barnabas* cites a paſſage drawn out of the Book of *Wiſdom*, Chap. 2. Verſ. 12. and another out of *Eccleſiaſticus*, Chap. 4. Verſ. 36. *Clemens Romanus*, in his Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*, has quoted the Book of *Wiſdom*, Chap. 11. Verſe 22. *Tertullian* likewiſe has quoted the ſame Author in his Book againſt *Marcion*, towards the end, and in his Preſcriptions. *Clemens Alexandrinus* has alſo quoted him frequently. Saint *Cyprian* very often quotes theſe two Books, and aſcribes them to *Salomon*. *Origen* mentions the Book of *Wiſdom* under the Name of Scripture in *Epiſt. ad Hebr.* in his third Book againſt *Celſus*, and in his eighth Homily upon *Exodus*, as he alſo cites *Eccleſiaſticus*, *Tom.* 2. —— upon St. *Matthew*, Treatiſe the 24th: And *Euſebius*, *l.* 6. of his Hiſtory, Chap. 13. ſays, That although St. *Clement* cites theſe Books, yet they are for the moſt part rejected. St. *Hilary* cites them upon the *Pſalm* 104. St. *Baſil* alſo cites them ſometimes, and particularly in his fifth Book againſt *Eunomius*. So does St. *Jerome* frequently, in his Commentary upon *Pſalm* 73. in his 16th Book upon *Iſaiah*, and in his 33d Book upon *Ezekiel*, and in his ſecond Book upon *Iſaiah*. St. *Auſtin* does the ſame in abundance of places. They are likewiſe cited by the Author of the Book of *Divine Names*, *and of the Hierarchy*, in the laſt Book, Chap. 2. in the firſt, Chap. 4. In the Letter of the Council of *Sardica*, ſet down by *Theodoret*, Hiſt. l. 2. c. 8. By *Anaſtaſius Sinaita*, *lib.* 9. *In Exam.* Orat. 2. *De incircumſcripto*, and Queſt. 8. and 10. By *Johannes Damaſcenus*, *l.* 4. *Of the Orthodox Faith*, Chap. 16. In his third Oration of the Nativity, and in his Sermon of the Dead. But to cite a Book, as *Gretzer* obſerves, is not to declare it to be Canonical. Theſe Books are thrown out of the Canon by thoſe very Perſons that cite them under the Name of Scripture, and they that attribute them to *Salomon*, when they cite them, at other times formally deny it. Some ſeem to think, that the Book of *Eccleſiaſticus* is cited by thoſe who produce this Sentence as from the Scripture, *Do nothing without advice.* Such as St. *Baſil* in his ſhort Rules, *Queſt.* 104. *Euſebius de Præp. Evang.* Lib. 12. *Caſſian*, Conference 2. *Boniface*, Epiſt. 98. The Council of *Epheſus*, in the Epiſtle to the Synod of *Pamphylia*. But the ſame Sentence is in ſubſtance in the 13th Chapter of the *Proverbs*, Verſ. 16. and is word for word in the 24th Chapter, Verſe 13. of the *Septuagint* Verſion, from whence theſe Fathers quoted it; as well as *Iſidore Peluſiota*, who frequently uſes it. The *Proverbs* likewiſe are very often cited by the Ancients under the Name of *Wiſdom*, by *Melito* in his Catalogue, *Proverbia quæ & Sapientia*, for ſo it ought to be tranſlated, and not *Proverbia & Sapientia*; by *Origen*, *Hom.* 17. upon *Geneſis*, upon *Exodus*, and *Numbers*; by the Author who has written under the Name of *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria* againſt *Paulus Samoſatenus*; by the Author of the *Conſtitutions*, frequently by St. *Baſil*, *Conſt. Monaſt.* C. 3. and 16. by *Gregory Nazianzen*, Orat. 1. and 26. And by *Gregory Nyſſene* in his 7th Book of *The Life of Moſes*, and in his 7th Book againſt *Eunomius*. By the Council in *Trullo*, Chap. 64. By the ſecond Council of *Nice*, *Act.* 6. The *Proverbs*

verbs are alſo called by St. *Clement* of *Alexandria*, *Stromata*. By *Hegeſippus*, and the Ancients, Παρεμβολαί.

(*m*) St. Baſil *ſufficiently obſerves, that he did not own the Books of* Wiſdom *and* Eccleſiaſticus *for Canonical.*] In his *Epiſt.* 406. to *Amphilochius*, he tells us, that *Philo* ſpeaking of the Manna, has ſaid according to the Tradition of the *Jews*, that it had a different Taſte according to the difference of Palats or Appetites. Now this is expreſly ſaid in the Book of *Wiſdom*. St. *Baſil* therefore believed it was written by *Philo*, if this is the Book whereof he ſpeaks, or at leaſt that it was no Book of Scripture, for otherwiſe he would not barely have called an Opinion, that is ſo clearly eſtabliſhed there in the 16th Chapter, by the Name of a Jewiſh Tradition. The ſame St. *Baſil*, *Lib.* 2. *contr. Eunom.* ſays, that this paſſage, *Dominus creavit me initium viarum ſuarum*, is only to be found once in Scripture. *Socrates* ſays the ſame thing, *Lib.* 4. *Cap.* 7. If they had acknowledged the Book of *Wiſdom* to be Canonical, they ought to have ſaid that this Sentence is twice to be found in the *Bible*, becauſe we read it in the Book of *Wiſdom*, as well as in the *Proverbs*.

SECT. III.

The Hiſtory of the Hebrew *Text. Of the Verſion of the* Septuagint, *and other* Greek *Verſions of the* Old Teſtament.

THE Books of *Moſes*, and (*a*) almoſt all the reſt of the Books of the *Old Teſtament*, were written in *Hebrew*. The ancient (*b*) Characters, which *Moſes* and the other Authors, that wrote before the Captivity, made uſe of, according to the common Opinion, were the *Samaritan*. For after the Diviſion of the Ten Tribes under *Rehoboam* the Son of *Salomon*, the *Iſraelites* preſerved the *Pentateuch* in the ſame form they received it from *Moſes*. and (*c*) gave it afterwards to the Men of *Cuth*, who came to ſettle in their place at *Samaria*, from whence they were called *Samaritans*. The Tribes of *Judah* and *Benjamin* alſo preſerved the ſame Characters till the *Babyloniſh* Captivity. But being once carried away into *Babylon*, they inſenſibly uſed themſelves to write and ſpeak after the manner of the *Chaldeans*. Therefore it was, that (*d*) *Ezrah*, having reviewed, and gathered together the Books of the *Bible*, uſed the new *Chaldee* Characters, as being better known to the *Jews* than the Ancient, which they have uſed almoſt always ever ſince. But the *Jews* not only borrowed their Characters from the *Chaldeans*, but they borrowed their Language alſo, which was the ſame with that of the *Syrians* or *Aſſyrians*, and came very near the *Hebrew* (*e*). It is very certain, that at firſt this Language was not common to all the *Jews*, that they all underſtood *Hebrew*, and that there were likewiſe ſome Perſons that ſpoke it ſtill; ſo that the *Chaldee* and *Hebrew* Tongue were at the ſame time common in *Judea* (*f*). But by little and little they were confounded together, and the Vulgar Language of the *Jews* became the *Syriack*, but mixed with ſeveral *Hebrew* Terms, which was afterwards commonly called *Hebrew*. Nevertheleſs, the Sacred Books ſtill continued written in *Hebrew*, and the *Jews* read them in that Language in their Synagogues; but the ancient *Hebrew* Language being no longer common, and beginning to be leſs intelligible to all the *Jews*, they explained the Original *Hebrew* in their Synagogues, and this perhaps might give the firſt occaſion to the (*g*) *Chaldee* Paraphraſes, though thoſe we now have ſeem to be of a later date. The *Hebrew* Text continued in this ſtate without Points, till about the Year of our Lord 500, at which time the (*h*) *Jews* of *Tiberias* invented the Points, to limit and reſtrain the Reading and Pronunciation of the *Hebrew* Tongue.

I will not loſe any time in endeavouring to prove all theſe things by any larger Explications, ſince any Man may ſee them more amply handled by thoſe Perſons, who have wrote Volumes of purpoſe upon theſe Subjects; Neither will I diſcourſe of the Oriental Verſions of the Old Teſtament, that are all new, and beſides of a very inconſiderable authority. But I cannot forbear to ſpend ſome time about the *Greek* Verſion of the *Bible* made by the *LXX*, whom we commonly rank in the number of Eccleſiaſtical Authors.

It has been long diſputed, whether there was not a *Greek* Verſion of the Books of the Bible more ancient than the Septuagint. St. *Clement* of *Alexandria*, *Euſebius*, and ſome other ancient Writers, who pretend, that *Plato*, and ſeveral other Pagan Philoſophers, have borrowed many paſſages out of the Books of the Bible, were of opinion, that they were Tranſlated into *Greek* before the Seventy undertook that buſineſs. They that follow this opinion, ſupport it principally by the Teſtimony of *Ariſtobulus* related by *Euſebius*, who ſays, that before the time of the Seventy, ſome Perſons had explained, *all that concerned the Laws of the* Jews, *their departure out of* Egypt, *and whatever happen'd to them after the taking of their Country*; words that ſeem to intimate, that the *Pentateuch* had been Tranſlated before the Verſion of the *Septuagint*. St. *Auguſtin*, *l.* 18. *De Civit. Dei*, *ch.* 11. and *Baronius* after him deny it, and aſſure us, that the firſt Verſion of the Bible was the *Septuagint*.

Huetius endeavours to reconcile theſe two Opinions, by ſaying, that there were only ſome few fragments of the Old Teſtament tranſlated before the *Septuagint*, but that theſe LXX Elders were the firſt, that made an entire Verſion of all the Sacred Volumes. He grounds his Opinion upon the above-cited paſſage of *Ariſtobulus*, which ought to be only underſtood, *ſays he*, of ſome parts, as the Circumlocution he uſes makes it appear, as well as what he adds, that the Law was firſt entirely tranſlated under *Ptolomy Philadelphus*. But in caſe this Book of *Ariſtobulus* ſhould only be the work of an Hellen iſt *Jew*, as it is exceeding probable, this Opinion would become very uncertain. Let us go on now to the Verſion of the *Septuagint*.

All the Ancient Fathers have believed after *Joſephus* and *Philo*, that the Verſion of the Bible, commonly called the *Septuagint*, was compoſed by Seventy or Seventy two *Jews* ſent to *Ptolomy Philadelphus*, who deſired to have the Jewiſh Books in *Greek*, that he might place them in the Magnificent Library which he had lately erected at *Alexandria* by the care and induſtry of *Demetrius Phalereus* an *Athenian*. This has gone a long time for conſtant Matter of Fact, nor was it ever queſtioned but in our Age, in which ſome Criticks have been found, that have looked upon this Hiſtory to be fabulous. We ſhall examine the conjectures they generally bring to prove it.

In the firſt place they ſay, that this Story is wholly founded upon the Authority of *Ariſteas* and *Ariſtobulus*, from whom *Joſephus* and *Philo* have taken all that they ſay in this matter, and that if theſe two Authors ſhould prove ſpurious, as the greateſt part of the Criticks agree they are, then there would be no other credible Witneſs of the truth of this buſineſs, the Fathers having talked of them only upon the relation of theſe Authors. Secondly, theſe Criticks pretend, that this Hiſtory does not in any manner agree with the Chronology of thoſe times, and they demonſtrate it thus: All thoſe Authors, ſay they, who ſpeak of this ſubject, ſuppoſe, that it was *Demetrius Phalereus*, who had been formerly a great Man at *Athens*, that took the pains to make the *Jews* come to tranſlate the Books of the Bible, and in the mean time they pretend, that this Verſion was compoſed under the Reign of *Ptolomy Philadelphus*. Now *Demetrius* could not be in reputation under *Ptolomy Philadelphus*, nor could he be alive at that time, when they ſuppoſe that this Verſion was made. For it is certain, that *Demetrius* lived in *Egypt* under the Reign of *Ptolomy* the Son of *Lagus*, and that having counſelled this Prince to name for his Succeſſors the Children which he had by *Euridice*, he incurred the diſgrace of *Ptolomy Philadelphus*, who baniſhed him the Court immediately after the Death of his Father, and ordered him to be kept cloſe in a certain Province, where he died ſoon after, as *Hermippus*, cited by *Diogenes Laertius*, teſtifies. All which makes it evident, that in the firſt place *Demetrius* was never in any credit with *Ptolomy Philadelphus*, and conſequently, that he was not Superviſor of his Library, nor ordered to bring the *Jews* to tranſlate the Bible: Secondly, that the Verſion of the *Septuagint* being made, as we are obliged to ſuppoſe, ſome years after the beginning of *Philadelphus*'s Reign, *Demetrius* could not be employed in that affair, ſince he was dead before. 'Tis commonly anſwered, that *Ptolomy Philadelphus* reigned ſome time along with his Father, as 'tis obſerved in *Euſebius*'s *Chronicon*, and that in this time he took care of the Library, and got the Verſion of the Bible to be made. 'Tis likewiſe urged, that this is the reaſon why ſome Authors place this Tranſlation in the time of *Ptolomy* the Son of *Lagus*, and others in the time of *Ptolomy Philadelphus*. But in my Opinion, this Anſwer does not clearly remove the difficulty, ſince *Ariſteas* and *Joſephus* tell us in expreſs words, that it happen'd under the Reign of *Ptolomy Philadelphus*, and that he was the King who took ſo much care to compleat his Library, without making the leaſt mention of his Father. 'Twas to him alone that *Demetrius* addreſs'd himſelf, to procure his Letters to the *Jews*, he was the only Man that wrote them; In a word, all Authors who ſay this matter happen'd under his Reign, ſpeak not one word of *Ptolomy* the Son of *Lagus*, and thoſe that affirm, that it happen'd under the firſt *Ptolomy*, don't mention a Syllable of *Philadelphus*. *Vitruvius* in the Preface to his 7th Book, tells us, that *Ptolomy Philadelphus* made a Library in imitation of the Kings of *Pergamus*, and that *Ariſtophanes*, an *Athenian* Grammarian was his Library Keeper, from whence it follows, that *Demetrius* never managed that Office, and that the Library was not begun till after his Death. For that King of *Pergamus*, in imitation of whom *Ptolomy Philadelphus* erected his Library, was *Eumenes*, who could not poſſibly do it till after the Death of *Demetrius*; and therefore *Suidas* ſays, the Verſion of the *Septuagint* was not made till the 33d year of the Reign of *Philadelphus*, and he obſerves, that *Zenodotus* was his Library Keeper. This ſtill diſcovers another contradiction in *Chronology*, that is to be found in *Ariſteas*'s and *Joſephus*'s Narration; for they ſay, that the Seventy came into *Egypt* when *Ptolomy* made a Solemn Feſtival, occaſioned by a Naval Victory which he obtained over *Antigonus*. This Sea-Fight ought to be the ſame, which *Diodorus* mentions in his 20th Book, and happen'd in the third year of the 118 *Olympiad*. Now at that time *Demetrius* was not come into *Egypt*, where he came not till after the Death of *Caſſander*, which happen'd in the ſecond year of the 120th *Olympiad*, according to the Teſtimony of *Hermippus*. And though one ſhould ſtill maintain, that he came thither at that time, yet it is certain, that *Eleazer* was not then the High Prieſt, ſince according to *Euſebius*, he did not begin to be ſo till the 123d *Olympiad*. They obſerve alſo another Soleciſm in *Chronology*, and that is in the Epiſtle attributed to *Demetrius* by *Ariſteas*: For *Hecataeus* of *Abdera*, that was *Demetrius*'s Contemporary, is there cited as a Man that had been dead a long while ago. Thirdly, 'tis urged againſt the Truth of this Story, that it is notoriouſly full of the fictions and inventions of the Helleniſt *Jews*. It is ſuppoſed there, that *Eleazer* choſe Seventy two Men, by taking ſix out of every Tribe. Now all the World knows, that at this time ſome of the Tribes were not to be found there, as having been carried away out of *Judea*, by *Shalmanezer* after the taking of *Samaria*. To this it may perhaps be replied, that there were ſtill remaining amongſt the *Jews* ſome Perſons deſcended from all thoſe Tribes

that

that were concealed in the Tribe of *Judah*, but that *Eleazer* ſhould find juſt Six and no more in every Tribe, who were able to do ſuch a buſineſs, ſeems, as they ſay, to look a little too fabulous. 'It is certain, ſays a modern Critick, that if we reflect a little upon the Hiſtory of *Ariſteas*, and read 'it with never ſo little Application, we ſhall be convinced, that an Helleniſt *Jew* wrote this Book 'under the name of *Ariſteas* in favour of his own Nation. The Miracles that are related there, and 'the very manner in which it is written, give us a true *Idea* of a Jewiſh Genius, which always and 'eſpecially at that time, delighted to publiſh Forgeries, that contained ſcarce any thing but extra-'ordinary things. He tells us, that ſome Perſons having formed a deſign to Tranſlate theſe Sacred 'Volumes, were deterred from their bold reſolution by a ſignal puniſhment from Heaven, that *Theo-'pompus* having determined to inſert ſome part of their Law into the body of his Hiſtory, became 'mad; That the ſame *Theopompus* having pray'd to God, during the intermiſſion of his Diſtemper, 'to diſcover to him the cauſe of this unfortunate accident, God anſwered him in a Dream, that it 'happened to him for his great preſumption in endeavouring to make common thoſe ſacred things 'that ought to be kept private, and that he was reſtored to his former health, after having deſiſted 'from this Enterprize. We read in the ſame place, that *Theodectus*, a Tragick Poet, loſt his ſight, 'for having preſumptuouſly attempted to inſert a paſſage of the Bible into his Works, but that he 'recovered his Sight upon acknowledgment of his fault, and begging pardon of God. After all, the Authors of the Books attributed to *Ariſteas* and *Ariſtobulus* ſay nothing but what is great and pompous, and extraordinary. *Ariſteas* for example does not content himſelf with ſaying, that the Seventy carried a Copy of the Law, but he adds, that they brought one written in Caaracters of Gold. He makes *Demetrius* give the King a Petition, that they might have the Books of the *Jews*. He deſcribes the Table, and the other Preſents, which King *Ptolomy* offer'd to the Temple at *Jeruſalem*, very fabulouſly. In a word, there is ſcarce one ſingle Circumſtance in the whole Narration, that does not look very like a fable.

Theſe reaſons, and many others which may yet be brought, have made ſeveral Criticks reject theſe Books that are attributed to *Ariſteas* and *Ariſtobulus*; and what is yet more material, there are ſome Perſons that doubt, whether there were ever any Verſion compoſed by the 70 *Jews* that were ſent to *Ptolomy Philadelphus*. As for my ſelf, although I am heartily perſwaded, that theſe Books of *Ariſteas* and *Ariſtobulus* are ſpurious, yet nevertheleſs (*i*) I am of opinion, that we cannot abſolutely deny, that there was a *Greek* Tranſlation of the Bible made in the time of *Ptolomy Philadelphus*: But I dare by no means affirm, that this buſineſs was done perfectly after the ſame manner, as we find it related in the Book attributed to *Ariſteas*.

Now as the *Jews* are fruitful in Fictions, ſo they are not content with retailing thoſe, that are to be found in this Author, but they have likewiſe added abundance of more extraordinary paſſages, in ſuppoſing that theſe 72 Perſons were ſhut up ſeverally each Man in a particular Cell, and that they all of 'em Tranſlated the Scripture in the ſame manner, inſomuch that all their Tranſlations were found conformable to each other, not only in the ſame Senſe, but even in the ſame Words and Expreſſions. Upon this foundation they pretend, that they were inſpired by God, and that their Verſion ought to be conſidered, as wholly Divine. Some of the Fathers that were extremely inclined to value the Authority of this Tranſlation, readily believed this Fiction of the *Jews* (*k*) but St. *Jerom*, who had examined theſe things more exactly, and who preferred the *Hebrew* Text to the Tranſlation of the *Septuagint*, laughed at this Story with reaſon, ſince neither *Ariſteas*, nor *Philo*, nor *Joſephus*, who were the firſt Perſons that gave us the Hiſtory of this Verſion, ſpoke a word concerning theſe little Cells; but on the contrary *Ariſteas*, or the Author of the Book that bears his name, tells us, that the Seventy, when they made this Verſion, concerted matters amongſt themſelves, and conferr'd together. 'Tis upon the Teſtimony of the ſame Author, that St. *Jerome* aſſures us, that the Seventy only Tranſlated the five Books of *Moſes*. *Ariſteas*, *Ariſtobulus*, and *Philo*, tell us, that they Tranſlated no more than the Law, a word which ordinarily ſignifies the *Pentateuch* only. And though we might underſtand it of all the Books of the Old Teſtament, which is not true, yet *Joſephus* utterly excludes this Explication, by telling us, that this Law was that of the *Legiſlator* of the *Jews*, which paſſage can only agree to *Moſes* and his Books. The *Talmudiſts* are of the ſame Opinion. On the other ſide St. *Auſtin*, and the greateſt part of the ancient Fathers, believed, that the Seventy Tranſlated all the Bible, becauſe in their time the *Greek* Verſion of the Books of Scripture, that are joyned to the five Books of *Moſes*, went under the name of the *Septuagint*: But it is far more probable to believe, that the Seventy only Tranſlated the five Books of *Moſes*, and that the following Books were from time to time Tranſlated by other Authors, as the difference of the ſtyle, that is to be obſerved between the ſeveral Verſions, ſufficiently ſhews, ſince we have not the poſitive Teſtimonies of the Seventy to the contrary, But though the *Greek* Verſion of the other Books of the Bible, joyned to that of the LXX, was not performed by them, yet we muſt acknowledge, that it is very ancient, and that the *Jews* had no other before our Saviour was born.

But after the Chriſtian Religion was ſetled, as the Chriſtians ſupported themſelves by the Authority of the Verſion of the LXX, ſo ſome of the *Jews* reſolved to make a new Tranſlation of the Books of the Bible, which as they pretend, ſhould be more conformable to the *Hebrew* Text, and leſs favourable to the Chriſtians (*l*) *Aquila* the *Jew*, who lived in the time of *Adrian*, was the firſt Man that thought of this deſign, and after put it into execution, by Tranſlating the *Hebrew* Text into *Greek* word for word. Afterwards *Theodotion* (*m*,) a Diſciple of *Tatian*, who after turned *Marcionite* and at laſt a *Jew*, and flouriſhed in the time of the Emperor *Commodus*, made another *Greek* Verſion of the whole Bible, in which, as he does not confine himſelf ſo cloſely to the Letter, as *Aquila* did

ſo

ſo neither does he depart ſo far from it as *Symmachus* (*n*,) the Author of the third Verſion who lived in the time of the Emperor *Severus*. He had formerly been a *Jew*, and at laſt went over to the Sect of the *Ebionites*, which comes up very near to *Judaiſm*. His Verſion is much freer, and he only concerns himſelf to render the Senſe, without ſticking at the words (*o*.) In the time of the Emperor *Caracalla* there was another Verſion of the Books of the Bible found, or at leaſt of one part thereof, and likewiſe a ſixth under *Alexander* the Son of *Mammea*, which is called the *Nicopolitan*. Laſtly, *Origen* added a Seventh Verſion, but that reached the *Pſalms* only. The *Hexapla*, and *Tetrapla* of *Origen* were compoſed of theſe Verſions. In the *Hexapla*, they were joyned to the *Hebrew* Text written two ways, that is to ſay, in *Greek* Characters, and in *Hebrew* Characters, and this compoſed the two firſt Columns of the Work: In the third Column ſtood *Aquila*'s Tranſlation, which was joyned to the *Hebrew* Text, as following the letter more Religiouſly than any of the reſt. The Verſion of the *Septuagint* was placed between that of *Symmachus* and *Theodotion*, and ſo theſe three Verſions compoſed three Columns: the two other Verſions were ranked in the two laſt Columns, and the Seventh, which was of the Book of *Pſalms*, in the ninth Column. I think that this Work ought rather to be called *Octapla* than *Hexapla*, being compoſed of eight Columns; and therefore ſome have believed, that the *Hexapla* did not contain the fifth and ſixth Verſion, but only the other four; and that theſe two Verſions having been added ſince *Origen*, they then made *Octapla* of them. But *Euſebius*, and (*p*) St. *Jerome*, with ſeveral of the ancient Writers, make no diſtinction at all between the *Octapla* and *Hexapla*, but only between the *Tetrapla* and the *Hexapla*, and plainly affirm, that both the fifth and ſixth Verſion were in the *Hexapla* of *Origen*, and even the ſeventh of the Book of *Pſalms*. Therefore we muſt either ſay, that they counted not the two Columns of the *Hebrew* Text, or elſe, that the fifth and ſixth Verſions were only of ſome particular Books of the Bible; and that thus the ſame Work of *Origen* had ſix Columns in ſome places, in others eight, and even nine in the *Pſalms*, but that they were called *Hexapla*, either becauſe there were generally but ſix Columns, or becauſe the fifth and ſixth Columns were afterwards added. And this appears to be the Opinion of St. *Epiphanius*, which the Learned *Huetius* has ſo excellently explained. In the *Tetrapla*, that were made after the *Hexapla*, *Origen* has retrenched the fifth and ſixth Verſions, as alſo the two Columns of the *Hebrew* Text, ſo that they were only compoſed of the Verſions of *Aquila*, *Symmachus*, the *Septuagint*, and *Theodotion*. We muſt ſtill obſerve, that the Verſion of the *Septuagint*, that was in the *Hexapla*, and *Tetrapla*, was corrected and augmented in ſeveral places, yet without being changed. For *Origen* added there ſome paſſages taken from *Theodotion*, which he marked with an Aſterisk, and as for thoſe places, that as he ſuppoſed ought to be cut off, and retrenched, he incloſed them between two Hooks. Since that there have been three Verſions of the *Septuagint* uſed in the Church. The firſt is the ancient or vulgar, and was received by *Lucian*, it was uſed in *Conſtantinople*, and in the Eaſt. The ſecond was that of *Heſychius*, which they uſed in *Alexandria*, and all over *Egypt*. Laſtly, the third, which was uſed in *Paleſtine*, was the ſame with that, which was in the *Hexapla* of *Origen*, and which *Euſebius* and *Pamphilus* tranſcribed, and publiſhed ſeparately. Here, ſays *St. Jerome*, are the three different Verſions of Scripture, that divide the whole Earth. *Totúſque orbis hac inter ſe trifariâ varietate compugnat*. I ſhall not ſay any thing about the Authority of the Verſion of the *Septuagint*, compared with that *Hebrew* Text, becauſe it is a great and famous Queſtion that does not in the leaſt concern that deſign I have propoſed to my ſelf.

NOTES.

(*a*) WERE *almoſt all written in* Hebrew.] We muſt except *Judith*, *Tobit*, ſome Chapters of *Daniel*, and ſome of the firſt Book of *Ezrah*, which are written in *Chaldee*, and ſome other Chapters of the ſame Prophet *Daniel*, with the Books of the *Maccabees* that are written in *Greek*.

(*b*) *The Characters which* Moſes *made uſe of*, &c. *were the* Samaritan.] This Opinion was taken for granted in St. *Jerome*'s time, as he himſelf obſerves in his Preface to the *Kings*, and it is confirmed by ancient Medals, where we find this Inſcription, *Holy Jeruſalem*, written in *Hebrew* in the *Samaritan* Characters; and this could not be written after the diviſion of the Tribes, for at that time the *Samaritans* did not conſider *Jeruſalem* as an Holy City.

(*c*) *Gave it to the Men of* Cuth.] 'Tis far more probable, that the Men of *Cuth* had the Books of the Law rather from the *Iſraelites* than the *Jews*. In the firſt place, becauſe they preſerved them written in the ancient Character, which makes it evident, that they did not receive them after the Captivity, ſince the *Jews* at that time wrote in *Syriack* Characters. Secondly, becauſe the Collection of the Sacred Books amongſt the *Samaritans* only contained the *Pentateuch*, and conſequently they received them of the *Iſraelites*, who acknowledged no other Books but theſe to be Sacred, and not of the *Jews*, who admitted the reſt.

(*d*) Ezrah *having reviewed and gathered together the Books of the Bible.*] I have followed the common opinion of the *Jews* and Holy Fathers, who aſcribe the collecting and reviſing of the Sacred Volums of the Old Teſtament to *Ezrah*: Others are of Opinion, that it was *Nehemiah* that took this care, but let the matter be how it will, certain

certain it is, that the *Jews* at their return from their *Babylonian* Captivity, took care to ſearch after and gather their Books together. The Author of the fourth Book of *Eſdras*, which is a Book full of falſities and fictions, ſuppoſeth, that all the Copies of the Sacred Books being burnt or loſt, *Ezrah* dictated them all anew by a Divine Inſpiration. We have this Fable at length in the 14th Chapter of this Book, where, it is tack'd to ſeveral other fooliſh Whimſies. St. *Clement* of *Alexandria*, *Theodoret*, and St. *Baſil* have followed this Opinion, without reflecting upon it; but others who have uſed more precaution in this matter, are content to ſay with us, that *Ezrah* collected, review'd, digeſted, and put in order the Books of Holy Scripture, when there were many Copies of it as yet remaining. This is the opinion of St. *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, St. *Jerome*, St. *Chryſoſtom*, the Author of the *Abridgement of the Bible*, commonly attributed to St. *Athanaſius*, and of ſeveral others. The firſt opinion is not only extremely prejudicial to Religion, but impoſſible to be maintain'd. For firſt, What probability is there, that the *Jews* during the Captivity, ſhould loſe all the Copies of that Book, for which they always preſerved ſo profound a veneration, and which was the foundation of their Religion? Why ſhould we think, that not one ſingle Man amongſt them kept it by him? Is it credible, that *Ezekiel Daniel*, and *Jeremiah* were deprived of reading the Books of the Law? Can one conceive, that *Ezrah* had no other knowledge of them than by Inſpiration? He, I ſay, that was ſo learned a Doctor of the Law of *Moſes* at the time when he was in *Babylon*, as it appears, *ch.* 7. *v.* 6. of the firſt Book of *Ezrah*. 2. We ought to make the ſame reflection upon the *Iſraelites* of the Ten Tribes. Now it is not probable, that they did not carry the Holy Books along with them. The Book of *Tobit* informs us, that *Tobit* read the Prophecy of *Amos* *Tob. c.* 2. *v.* 6. 3. And 3dly, is it not paſt diſpute, that the Men of *Cuth* preſerved the *Pentateuch* which the *Iſraelites* of the Ten Tribes gave them?

4. It appears by the 9th Chapter of *Daniel*, that the *Jews* had the Books of *Moſes*, and read them during the Captivity. *All Iſrael*, ſays this Prophet, *have tranſgreſſed thy Law, even by departing, that they might not obey thy voice, and therefore the curſe is poured upon us, and the oath that is written in the Law of* Moſes, *becauſe we have ſinned againſt him.* And a little lower, *All this evil is come upon us, as it is written in the Law of* Moſes. 5. It is ſaid in the ſixth Chapter of the Book of *Ezrah*, that the building of the Temple was finiſhed in the ſixth year of *Darius*, and that the Prieſts and Levites were eſtabliſhed in their Miniſterial Functions, as it is written in the Law of *Moſes*. *Sicut ſcriptum eſt in lege Moyſis.* Now *Ezrah* was not yet come up to *Jeruſalem*, for it is related in the following Chapter, that he arrived in *Judea* in the ſeventh year of King *Artaxerxes*. 6. In the ſecond Book of *Ezrah*, *ch.* 8. the People being deſirous to be inſtructed in the Law of *Moſes*, did not requeſt him to dictate it to them anew, but only to bring the Book of the Law of *Moſes*, which the Lord had given to the People of *Iſrael*. *Et dixerunt Eſdræ ſcribæ, ut afferret librum legis Moyſis quam præceperat Deus Iſraeli*, And it is ſaid immediately after, that *Ezrah* brought the Book of the Law, and read it before all the People. It will be ſaid, perhaps, that I have borrowed theſe Reaſons out of another Man's Book; I own it, but I thought they were ſuitable to the preſent occaſion.

(*e*) *It is very certain, that at firſt this Language was not common to all the Jews.*] This is abundantly proved againſt the common Opinion, by what is ſaid in the Book of *Nehemiah*, *ch* 13. *v.* 24. that the Children of the *Jews* who had Married ſtrange Women, ſpoke *Aſotice*, and not *Judaice*. In the *Hebrew* the words are *Aſhdodith*, and *Jehudith*, and this laſt word in the ſecond Book of *Kings*, *ch.* 18. *v.* 26. is oppoſed to *Aramith*, which ſignifies in *Syriack*, *Precamur, loquaris nobis Syriace & non Judaice*; in the firſt Book of *Ezrah*, *ch.* 4. *v.* 7. and in the Prophet *Daniel*, *ch.* 2. *v.* 4. *Aramith* has ſtill the ſame ſignification. On the contrary *Jehudith* ſignifies the *Hebrew* Tongue in oppoſition to the *Syriack*, as we may ſee in the ſecond Book of *Chron. ch.* 32. *v.* 18. 2 *Kings* 18. 26. and in *Iſaiah*, *ch.* 36. *v.* 11. There were ſeveral *Jews* therefore in the time of *Ezrah* that ſtill ſpoke *Hebrew*. And this is evidently proved by the Books of *Ezrah* that were made ſince the Captivity, and yet were written in *Hebrew*, and not in *Chaldee*, except ſome Chapters of the firſt Book of *Ezrah*, where he tells us of the oppoſition, that the Officers of the King of *Perſia*, who ſpoke *Chaldee*, gave to the *Jews*. From whence it follows, that the *Jews* both underſtood and ſpoke *Hebrew*. For otherwiſe why ſhould *Ezrah*, if he deſigned to have his Books intelligible by all the *Jews*, write them in a Language, which was not natural to them. The ſame conſideration will hold good as to the Books of the latter Prophets, who wrote in *Hebrew* after the Captivity, and yet addreſſed their Prophecies to all the People. But laſtly, that which admits of no reply, is a remarkable paſſage in the Book of *Nehemiah*, *ch.* 8. and 9. where we find that the Law was read in *Hebrew* before the People, and all the People hearkened to it, and underſtood it; Theſe Remarks have been lately made by a very Ingenious and Learned Perſon. Mr. *Simon* indeed brags, that he has invincible Reaſons to overthrow them; When he has Honoured the World with a Sight of them, we ſhall ſee whether they are powerful enough to make us retract this Opinion, as he would willingly perſwade us they are; but in the mean time he ought not to take it amiſs, if till then, we continue in the ſame mind.

(*f*) *The Syriack Tongue mix'd with Hebrew Words became the vulgar Language of the Jews, which was afterwards called the Hebrew Tongue.*] The truth of this appears by the *Hebrew* Words that we find in the New Teſtament, which are all, as St. *Jerome* obſerves, *Syriack* Words, and what our bleſſed Saviour ſays, 'That one Iota of 'the Law of God ſhall paſs away, *&c.* makes it evident, that the *Jews* at that time uſed the preſent *Hebrew* Alphabet, and not the ancient, and it is demonſtrated from hence, that the י of the *Jews* was a little Letter, which is true of the *Syriack* [and *Hebrew*] *Jod*, and not of the *Samaritan*, which has three Feet.

(*g*)

(*g*) *The Chaldee Paraphraſes which we have ſeen to be of a later date.*] The *Chaldee* Paraphraſe is divided into three Parts: The firſt, that contains the *Pentateuch*, is attributed to *Onkelos*; The ſecond, that contains the Prophets, to *Jonathan*; The third, to one *Joſephus* the blind. There is likewiſe another Paraphraſe of the *Pentateuch*, called that of *Jeruſalem*, and another of the *Canticles*; but all theſe Paraphraſes are imperfect, as well as new. Since that time the *Jews* having committed to writing abundance of Traditions in a Book which they call *Miſna*, they afterwards compoſed Commentaries upon it, whereof the moſt celebrated is called the *Gemera*. But all theſe Books are full of ridiculous fooliſh Fictions, and have nothing common with the Scripture; The *Maſora*, that is, a ſort of a Critical Performance upon the Bible, is of more uſe and advantage. The Follies and Whimſies of the *Cabala* are impertinent and impious.

(*h*) *About the year of our Lord* 500, *the Jews of* Tiberias *invented the Points.*] Theſe Points were not uſed in St. *Jerome*'s time, as may be eaſily proved from ſeveral Paſſages of this Father drawn out of his 22d Queſtion upon *Jeremiah*, and out of his Commentary upon *Habakkuk*, in Chap. 3. Verſ. 20. which abundantly ſhew that in his time the Pronunciation of the *Hebrew* Words was not determined by the Points, as it has been ſince.

(*i*) *I am of opinion, that one cannot abſolutely deny, that there was a Greek Verſion of the Books of the Bible made in the time of* Ptolomy Philadelphus.] It is not credible, that the Authors of the Books attributed to *Ariſteas* and *Ariſtobulus* entirely invented the whole Hiſtory, and that there is no part of it true. 'Tis far more probable, that they only added ſeveral Circumſtances to the Matter of Fact, which was aſſuredly certain. Mr. *Simon* imagines, that this Verſion was called the *Septuagint*, becauſe it was approved by the *Sanedrim*, but this is a Conjecture without any Foundation.

(*k*) *Some of the Fathers have believed this Fiction of the* Talmudiſts.] The Author of the Diſcourſe againſt the *Greeks*, attibuted to St. *Juſtin*, St. *Irenæus*, and St. *Clement*, believed it, St. *Auſtin* queſtioned and doubted the truth of it, St. *Jerome* laughs at it.

(*l*) Aquila *the Jew.*] A certain *Syriack* Author, cited by Monſieur *Le Jai* [the Publiſher of the *French Polyglot*,] tells us, that he was deſcended from *Adrian*, and adds many other Paſſages that are extremely improbable. St. *Jerome* aſſures us, that he was a *Jew*, in his Commentary upon the third Chapter of *Habakkuk* upon the third of *Iſaiah*, and in his Epiſtle to *Marcellus*.

(*m*) Theodotion *the Diſciple of* Tatian.] St. *Jerom*'s Teſtimony confirms what we have ſaid here, St. *Irenæus* names him in his Book againſt Hereſie, from whence it follows, that he lived when *Elutherius* was Pope,

(*n*) *Symmachus*, &c.] What we ſay concerning this Man, is taken out of St. *Jerom* in his Preface upon *Job*; *Euſebius* alſo ſays, *l.* 6. *c.* 7. that he was an *Ebionite*; and this is the reaſon why *Hilary* the Deacon, Author of *The Commentary of St. Paul*, attributed to St. *Ambroſe*, calls the *Ebionites Symmachians*.

(*o*) *We yet find another Verſion of the Bible in the time of the Emperor* Caracalla.] St. *Epiphanius* is of opinion, that this Fifth Verſion was found at *Jericho*, the Author of *The Abridgment* attributed to St. *Athanaſius* is of the ſame opinion: But *Euſebius* following the Teſtimony of *Origen*, tells us, that the ſixth was found at *Nicopolis*; that we don't know where *Origen* found the fifth: and that the ſeventh, which was only a Verſion of the *Pſalms*, was found at *Jericho*. Conſult *Euſeb. l.* 6. *c.* 16. St. *Jerom* aſſures us, that all theſe Tranſlations were made by *Jews*.

(*p*) Euſebius, St. Jerom, *and ſeveral other Ancients make no diſtinction between the* Octapla *from the* Hexapla.] They place the fifth, ſixth, and ſeventh Verſion, in what they call the *Hexapla*, St. *Epiphanius* in his Book of *Weights and Meaſures*, ſpeaks of the *Octapla*, but as of a Work which was not diſtinguiſhed from the *Hexapla*, for after he has deſcribed the *Hexapla*, he adds, *And if we find there the fifth and ſixth Verſion added, it follows that we ought to call them* Octapla. Theſe Columns were unqueſtionably written upon different Rolls, that were faſten'd one to the ſide of another.

SECT.

SECT. IV.

Of ſome Authors, whoſe Works have a Relation to the Old Teſtament, *viz.* Philo. T. Flavius Joſephus, Juſtus, Ariſteas, Ariſtobulus, Joſephus Bengorion; Beroſus, *the falſe* Dorotheus, Zoroaſter, *&c.*

THere are ſeveral Authors, whoſe Works, whether Genuine or Spurious, have a Relation to the Hiſtory of the Old Teſtament, whom we think our ſelves obliged to take ſome ſhort notice of.

Philo, a *Jew* of *Alexandria*, lived in the time of *Caius Caligula*, and was the chief Perſon of an Embaſſy, that the *Jews* ſent to the Emperor. He compoſed ſeveral Works upon the Old Teſtament, a Catalogue of which may be ſeen in *Euſebius*'s Hiſtory, *l.* 2. *ch.* 8. and in St. *Jerom*'s Book of Eccleſiaſtical Writers, as well as at the beginning of the *Greek* and *Latin* Impreſſion of his own Writings, printed at *Paris* 1640. This Author is a *Platoniſt*, and ſo well imitates *Plato*'s Style, that he has been called by ſome *The Jewiſh Plato*: He explained the whole Bible by way of Allegory, he is very Eloquent and Diffuſive, his Works are full of Moral Thoughts, and continual Allegories upon all the Hiſtories of the Bible; he approaches very near the Notions of the Chriſtians in his Morals. His Works were publiſhed in *Greek* by *Turnebus*, and printed at *Paris* 1552. and at *Francfort* 1587. Tranſlated into *Latin* by *Gelenius*, and printed at *Baſil* 1554, and in 1561. at *Lyons* 1555, in *Greek* at *Geneva* 1603. and in *Greek* and *Latin* at *Paris* 1640.

Joſephus was deſcended of the Sacerdotal Race of the *Aſmoneans*, as we are told in his Life, which he wrote himſelf, where all his Employments and Actions are exactly related. He was born *Anno Dom.* 37. and died 93. He was Sirnamed *Flavius*, by reaſon of *Veſpaſian*. He compoſed the Hiſtory of the *Jews*, which he took for the moſt part out of the Books of the Bible, and continued it down to the time of the Wars of the *Jews*, under the Name of *The Jewiſh Antiquities*. He alſo wrote the Hiſtory of the War againſt the *Romans*, and the taking of *Jeruſalem*. He has likewiſe written, beſides his own Life, two excellent Books againſt *Appion* to anſwer the Objections, which that Heathen had muſter'd up againſt the Antiquity of the *Jewiſh* Nation, the Purity of the Law, and the Conduct of *Moſes*; and he has written a Treatiſe concerning the Martyrdom of the *Maccabees*, which is called by *Eraſmus*, and not without Reaſon, *An exquiſite Maſter-piece of Eloquence*. This Author wrote very politely, and the turn which he gives things, is very agreeable. His Hiſtory is beautified with admirable Deſcriptions, very eloquent Harangues, and very ſublime Thoughts; his Style is clear and faithful, he not only diverts his Readers, but he alſo brings them over to what ſide he pleaſes; in one word, he excites and calms the Paſſions as himſelf thinks fit. We may ſay, he is a perfect Hiſtorian, and we may juſtly call him the *Levi* of the *Greeks*. The Treatiſe of the *Maccabees* ſufficiently ſhews the Beauty of his Genius, and the Height of his Eloquence; and his Books againſt *Appion* demonſtrate his profound Learning, and the exactneſs of his Judgment. The Works of this Author have been printed ſeveral times in *Latin*, of the Tranſlation partly of *Ruffinus*, partly of *Gelenius*, and partly of *Eraſmus*; and at *Geneva* in *Greek* and *Latin*, *Anno Dom.* 1611. It were to be wiſh'd that we had a new Edition of it, in a better Letter, and better Paper.

Juſtus of *Tiberias* wrote alſo an Hiſtory of the *Jews*, and ſome Commentaries upon the Bible, but *Joſephus* accuſes him of Falſity and Lying. We had not placed him in the number of the Eccleſiaſtical Authors, if St. *Jerom* had not done it before us.

The Books of *Ariſteas* and *Ariſtobulus* concerning the Verſion of the *Septuagint*, are manifeſt Forgeries, and impoſed upon the World by ſome Helleniſt *Jew*, as we have already ſhewn when we were diſcourſing of that Verſion.

The Hiſtory of the War of the Jews by *Joſephus Bengorion*, was written by an Author that lived ſince St. *Jerom*'s time. He ſpeaks of the *Goths* as being in *Spain*, and of the *Franks* in *Gaul*. Now theſe People were not ſetled in *Spain* and in *France* till about the Fifth Century, and ſo by conſequence this is a ſpurious Writer, who having ſtolen ſeveral things out of the true *Joſephus*, has mingled them after his manner with Fictions and Fables.

The Teſtament of the Twelve Patriarchs, which is extant in the firſt Volume of the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, is a Book wholly filled with Trifles and Impertinencies, and deſerves nothing but contempt. Neither ſhould one have a better opinion for the Abridgment of the Lives of the Prophets, the Apo-

ſtles, and the other Diſciples, attributed to *Dorotheus* of *Tyre*, who ſuffered Martyrdom in the time of *Dioclesian*. It is a Book altogether unknown to the Ancients, full of groſs Faults and Miſtakes in Hiſtory, and made up of Fables and Tales to divert the Reader.

There are ſome Books that go under the Name of *Beroſus* the *Chaldean*, of *Manetho* the *Egyptian*, and of *Metaſthenes*; but they are altogether unworthy of thoſe great Men, whoſe Names they carry, and the Forgery is plain and manifeſt. All thoſe Paſſages out of the true *Beroſus*, cited by *Joſephus* in his Book againſt *Appion*, are not to be found in this Book that is aſcribed to him, but we find there are ſeveral Things that are clean contrary. He ſpeaks of the City of *Lyons*, which had not that Name till after *Cæſar*'s time. In ſhort, the Hiſtory of *Beroſus* went no farther than the time of *Nabuchadonoſor*, and *Nabopalaſſar*, and this deſcends much lower.

The Book of (*a*) *Zoroaſter*, of *The Sacred Hiſtory of the Perſians*, a Fragment whereof is cited by *Euſebius* in his firſt Book *De præpar. Evangel.* is a ſuppoſititious Work, as well as the other Writings attributed to that fabulous Author. In fine, the Hiſtory of the *Phenicians*, which is ſuppoſed to be written by (*b*) *Sanchoniathon*, and tranſlated into *Greek* by *Philo Biblius* (*c*), who lived in the time of *Adrian*, is a Romance, wherein there are ſeveral Pages taken out of the Hiſtory of the Bible, and many Circumſtances of the Fables of the *Greeks*.

NOTES.

(*a*) *Zoroaſter.*] There were many of this Name, but 'tis generally held, that the firſt and moſt celebrated of them lived in the time of *Nimrod*, that he was King of the *Bactrians*, and that he was overcome by *Ninus*. They ſpeak wonderful Things of his Knowledge, his Wiſdom, and of the Prodigies which he wrote. They make him the firſt Author of the *Perſian* Philoſophy, which they called Magick. *Plato* ſpeaks of *Zoroaſter* as Inventor of the Science amongſt the *Perſians*, and obſerves that he was the Son of *Oromazes*. *Eubulus*, cited by *Porphyry*, attributes the Inſtitution of the Myſteries of the Goddeſs *Mithra* to him. *Eudoxus* and *Hermippus*, cited by *Pliny*, tells us, that he lived Six thouſand Years before *Plato*. But *Cteſias*, who has written the Hiſtory of *Zoroaſter*, teſtifies, that he lived in the time of *Cyrus*. This is the reaſon why *Arnobius* diſtinguiſhed the two *Zoroaſters*. *Euſebius* alſo makes *Zoroaſter* as old as *Ninus*, and St. *Epiphanius* ſays, that he lived in the time of *Nimrod*. He is called *Zarades* by the *Perſians*, and by the *Greeks Zoroaſter*. There are ſeveral Explications given of his Name: Some pretend, that it ſignifies a Living Star; others ſay, that he was the Son of *Aſter*; and laſtly, others tell us, that it ſignifies a Contemplator of the Stars. All that is related of the ancient *Zoroaſter* is fabulous. *Diodorus Siculus* tells us, that the King of *Bactria*, that fought againſt *Ninus*, was named *Oxiartes*, and not *Zoroaſter*. Nevertheleſs there is a great deal of reaſon to believe, that there was a Man of this Name amongſt the *Perſians*, who taught 'em Magick. *Hermippus* tells us, that he made an infinite number of Verſes. The Fragment, which *Euſebius* cites in the 7th Chapter of his firſt Book *De præparatione Evangelicâ*, taken out of the Hiſtory of the *Perſians* attributed to this Author, has ſo plainly explained all the Attributes of God, that it is viſible, it was compoſed by an Author who was no Stranger to the Chriſtian Religion. *Syneſius* cites the Oracles of *Zoroaſter*, upon the Dreams that are taken out of the Works of the later *Platoniſts*. Theſe Oracles have been publiſh'd by *Opſopæus*, and printed at *Paris* 1599. with the Notes of *Pſellus* and *Plato*. 'Tis no difficult matter to diſcover, that theſe Writings have been forged by the *Platoniſts*, that lived ſince our Bleſſed Saviour.

(*b*) *Sanchoniathon.*] This Author was unknown to all the Ancients. *Porphyry* is the firſt Man that cited this Hiſtory, which is full of Fables and ridiculous Fictions. Whatever we there find concerning the Origine of the World, and the firſt Men, is taken out of *Geneſis*. From thence he has borrowed the Word *Bohu* to ſignifie Night, and that of *Colpia*, which is given to the Wind; as for what he ſays of the *Æora*, and of the *Firſtborn*, it looks very like the Dreams of the *Valentinians*. Laſtly, he takes ſeveral things out of the Fables of the *Greeks*, which evidently ſhew, that the Author of this Book could not live in the time of *Semiramis*. [Mr. *Dodwell* has writ an *Engliſh* Diſcourſe, to prove that this Book could not be older than *Philo Byblius*, who is ſaid to Tranſlate it out of the *Phœnician* Language.]

(*c*) *Philo Byblius.*] This Man was a *Grammarian*, of whom mention is made in *Suidas*, who lived after *Nero*'s time, for 'tis obſerved, that he was 78 Years old, when *Serus* and *Herennius* were Conſuls, which was *A. D.* 137. that is almoſt an hundred Years after the Death of *Nero*. According to the Teſtimony of the ſame *Suidas*, he wrote twelve Books, Περὶ Ἑλλήνων, καὶ ἐκλογῆς βιβλίων, and thirty Books, Περὶ πολέων, *Et de Claris viris*; and one Treatiſe about *Adrian*'s Empire, under which he lived. *Suidas* does not ſpeak of this Tranſlation of the Hiſtory of *Phœnicia*, *Euſebius* and *Theodoret* cite it after *Porphyry*. This *Philo* is probably the Man, of whom St. *Clement* of *Alexandria* ſpeaks, *lib.* 1. *Strom.* and whom he calls *Philo* the *Pythagorean*.

SECT.

SECT. V.

Concerning the Authors of the Books of the New Teſtament.

THE Goſpel in the *Greek* Language ſignifies (*a*) *Happy Tidings*, but now this Word, in the common acceptation of the Church, is taken for the Hiſtory of the Life of *Jeſus Chriſt*; and the Name of *Evangeliſt*, that was heretofore given to all thoſe Perſons that preach'd the Word of God, is at preſent only given to the four Saints that writ the four Goſpels, which the Church has always owned for Canonical. We there find two Apoſtles, that were Eye-Witneſſes of the Life and Actions of *Jeſus Chriſt*; and two Diſciples of the Apoſtles, who wrote their Goſpel upon relation of others.

The firſt of the four Evangeliſts is St. *Matthew*, who of a Publican became an Apoſtle of our Bleſſed Saviour: He wrote his Goſpel in *Jeruſalem* ſoon after the Death of *Jeſus Chriſt* (*c*), in favour of the Jews that embraced the Chriſtian Faith, as St. *Jerome* has obſerved. (*d*) For this reaſon he wrote in Hebrew, or rather in Syriack. according to the Teſtimony of *Papias*, St. *Irenæus*, *Euſebius*, St. *Jerome*, St. *Chryſoſtom*, St. *Epiphanius*, and indeed of almoſt all the Antients, whoſe poſitive Determinations we ought not to reject, unleſs we have convincing Proofs to the contrary.

Therefore the Opinion of *Cajetan* and ſome others, who pretend, that the Original of St. *Matthew*'s Goſpel was written in *Greek*, is rejected with reaſon by all the Learned Criticks, as being eſtabliſhed upon very weak Foundations. St. *Jerome* aſſures us, that in his own time he ſaw an Hebrew Copy of this Goſpel in the Library at *Cæſarea*, and that the Nazarenes likewiſe had a Copy of it in the City of *Beræa*, which they gave him the liberty to Tranſcribe; and that it was remarkable, that all the Paſſages out of the *Old Teſtament*, cited in this Goſpel, were exactly according to the Hebrew, and not according to the *Septuagint*. *Euſebius* alſo tells us, that *Pantænus* found a Copy of it amongſt the *Indians*, but it is not certain, whether that was not a Copy of the Goſpel of the Nazarenes which was different from that of St. *Matthew*. However it is, 'tis paſt diſpute, that the Original, Hebrew of St. *Matthew*'s Goſpel is loſt at preſent; and it is equally certain, that the Hebrew Texts, that have been publiſhed in our time, are not the Original of St. *Matthew* (*e*), no more than the Syriack Verſion publiſhed by *Widmanſtadius*: The Greek Verſion, which we have, is very ancient, and was extant even in the time of the Apoſtles, as St. *Jerome* and St. *Auſtin* have obſerved. We cannot tell who is the Author of it: Some Perſons, as for inſtance, St. *Athanaſius* in his Book, Entituled, *The Abridgment of Scripture*, attribute it to St. *James*, Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, *Theophylact* to St. *John*; *Papias* ſays, that they Tranſlated into Greek, as well as they could, without naming in particular any Author of that Verſion.

(*f*) The Evangeliſt, St. *Mark*, the Diſciple and Interpreter of St. *Peter*, and Founder of the Church of *Alexandria*, ſeems to be different from that *Mark*, who is ſo often mentioned in the Acts of the *Apoſtles*, and in the Epiſtles of St. *Paul*. (*g*) He compoſed his Goſpel at *Rome* with St. *Peter*, at the intreaty of the Chriſtians reſiding in that City, ſetting down in Writing thoſe things which he had learned from that Apoſtle, who alſo approved of his Goſpel after it was compoſed. (*h*) Some late Authors imagine, that it was written in Latin, but this Opinion is contrary to St. *Jerome*'s and St. *Auſtin*'s Opinion, and indeed has no tolerable Pretences to ſupport it, for we can no more doubt that St. *Mark* wrote it in Greek, than that St. *Luke* or St. *John* did theirs. He follows St. *Matthew* in abundance of things, and ſometimes abridges him, nevertheleſs there are ſome Hiſtorical Paſſages which he relates more copiouſly, and with the addition of ſeveral Circumſtances. 'Tis commonly believed, that this Goſpel was written in the Forty third year of our Saviour's Birth, and, according to the common Computation, Ten Years after his Death, but this is not certain. St. *Jerome* obſerves that the laſt Chapter of this Goſpel is to be found but in very few Copies, and that almoſt all the Greeks reject it. *Wherefore*, ſays he, *one may reject it, particularly becauſe it ſeems to relate ſome things contrary to the account we have of them in the other Evangeliſts.* And in his ſecond Book againſt the *Pelagians*, he cites a Paſſage that was inſerted into this Chapter, and contained the Error of the *Manichees*: It plainly proceeds from this Addition, that in moſt of the Copies of St. *Mark*, this Chapter was entirely left out; for as for the reſt, it is cited by St. *Irenæus*, and ſeveral others, and contains nothing that cannot be reconciled with eaſe to the Accounts given by the other Evangeliſts.

St. *Luke* was of *Antioch*, the Metropolitical City of *Syria*, (*i*) He was a Phyſician by Profeſſion, and very well skilled in the Greek Tongue; (*k*) He was not an Apoſtle or Diſciple of *Jeſus Chriſt*, but was a Diſciple or Follower of St. *Paul*, whom he accompanied in his Voyages. He himſelf tells us, ſays *Euſebius*, in the beginning of his Goſpel, the reaſon of his writing, for many Perſons having raſhly undertaken to write the Evangelick Hiſtory, he thought himſelf obliged to reſcue it out of

ill Hands, after he had been exactly informed of all the Occurrences by thoſe that were Eye-witneſſes and Miniſters of the Word, that is to ſay, by the Apoſtles, and particularly by St. *Paul*. 'Tis imagined, that the Apoſtle ſpeaks of this Goſpel, when he ſays, *according to my Goſpel*, and that he meant St. *Luke* when he wrote this paſſage. *The Brother whoſe praiſe is in the Goſpel in all Churches, Cujus laus eſt in Evangelio per omnes Eccleſias.* St. *Jerome* obſerves, that he wrote his Goſpel travelling along with St. *Paul*, when he was in *Achaia* and *Bœotia*, towards the ſecond year of *Nero*, and the fifty ſixth of Jeſus Chriſt. The ſame Father aſſures us, that he always continued unmarried, and that he lived Fourſcore and four years. He is alſo the Author of the *Acts of the Apoſtles*, which Book contains the Hiſtory of the Church from the Aſcenſion of our bleſſed Saviour to the fourth year of *Nero*, during the ſpace of 29 or 30 years.

St. *John* the Evangeliſt of the City of *Bethſaida* in *Galilee*, was the Son of *Zebedee*, and was called to the Apoſtleſhip when he was very young. St. *Jerome* and *Tertullian* affirm, that he continued in the ſtate of Celibacy all his Life-time. He was the dearly beloved Diſciple of Jeſus Chriſt, and 'tis ſuppoſed, that he ſpeaks of himſelf, when he ſays, *the Diſciple whom Jeſus loved*: But though this were not to be thus underſtood, yet the tenderneſs which Jeſus Chriſt had for him, ſufficiently appear'd in the laſt Supper, when he placed him in his Boſom, and in his laſt words to his Mother, *Woman behold thy Son.* After the deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt, he went and preached the Goſpel in *Aſia*, where he founded and governed the Churches for a long time, being Biſhop of *Epheſus*, the Metropolis of that Province. He was condemned at *Rome* by the Emperor *Domitian* to be thrown into a Veſſel of burning Oyl, but he came out, ſays *Tertullian*, more vigorous and ſtrong than when he enter'd in at firſt. He was baniſhed afterwards into the Iſle of *Patmos*, where, as 'tis generally ſuppoſed, he wrote his *Revelation*. After the Death of *Domitian* he came back to *Epheſus*, and there wrote his *Goſpel*, about an hundred years after the Birth of our Bleſſed Saviour. St. *Jerome* reports, that he was engaged in this Work by the other Biſhops and Chriſtians of *Aſia*, who obliged him to write his *Goſpel*, to confound the Errors of *Cerinthus* and *Ebion*, who ſaid, that Jeſus Chriſt was a meer Man, and that He had no being before He was born of the Virgin *Mary*. The ſame Father adds, that he had yet another reaſon to write his *Goſpel* after others, for having read the *Goſpels* of St. *Matthew*, St. *Mark*, and St. *Luke*, he obſerved, that they only concerned themſelves to write the Hiſtory of one year of our Bleſſed Saviour's Life, namely, from the Impriſonment of St. *John*, down to the Death of our Saviour, which made him reſolve to give an account of the moſt conſiderable things that occurred in the preceding years. He has likewiſe written three *Epiſtles*. The firſt, of which no Man ever doubted, is directed to the Faithful, and particularly to the *Parthians*, if we may believe St. *Auſtin*, and ſome other ancient Writers, that is to ſay, to all the Faithful diſperſed in *Perſia*, which at that time was under the Domination of the *Parthians*. We don't certainly know the time or place where it was written. The two others were directed to particular Perſons, one to a Lady called *Electa*, the other to *Gaius*. They only carry the name of an Elder or Prieſt; which has made ſome People of opinion, that they were written by another St. *John*, as *Euſebius* and St. *Jerome* obſerve. But the Stile, the Spirit, and Thoughts of theſe *Epiſtles*, together with the concurring Authority of moſt of the Fathers, make it evident, that they belong to this Evangeliſt. There is a greater difficulty about the *Apocalypſe*, the Stile of which Book appears to be different from the reſt, and which ſeveral of the Ancients rejected, or attributed to another St. *John*: but the moſt received opinion is, that it was written by the Evangeliſt. The Stile of St. *John* is ſimple, and has little eloquence in it, but his Thoughts are very lofty. He lived till the time of *Trajan*, not dying till the 68th year after the Paſſion of our Bleſſed Saviour.

St. *Paul* deſcended of the Tribe of *Benjamin*, and born in the City of *Tarſus*, came up to *Jeruſalem*, and there became the Diſciple of *Gamaliel*, a famous Phariſee. He was converted to the Faith of Jeſus Chriſt in that miraculous manner which is ſet down in the *Acts of the Apoſtles*; he afterwards changed his name of *Saul* into that of *Paul*, after he had openly Converted and Baptized the Proconſul *Sergius Paulus*. The Hiſtory of his Travels and Preaching, down to his firſt Impriſonment at *Rome*, is written by St. *Luke* in the *Acts*. We don't certainly know, what he did after his Enlargement; ſome of the Ancients were of opinion, that he went into *Spain*, but this is very uncertain, and the contrary ſeems to be more probable. Be that as it will, 'tis certain, that he was beheaded afterwards at *Rome* for his Religion, by *Nero*'s Command, towards the 64th year of the common computation. He has written 14 *Epiſtles*, all which, Antiquity has own'd to be Genuine and Canonical, excepting the *Epiſtle to the Hebrews*, concerning which there has been formerly ſome doubt, and ſome Perſons have ſuppoſed, that it was written in *Hebrew*. They are not rank'd in the *New Teſtament* according to the order of time, which nevertheleſs is very neceſſary to be known.

The *Epiſtle to the Romans* was written from *Corinth*, as *Origen* proves by ſeveral reaſons; for firſt of all it was ſent by *Phœbe* Servant of the Church at *Cenchrea* from *Corinth*. Secondly, St. *Paul* calls *Caius* his Hoſt, with whom he tarried at *Corinth*, as we may ſee in the *Firſt Epiſtles to the Corinthians, chap.* 14. Thirdly, in the Salutations, that are to be found towards the end of this Epiſtle, we find the Names of thoſe who departed from *Corinth* to go to *Jeruſalem*, as it is ſaid in the 20th Chapter of the *Acts*. It was therefore written at the time, when St. *Paul*, having gathered the Contributions of *Macedonia*, and *Achaia*, went to viſit *Jeruſalem* in the 57th year of Jeſus Chriſt. From whence St. *Chryſoſtom* concludes, that it was written after both the *Epiſtles to the Corinthians*, in which he exhorts the Faithful to this Charitable Contribution.

Nevertheleſs they were not written much before: For the firſt was written from *Epheſus*, as it appears, *ch.* 16. *v.* 8. (and not from *Philippi*, as ſome *Greek* Inſcriptions obſerve) in the abſence of *Timothy*.

The

The ſecond was written from *Macedonia* after his return. In ſome Copies it is ſaid, that it was written from *Philippi*, in others from *Nicopolis*.

That to the *Galatians* is yet elder than the two Epiſtles to the *Corinthians*. It was written from *Epheſus*, at the time when St. *Paul* taught in the School of one Sirnamed *Tyrannus* in the beginning of the year 56. It is obſerved in ſome *Greek* Copies, that it was written from *Rome*, but this is not probable, becauſe he does not there ſpeak concerning his Chains, as he does in his Epiſtle to the *Epheſians*, where he mentions them in three ſeveral places.

This Epiſtle therefore was written towards the 62d year of our Lord, as well as that to the *Philippians*, and that other which is directed to the Chriſtians of *Coloſſæ*, a City of *Phrygia* near *Hierapolis* and *Laodicea*.

The two Epiſtles to the *Theſſalonians* ſeem to be the earlieſt, if we follow the Chronological Order. It is probable, that the firſt was written towards the year 52; for after St. *Paul* had converted many Chriſtians at *Theſſalonica*, as it is obſerved in the *Acts*, *ch.* 9. *v.* 7. he ſent *Timothy* thither, who being come to find him at *Corinth*, informed him of their Affairs, as it is obſerved in the third Chapter of this Epiſtle, which was conſequently written in the year 52. The ſecond Epiſtle to the *Theſſalonians* was written ſoon after, and from the ſame place.

The firſt Epiſtle to *Timothy* was written after he was ordained Biſhop, when St. *Paul* was freed from his Chains in the ſixty third year of our Bleſſed Saviour. The ſecond Epiſtle was written from *Rome*, when St. *Paul* was twice impriſoned there, a little before his Martyrdom. The Epiſtle to *Titus* was written about the ſame time with the firſt Epiſtle to *Timothy*. That to *Philemon* was written at the time of his firſt impriſonment at *Rome*. And to conclude, the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews* was written likewiſe about this time, ſince it is there obſerved, *ch.* 13. *v.* 23. that *Timothy* was delivered. Some of the Fathers, as *Caius* and *Hippolytus*, and the ancient Church of *Rome*, have rejected this Epiſtle. Others attribute it to St. *Barnabas*, ſome to St *Clement*, and ſome to St. *Luke*; but however (*p*) the moſt prevailing opinion is, that it was written by St. *Paul*. St. *Jerome* ſeems to accommodate theſe differences, by ſaying, that the thoughts belong to St. *Paul*, but that the words and compoſition are either St. *Barnabas*'s or St. *Lukes*, or rather St. *Clement*'s, who diligently collected whatever he learn'd from his Maſter. Thoſe ancient Writers that attribute it to St. *Paul*, ſay, that it was written in *Hebrew*, that is to ſay, in *Syriack* (*q*,) being written by an *Hebrew* to the *Hebrews*. Some of the Moderns pretend it was written in *Greek*, but to this Authority of the Ancients, they oppoſe nothing but frivolous weak Conjectures, which are too weak to biaſs any Man.

The Epiſtles that follow thoſe of St *Paul*, are called *General*, becauſe if we except the two laſt of St. *John*, they are not directed to the Faithful of one City, as thoſe of St. *Paul* are, but to Chriſtians diſperſed in ſeveral Countries.

The Epiſtle of St. *James* was not written by *James* the Son of *Zebedee* the Brother of *John*, but by St. *James* the Brother of St. *Jude* the Apoſtle, and (*r*) Couſin of our Bleſſed Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, and Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*. For it cannot belong to the other St. *James*, ſince it is directed to Chriſtians out of *Judæa*, whereas he ſuffer'd Martyrdom before the Goſpel was preached in any other place than *Judea*.

St. *Peter* the chief of the Apoſtles has written two Epiſtles; the firſt that has been received as Canonical by all the Ancients (*s*) was written from *Babylon*. Some of the Ancients were of opinion, that the City of *Rome* was meant by this name, but the Senſe is not natural. We cannot preciſely aſſign the time when it was written, but certain it is, that it was ſent, after the Diſciples of Jeſus Chriſt were called Chriſtians at *Antioch*, that is to ſay, at leaſt nine years after the Death of our Bleſſed Saviour; for the name of Chriſtians is to be found there in the fourth Chapter. *Now if thou art called a Chriſtian. Si autem Chriſtianus cognominaris.* It is alſo probable, that it was written after St. *Peter*'s being delivered out of Priſon, *A. D.* 44. for until that time he continued for the moſt part in *Judea*. Some believe that it was written towards the end of his Life, becauſe it does not ſeem to have been written long before the ſecond Epiſtle, but this is not certain: One may ſay, that it was written at *Babylon* in the 45th year of Jeſus Chriſt.

The ſecond was probably written towards the end of his Life, becauſe he there teſtifies, that he expected Death very ſuddenly, *ch.* 1. *v.* 14. Some of the Fathers have doubted, whether this Letter was written by St. *Peter*, becauſe the ſtyle of it is ſo extremely different from that of the former, as St. *Jerome* obſerves, but St. *Peter* diſcovers himſelf ſo plainly and openly there, that we cannot with the leaſt colour or pretence attribute it to any body elſe.

St. *Jude* the Apoſtle the Brother of *James* and *Simon* the Son of *Alpheus*, Sirnamed *Thaddeus* and *Lebbeus*, wrote the Epiſtle, that carries his Name, after the Death of moſt of the Apoſtles, as he teſtifies when he exhorts the Chriſtians to contend earneſtly for the Faith, which was once delivered to them by the Apoſtles. He imitates and follows the thoughts and deſign of the ſecond Epiſtle of St. *Peter*, and even inſerts ſome of his words into his own.

NOTES

NOTES.

(*a*) THE *Goſpel ſignifies in Greek, Happy tidings.*] Εὐαγγέλιον is derived from the Particle εὖ that ſignifies *well*, and the Verb ἀγγέλλω that ſignifies *to tell*. 'Tis to be found in *Homer* and *Xenophon*, but in another Senſe, *viz.* 'tis taken for the recompence which is given a Man for carrying good news. *Tully* has uſed this term in this Senſe in one of his Epiſtles to *Atticus*.

(*b*) *The word Evangeliſt, that was heretofore given to all thoſe that preached the Word of God.*] *Acts* 21. *v.* 18. *Philip* is called an Evangeliſt. St. *Paul* in his 2d Epiſtle to *Timothy*, *ch.* 4. *v.* 5. beſeeches that Biſhop to do the work of an Evangeliſt. *Opus fac Evangeliſtæ.*

(*c*) *Soon after the death of our Bleſſed Saviour.*] This is the opinion of St. *Jerome*, and St. *Epiphanius*, who ſay, that he compoſed his Goſpel, before he went to Preach to the Gentiles. St. *Irenæus*, *l.* 3. *c.* 1. ſeems to ſay the contrary, when he aſſures us, that St. *Matthew* wrote his Goſpel for the *Jews*, and in the Language of the *Jews*, at the time when St. *Peter* and St. *Paul* founded the Church of *Rome*: But theſe words are not to be underſtood in the literal Senſe.

(*d*) *For this reaſon he wrote it in Hebrew, or rather in Syriack.*] *Papias* cited by *Euſebius*, *l.* 3. of his Hiſtory, Chapter the laſt. St. *Irenæus*, *l.* 3. *c.* 1. St. *Jerome* in his Preface to the Evangeliſts, in his Book of the Eccleſiaſtical Writers, and in ſeveral other places. *Euſebius*, *l.* 3. *c.* 18. the Author of the Work upon St. *Matthew* attributed to St. *Chryſoſtome*, St. *Epiphanius*, *Hæreſ.* 29. & 57. The Author of the *Abridgment of Scripture*, attributed to St. *Athanaſius*. St. *Cyril*, *Catech.* 14. St. *Auſtin*, *l.* 1. *de Conſenſu Evangel. cap.* 2. teſtifie that the Goſpel of St. *Matthew* was written in *Hebrew*, that is to ſay in *Syriack*. St. *Irenæus* and St. *Jerome* ſay, that it was written in the Language of the Country, which was the *Chaldee* or *Syriack* Tongue mixt with *Hebrew* words, which is commonly called the *Hebrew* Tongue in the New Teſtament. St. *Jerome* tells us plainly, that the Goſpel of St. *Matthew* was written in this Tongue; for in his Commentary upon the 12th Chapter of this Goſpel, he ſays, that ſome Perſons were of opinion, that the Goſpel of the *Nazarenes* was the Original Hebrew of St. *Matthew*; and in his ſecond Dialogue againſt the *Pelagians*, he ſays, that the Goſpel of the *Nazarenes* was written in *Chaldee* or *Syriack* with *Hebrew* Characters. Thoſe that are of the contrary opinion, who maintain, that St. *Matthew* wrote it originally in *Greek*, as *Grotius* well obſerves, reject the unanimous Conſent of the Ancients without any appearance of Reaſon. Let us for once examine the Conjectures of a certain Author, that is of this opinion: He ſays, that the words *Emanuel*, *Eli*, *Lamma Sabacthani*, *Aceldama*, and other Syriack Terms are explained there; but this does not at all prove, that this Goſpel was not written in *Syriack*, for otherwiſe we ought to ſay, that ſeveral Books of the Old Teſtament were not written in *Hebrew*, becauſe even in thoſe Books we have the *Hebrew* Terms explained after the ſame manner; for example, *Gen.* 31. *v.* 49. *Galaad*, *id eſt*, *tumulus teſtis*; 35. *v.*18. *Benoni*, *id eſt*, *filius doloris mei*; *Exod.* 12. *v.* 11, *Peſach*, *id eſt*, *tranſitus Domini*; and 16. *v.* 15. *Manhu*, *quod ſignificat quid eſt hoc.* Theſe Explications are not to be found in the *Hebrews* but have been added by the Interpreter; and we ought to make the ſame Judgment of theſe paſſages in St. *Matthew*. They pretend ſtill, that theſe Fathers never ſaw the Original of St. *Matthew*, that they ſaid it was *Hebrew*, only becauſe the Goſpel of the *Nazarenes* was in *Hebrew*, which is extremely different from that of St. *Matthew*. To this it is anſwered, 1. That we cannot ſay this of the moſt ancient Fathers, as *Papias*, St. *Irenæus*, *&c.* 2. That although the Goſpel of the *Nazarenes* was different from that of St. *Matthew*, yet it might very well be taken from the Original of St. *Matthew*, in which the Hereticks had inſerted, and altered abundance of things,

(*e*) *No more than the Syriack Verſion.*] It is an eaſie matter to ſhew this, becauſe the *Hebrew* or *Syriack* words that are cited in the *Greek* of St. *Matthew*'s Goſpel are different from thoſe of the *Syriack*, in the 27th Chapter inſtead of *Haceldama* he has *Aguraſcadema*; inſtead of *Cephos*, he has *Cepho*; for *Eli*, *Il*; for *Golgotha*, *Golgoutho*; for *Jaacob*, *Jaacoub*; for *Joſeph*, *Joouſeph*. We likewiſe find there abundance of Greek words terminated after the *Syriack* manner, which makes it evident, that it was a *Grecian* that Tranſlated the *Greek* of St. *Matthew* into *Syriack*, and not the Original it ſelf of St. *Matthew*.

(*f*) *The Evangeliſt St.* Mark *ſeems to be a different perſon from that* Mark, *who is ſo often mentioned in the* Acts, *&c.*] He, of whom mention is made in the *Acts*, *ch.* 12. *v.* 12. and in *ch.* 15. *v.* 37. and 39. was Sirnamed *John* the Son of *Mary*. There is likewiſe mention made of one *Mark* the Couſin of *Barnabas*, *Coloſ.* 4. *v.* 10. 'Tis very probable he is the ſame with the former, but the *Evangeliſt* in all appearance is a different Perſon: for beſides that he was not Sirnamed *John*, he was the Diſciple of St. *Peter*, and attending upon him, at the ſame time that the other was with St. *Paul*: he was likewiſe at *Alexandria* at the time when the other was with St. *Paul* at *Rome*. Some think that St. *Mark* the *Evangeliſt* was one of the Seventy two Diſciples, but this is not certain enough to be relied upon; It is more probable, that he was converted to the Faith by St. *Peter*, who calls him his Son, and whoſe Diſciple and Interpreter he was.

(*g*) *He compoſed his Goſpel when he was at* Rome.] This is the opinion of all the Ancients.

Pa-

Papias in Euſebius, l. 2. c. 15. St. Irenæus, l. 3. c. 1. St. Clement cited by St. *Jerome, Tertullian, l. 4. Contra Marcionem, Euſebius*, St. *Jerome*, &c. St. *Irenæus* tells us, that it was written after the death of St. *Peter*, others on the contrary unanimouſly affirm, that it was written whilſt he was living, and that he approved of it. Upon this account ſeveral Perſons have called it the Goſpel of St. *Peter*, as *Tertullian* obſerves.

(*b*) *Some modern Authors imagine, that it was written in Latin.*] *Baronius ad ann. Chr.* 45. *n.* 14. and thoſe that follow him without farther conſideration are of this opinion, but after all it's a Problem that cannot be maintained. St. *Jerome* in *Epiſt.* 125. to *Damaſus*, expreſly tells us, that all the *New Teſtament*, except St. *Matthew*'s Goſpel, was written in *Greek*. And St. *Auſtin. lib. de Conſenſu Evang. c.* 2. tells us, that all the four Evangeliſts except St. *Matthew*, wrote in *Greek*. The *Latin* St. *Mark*, which we now have, is certainly a Tranſlation of the *Greek*.

(*i*) St. Luke *a Phyſician by Profeſſion.*] St. *Paul* in his Epiſtle to the *Coloſ.* Luke *the beloved Phyſician greets you. Nicephorus, l.* 2. *c.* 43. of his Hiſtory affirms, that he was an excellent Painter, and ſome People ſay, that he drew the Picture of the Virgin *Mary*, but theſe are fictions.

(*k*) *He was neither of the number of the Apoſtles, nor of the Diſciples.*] This is certainly true, becauſe he tells us, that what he wrote, he learnt from others. St. *Irenæus, l.* 1. *c.*2. St. *Jerome* upon *ch.* 65. of *Iſaiah*, St *Auſtin* and ſeveral others poſitively ſay, that he was not a Diſciple of Jeſus Chriſt. They are only ſome few modern Authors, that are pleaſed to beſtow this Character upon him.

(*l*) *Cujus laus eſt in Evangelio per omnes Eccleſias.*] We cannot cetainly tell, whether the word *Evangelium* in this place ſignifies a Book of the Goſpel, or whether we are not rather to underſtand it thus, *The Brother who deſerves praiſe for having preached the Goſpel.* That which follows afterwards, *and who was ordained to be the Companion of our Travels*, made *Baronius* believe, that it is *Silas*, of whom we are to underſtand this paſſage. But St. *Jerome*, and St. *Ambroſe* in his Preface upon St. *Luke* do underſtand it of this Evangeliſt.

(*m*) *He afterwards changed his name of* Saul *for that of* Paul, *after having converted and baptized the Preconſul* Sergius Paulus.] The Author of the One and thirtieth Sermon, attributed to St. *Ambroſe*, tells us, that he changed his name at his Baptiſm, but this is but a groundleſs fancy, for in his time they gave no name to any body at their Baptiſm. Others ſay, that he changed his name, when he changed his Profeſſion; and ſome pretend to affirm that he had two Names. The moſt probable Opinion is, that he took the name of *Paul* after the converſion of *Sergius Paulus*, for till that time he is conſtantly called *Saul* in the *Acts of the Apoſtles*, and afterwards he is always called by the name of *Paul*. It was the cuſtom of the Romans to give their own names to others in teſtimony of friendſhip; *Joſephus* for example received the name of *Flavius* from the Emperor *Veſpaſian* by way of Honour: [Or rather, becauſe having been once his Priſoner, he ſet him at Liberty: it being uſual for freed Men, to take their Patrons *Prænomen*.

(*n*) *Some Authors pretend, that he went into* Spain, *but this is very uncertain.*] St. *Athanaſius* in his Epiſtle to *Dracontius*, St. *Cyril*, *Cat.* 17. St. *Epiphanius, Hæreſ.* 27. St. *Chryſoſtome in Ep. ad Hebr.* and in *Matth.* 76. and *Homil. de laud. Pauli, Theodoret in Ep. ad Timot. c. ult. Hier. in* 11 *Iſ. Greg. moral, l.* 3. *c.* 22. *Iſidore, Bede, Ado*, &c. are of this opinion. All theſe Authors lived after the third Century, but before that time nothing is written concerning it, and beſides they don't ſpeak of it as a certain thing, but only as a probable conjecture. St. *Paul* in his Epiſtle to the *Romans*, *c.* 15. *v.* 24. promiſes, that he would go into *Spain*, but though it follows from thence, that he had a deſign of going thither, yet we cannot rationally conclude, that he was ever there. Pope *Gelatius* and *Innocent* the firſt tell us, that he did not perform that promiſe, and it is very certain, that the Goſpel was preached ſomewhat later on this ſide the *Alpes*.

(*o*) *In the year* 61, *according to the vulgar computation.*] All Authors are agreed, that St. *Paul* was beheaded at *Rome*, but however, they are not agreed about the year. Some of them tell us, that he ſuffered Martyrdom with St. *Peter*, others place it a year, and ſome two years, lower; ſome pretend, that this happened in the laſt year of *Nero*'s Reign, which was the ſixty eighth of our Bleſſed Saviour; but moſt Men think, that St. *Peter* and St. *Paul* ſuffered Martyrdom at the time of *Nero*'s Perſecution, which began in the fourth year of that Emperor after the burning of *Rome*, *Anno Dom.* 63. and therefore according to this account theſe two Princes of the Apoſtles ſuffered Martyrdom in the 64th year of the Vulgar Æra.

(*p*) *The moſt received opinion is, that it was written by St.* Paul.] This opinion ſeems to be the moſt probable. The Epiſtle to the *Hebrews* does not belong to St. *Barnabas*, having a different Title from that of this Apoſtle. There is no reaſon to attribute it to St. *Luke*. The ſtyle and the thoughts very much reſemble thoſe of St. *Clement* in his Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*: and upon this account I am apt to believe, that we ought to attribute the Compoſition or Tranſlation of it rather to him than any other, although it is written in the name of St. *Paul*, and by that Apoſtle: for it was written at *Rome* by a Perſon that enjoyed his liberty, and who had *Timothy* for his Collegue. Theſe three Characters ſhew plainly, that it was written by St. *Paul*, who did not put his name to it for fear of offending the *Jews*, who were prejudiced againſt him. *Grotius* believes, that it was written after the taking of *Jeruſalem*, becauſe it is obſerved, ſays he, in the third Chapter, that there were certain Chriſtians, who ſuppoſed the Day of Judgment was very near; an Opinion that was not common till after *Jeruſalem* was taken, but this is a bare conjecture upon weak grounds. St. *Jerome* anſwers the uſual Objection about the diverſity of ſtyle, that is alledged to prove, that this Epiſtle was not written by St. *Paul*, by ſaying, that it was occaſioned either by him that compoſed it under St. *Paul*,

Paul, or elſe by the Interpreter. [But if Mr. *Lowth*'s Opinion be true, the Controverſy muſt be at an end: For in his Vindicatation of the Authority of the H. Scriptures againſt the five Letters publiſhed by the Anſwers of Mr. *Simon*, *p.* 24. He ſays that St. *Peter* quotes the 37th Verſe of the 10th Chapter of the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, in the 15th Verſe of the 3d Chapter of his 2d Epiſtle, where he ſays that St. *Paul* often ſaid thoſe things which the unlearned and unſtable wreſt as well as the other Scriptures to their own deſtruction.]

(*q*) *In Hebrew to the Hebrews.*] St. *Clemens Alexandrinus* is of another opinion, as alſo St. *Jerome*, *Theodoret*, *Oecumenius*, and ſeveral others. *Eſtius* and ſome of the Moderns believe, that it was written in *Greek*. 1. Becauſe the Scriptures there cited follow the *Septuagint*, and not the *Hebrew*; 2. Becauſe there is no probability that the Copy ſhould be loſt. Theſe Reaſons are exceeding weak, for ſuppoſe the Citations are not to be charged upon the Interpreter, yet, why might not St. *Paul*, when he was writing in the *Syriack* Tongue, Tranſlate the *Septuagint* into that Language, rather than cite the Hebrew Text, ſince the *Septuagint* was more familiar to him? This may ſerve by way of Anſwer to the firſt Reaſon. The Second is yet weaker, for why might not the Hebrew Copy of this Epiſtle be loſt, as well as the Original Hebrew of the Goſpel of St. *Matthew*?

(*r*) *But of St.* James *the Brother of the Apoſtle St.* Jude, *and Couſin of our Bleſſed Saviour.*] This *James* is he, that is called in the Goſpel the Son of *Alpheus*, for there were but two in all: He is called the Brother of our Lord, either becauſe he was the Son of *Joſeph* by another Wife, or becauſe he was very nearly related to him.

(*s*) *It was written from* Babylon.] *Euſelius*, *l.* 2. *c.* 5. of his Hiſtory ſays, that it is *Rome* that St. *Peter* calls *Babylon* in this place. Some have thought that *Papias* and St. *Clement*, cited by *Euſebius*, were of this Opinion, but he does not cite them upon this Subject. St. *Jerome* received this opinion from *Euſebius*, and carried it farther with ſtrong Reaſons. Tho' after all, this Interpretation is falſe, and it is more natural to ſay, that he wrote this Epiſtle from *Babylon*.

(*t*) St. Peter *diſcovers himſelf ſo plainly there, that we cannot with the leaſt colour attribute it to any other Author.*] The Author of this Epiſtle tells us, that he was with *Jeſus Chriſt* upon the Mountain, he calls St. *Paul* his Brother, and makes himſelf Author of a former Epiſtle written to the ſame Perſons. Now all this agrees very well to St. *Peter*, and it is viſible, that he who compoſed it, was no Impoſtor. The Character of this Epiſtle is perfectly Apoſtolical, and the Style is not ſenſibly different from that of the firſt.

SECT.

SECT. VI.

Of the Canon of the Books of the New Teſtament, *and particularly of thoſe Books that were formerly doubted of.*

THE firſt Canon of the Holy Books of the *New Teſtament* was not compoſed by any Aſſembly, or by any one Perſon in particular, but by the Unanimous Conſent of all the Churches, that were agreed upon the Authority of certain Books, and conſidered them as Sacred and Divine. 'Twas this Conſent of all the Churches, that in the Primitive Times ſerved for a Rule, to diſtinguiſh the Canonical Books from thoſe that were Doubtful and Suppoſititious. 'Tis in purſuance of this Rule that *Euſebius*, who is the firſt Man that made an exact Enquiry into theſe Matters, diſtinguiſhes three ſorts of Books that belong in ſome manner to the *New Teſtament*. The firſt Claſs comprehends thoſe, that have been always received by the Unanimous Agreement of all Churches, ſuch as the four Goſpels, the fourteen Epiſtles of St. *Paul*, if we except that of the *Hebrews*, (which ſome Authors did not number amongſt the reſt, becauſe they ſuppoſed it was not St. *Paul*'s,) and the Firſt Epiſtles of St. *Peter* and St. *John*. The ſecond Claſs comprehends thoſe, that having not been received by the whole Catholick Church, yet nevertheleſs were looked upon by ſome as Canonical Books, and cited as Books of Scripture by Eccleſiaſtical Authors. But this Claſs does yet branch it ſelf into two Diviſions, for ſome of theſe Books have been ſince received by all the Churches, and acknowledged for Genuine, ſuch as the Epiſtle of St. *James*, the Epiſtle of St. *Jude*, the Second Epiſtle of St. *Peter*, the ſecond and third Epiſtle of St. *John*: The other on the contrary have been univerſally rejected, either as Spurious, or unworthy to be placed in the number of Canonical Books, though they might otherwiſe be uſeful enough, ſuch as the Book of the *Paſtor*, the Epiſtle of St. *Barnabas*, the Goſpel according to the *Ægyptians*, another according to the *Hebrews*, the Acts of St. *Paul*, the Revelation of St. *Peter*. In ſhort, the laſt Claſs contains thoſe Books that were deviſed by the Hereticks, and were always diſowned by the Church, ſuch as the Goſpels of St. *Thomas*, and of St. *Peter*, &c. As for what concerns the *Apocalypſe*, of which we have not as yet diſcourſed, *Euſebius* obſerves, that ſome Perſons place it in the firſt Claſs, that is to ſay, in the number of thoſe Books that are unqueſtionably Canonical, and that others reckon it amongſt the Books of the ſecond Claſs.

This obſervation of *Euſebius*, which is confirmed by the Teſtimonies of the Ancients, whom he cites in ſeveral places of his Hiſtory, ſhews, that the Canon of the Books of the *New Teſtament* was almoſt the very ſame in all Times: For although there were ſome of the Epiſtles of the Apoſtles, that at firſt were not received by an Unanimous Conſent of all Churches, yet they were always conſidered as Books of great Authority, and ſoon after they received the ſame Authority with the reſt. This is confirmed by the ancient Catalogues of the Holy Books of the *New Teſtament*, where the Books, which we receive at preſent, are compriſed: You will find all of them, except the Revelation, in the Canon of the Council of *Laodicea*, which St. *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem* follows. They are all received by St. *Athanaſius*, St. *Jerome*, St. *Gregory Nazianzen*, by *Amphilochius*, the Council of *Carthage*, the Council at *Rome*, by Pope *Innocent*, and all the other Greek and Latin Authors ſince *Euſebius*. They are all cited as Holy Books by thoſe Authors that lived neareſt the time of the Apoſtles. In ſhort, 'tis beyond Controverſie, as we have already demonſtrated above, that theſe Books were written by thoſe Perſons, whoſe Names they bear: The Epiſtles themſelves that were formerly queſtioned, contain nothing diſagreeable to the Faith and Doctrine contained in the other Books, that have been received and acknowledged by all the Churches from the beginning.

The Epiſtle to the *Hebrews* has been received as Canonical, with the Conſent of almoſt all Churches. They were only a few *Latins* that queſtion'd its Authority, becauſe they did not believe it to be written by St. *Paul*: But although it was not compoſed by him, which is not probable, as we have already ſhewn, yet it ought nevertheleſs to paſs for Canonical, it being a conſtantly received Tradition, that it was written by one of his Diſciples, and that it was owned by almoſt all the Churches of the World, as ſoon as it appeared in Publick. It is cited by *Clemens Romanus* in his Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*, by *Clemens Alexandrinus*, by *Tertullian* and *Origen*, by St. *Cyprian*, and all thoſe that came after, as a Writing undoubtedly Canonical. We cannot find out the particular Author, that queſtioned the Epiſtle of St. *James* as doubtful; it is cited by all the Ancients, and placed in the number of Canonical Books in all the Catalogues that we have. The ſame Obſervation may be made upon the ſecond Epiſtle of St. *Peter*, which was certainly written by that Author.

as we have elſewhere ſhewn. It is cited by St. *Auſtin*, by *Origen*, and by many other ancient Writers. The Epiſtle of St. *Jude* was rejected by ſome, not becauſe they had any lawful Grounds to doubt that St *Jude* was the Author of it, but only becauſe there is a Citation out of the Book of *Enoch* to be found there: And yet notwithſtanding that, it was ſet down in the ancient Catalogues of the Books of the *New Teſtament*, and it has been cited by *Tertullian*, by *Clemens Alexandrinus*, by *Origen*, by St. *Cyprian*, by St. *Gregory Nazianzen*, and by ſeveral other Authors. St. *Jerome* tells us, that although ſeveral rejected it, by reaſon of the Citation out of the Book of *Enoch*; yet it was received in his time, becauſe it was ancient, and approved by the uſage of the Church, *Authoritatem vetuſtate jam, & uſu meruit*. The two laſt Epiſtles of St. *John* being very ſhort, and containing nothing that is diſagreeable to what we find in the firſt, cannot occaſion any difficuly. They are written without queſtion by the Author of the firſt, as may plainly be proved by the likeneſs of Style: The ſecond is cited by St. *Irenæus* in his firſt Book, *ch.* 12. and in the third Book, *chap.* 18. by *Tertullian*, by *Origen*, by St. *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria*, and by many others. In a word, they are both of them reckoned in the number of Canonical Books in all the ancient Catalogues of the Volumns of the *New Teſtament*.

Nothing more remains for me to diſcourſe of but the *Apocalypſe*, which ſome of the Ancients, according to the Teſtimony of *Euſebius*, placed in the rank of indubitable Books, others in the number of doubtful Books, or rather ſpurious. It was rejected by *Caius* an ancient Prieſt of *Rome*, who attributed it to the Heretick *Cerinthus*, as *Euſebius* teſtifies in the third Book of his Hiſtory, *chap.* 28. On the contrary, St. *Juſtin*, St. *Irenæus*, *Origen*, St. *Cyprian*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, and *Tertullian*, cite it in abundance of places, and attribute it to St. *John* the Evangeliſt. St. *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria* obſerves, that ſeveral Perſons before him diſowned and confuted the *Apocalypſe*, as a Book full of Fictions and Falſities, but that many others approved of it; that as for himſelf he durſt not preſume to reject it, that he believed it had a hidden Meaning, but that he was fully perſuaded it was not written by St. *John*, as he endeavours to prove by ſeveral Reaſons. St. *Jerome* tells us in his 129th Epiſtle, that in his time the greater part of the *Greek* Churches did not receive this Book, no more than the *Latins* did the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, but that he received both the one and the other, not minding the Cuſtom of his own Time, but the Authority of the Ancients. *Amphilochius* alſo obſerves, that in his time ſome received it, but that there were great numbers that rejected it, and indeed it is not to be found, as we have already taken notice in the Catalogue of the Council of *Laodicea*, nor in that of St. *Cyril*. But it has been ſince acknowledged by the *Greek* and *Latin* Churches, and cited by St. *Epiphanius*, by St. *Chryſoſtom*, by St. *Ambroſe*, by St. *Hilary*, by St. *Jerome*, by St. *Auſtin*, and by all thoſe that have written ſince. It was reckoned amongſt the Canonical Books by the Council of *Carthage*, by the *Roman* Conncil under *Gelaſius*, and by Pope *Innocent*. The fourth Council of *Toledo* held in the year 633. in the ſixteenth Canon has determined, That it was written by St. *John*, and that it ought to be placed in the number of the Holy Books. And the Council of *Trent*, by whoſe Deciſions we ought to be determined, reckons it amongſt the Canonical Books of the *New Teſtament*.

We ought here to diſcourſe a little concerning the Apocryphal Books of the *New Teſtament*, that were forged either by the Catholicks or Hereticks. But theſe not being of the number of Canonical Books, ought to be ranged amongſt the Books of the Eccleſiaſtical Writers: Wherefore we will now begin our Library of Eccleſiaſtical Authors with them.

BIBLIO.

BIBLIOTHECA PATRUM:

OR, A

New Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory

OF THE

Firſt three Centuries of *CHRISTIANITY.*

CONTAINING

An Account of the LIVES and WRITINGS of the *Primitive FATHERS*, with Cenſures upon all their BOOKS, determining which are *Genuine*, and which *Spurious.*

Of the Letter ſuppoſed to be ſent by Jeſus Chriſt *to King* Agbarus, *and of that of* Agbarus *to* Jeſus Chriſt.

The Letters of Jeſus Chriſt, *and* Agbarus.

EUſebius gives us an Account in the firſt Book of his Hiſtory, of a certain King of *Edeſſa* (*a*), named *Agbarus* (*b*), who having heard the report of the Miracles that were wrote by *Jeſus Chriſt*, ſent a Letter to him, the purport whereof was, To intreat him to Cure a Diſtemper with which he was afflicted: And that our Saviour did not then grant his Requeſt, but wrote a Letter back to him, wherein he promiſed to ſend one of his Diſciples to heal him: and laſtly, that St. *Thomas* the Apoſtle, immediately after the Reſurrection of *Jeſus Chriſt*, deputed *Thaddeus* one of the 72 Diſciples, who went and performed the Promiſe that had been made by our Saviour to Cure his Diſeaſe, and at the ſame time Converted him, together with his whole Family. *Euſebius* grounds this Story upon the Letters of *Jeſus Chriſt* and *Agbarus*, which were taken out of the Archieves of the Church of *Edeſſa*, which he likewiſe produceth Tranſlated out of *Syriack* into *Greek*. Now it is probable, that *Euſebius* credited thoſe Records that were exhibited to him too eaſily, as alſo, that theſe Letters are forged, and that this whole Hiſtory is fabulous. For firſt, how can it be imagined that the King of *Edeſſa*, upon the bare rehearſal of the Miracles of *Jeſus Chriſt*, ſhould addreſs himſelf to him, as one that was convinced of his Divinity, and inſtructed in the Principles of his Religion: *Having heard* (ſays he) *of the Miracles which thou haſt wrought, I am perſuaded that thou art God, or the Son of God.* It is evident, that theſe words could not be written but by a Perſon already perſuaded and trained up in the Doctrine of Chriſtianity, who makes *Agbarus* ſpeak almoſt the ſame Expreſſions as he himſelf would have uſed on the like occaſion. The following Words that are likewiſe attributed to this King, *viz. That being informed, that the* Jews *laid Snares for* Jeſus Chriſt, *he deſigned to moleſt them, and invited him to come to his City, which, although it were ſmall, might be ſufficient for them both*, more clearly demonſtrate the falſhood of this Letter: For who can believe, that a King ſhould offer the Moiety of his Kingdom at once to a Man that was altogether unknown to him?

Neither is it more difficult to diſcover the forging of the other Letter that is attributed to *Jeſus Chriſt*, beginning with theſe words; *Thou art happy*, Agbarus, *for having believed in me, without ſeeing me; for it is written of me, That they that ſee me ſhall not believe in me, to the end, that they that believe on me without ſeeing me may receive Eternal Life.* To what purpoſe are theſe Words written? Is it not apparent, that he that compoſed this Letter alludes to the Expreſſion of *Jeſus Chriſt* to St. *Thomas, Happy are they that have not ſeen and yet have believed?* Which Words being not ſpoken by our Saviour till after his Reſurrection, nor written till a long time after, it evidently appears that this Letter is counterfeit.

(*a*) *Edeſſa.*] This is a famous City, ſituated beyond the River *Euphrates*, between *Syria* and *Meſopotamia*.

(*b*) *Named* Agbarus.] Others read *Abgarus*, and he is ſo called in ſome ancient Medals; but it is written *Agbarus* in the moſt correct Manuſcripts, and it is pronounced ſo in *Arabick*.

The Hiſtory, which is afterwards produced concerning theſe two Letters, and taken from the ſame Archieves, is no leſs fabulous. It is reported, that *Jude* the Apoſtle (*c*), who is alſo called *Thomas*, ſent *Thaddeus* the Apoſtle, one of the 72 Diſciples, to King *Agbarus*: That this Prince, being informed that there was a Man in his City that wrought many Miracles, and doubting whether he were not the Diſciple whom *Jeſus Chriſt* had promiſed to ſend, gave orders to one named *Tobias* to bring him into his Preſence: And that he had no ſooner ſeen him, but his Countenance ſeeming to him to be Divine, he proſtrated himſelf at his Feet to worſhip him, deſiring to know, whether he were that Diſciple whom *Jeſus Chriſt* had promiſed to ſend to cure his Diſtemper. *Thaddeus* having anſwered that he was, and that if he believed in *Jeſus Chriſt* he ſhould be ſaved, *Agbarus* replied, *I have believed ſo firmly in him, that I intended to proclaim War againſt the* Jews *who Crucified him, and utterly to deſtroy that Nation; if the fear of the* Roman *Empire had not deterred me from this Undertaking.* Certainly the Perſon (whoſoever he be) that cauſed this petty Prince of *Edeſſa* to utter theſe Words, was endued with very little judgment, in aſcribing to him a Deſign ſo extravagant as this; for is it not an egregious piece of folly to imagine, that a Prince only of one ſingle City ſhould undertake to maintain a War againſt a Nation ſo powerful as that of the *Jews*, and ſhould hope to deſtroy it, to revenge the Death of a Man, whom he knew only by hear-ſay? What probability is there, that nothing but the fear of the *Romans* was able to divert him from ſo raſh an Attempt? I ſhall not proceed to make any Reflection on the other Circumſtances of this Relation, which appear to be no leſs fabulous than thoſe that we have even now recited: I ſhall only add, that the time wherein it is affirmed that thoſe Occurrences happened, ſhews this whole Hiſtory to be Suppoſititious. They take notice at the end of this Record, that theſe Things were Tranſlated in the 430th Year of the *Edeſſenian* Æra, now the 430th Year of the *Edeſſenians* is the 15th of *Tiberius*, in which the Ancients believed that *Jeſus Chriſt* died and roſe again. And we muſt ſay according to this *Epocha*, and what we find recorded in the *Acts*, that this happened immediately after our Saviour's Reſurrection, and that *Agbarus*, and ſeveral other Gentiles of *Edeſſa*, received the Goſpel before *Cornelius*, which is plainly contrary to the *Acts of the Apoſtles*; and conſequently we may be certain that this Hiſtory is falſe, and that theſe Letters are forged. The Authority of *Euſebius* is not to be regarded in this caſe, ſince it is evident, that he hath too raſhly given credit to the Memorials that were tranſmitted to him, taken from the Archieves of the Church of *Edeſſa*. And none can be ignorant, that this ſort of Records ought not too much to be relied on, eſpecially with reſpect to Hiſtories of ſuch a Nature.

But in regard that theſe Fables are always augmented in proceſs of time, it hath been likewiſe feigned that *Jeſus Chriſt*, in writing to *Agbarus*, ſent him his Picture drawn on a Handkerchief. *Evagrius* is the firſt that makes mention of this Effigies in *Book IV. Chap.* 27. of his Hiſtory, relying on the Authority of *Procopius*, who nevertheleſs takes no notice of this Relation. However, ſince the time of *Evagrius*, the Defenders of Image-Worſhip have often cited it, and the Modern *Greeks* ſo firmly believed it, that they keep a Feſtival on the 16th of *Auguſt* in Commemoration thereof.

(*c*) *That* Jude *the Apoſtle, who is alſo called* Thomas.] *Thomas* the Apoſtle was not ſirnamed *Jude*, but *Didymus*, and *Jude* the Apoſtle was not called *Thomas*; which is a further Proof of the Falſhood of this Hiſtory.

Of ſome Letters attributed to the Virgin Mary.

Letters of the Virgin Mary.

THere are ſeveral Letters likewiſe aſcribed to the Virgin *Mary*, which being not ſo ancient as thoſe of *Jeſus Chriſt* to *Agbarus*, may more eaſily be proved to be falſe; the Letter of the Virgin *Mary* to St. *Ignatius* is ſuppoſitious, as we ſhall hereafter take an occaſion to ſhew in diſcourſing concerning the Epiſtles of that Saint. That to the *Florentines* publiſhed by *Caniſius*, as alſo another which the Inhabitants of *Meſſina* pretend to keep in their Poſſeſſion, have more evident Marks of their Falſhood, and are generall rejected; inſomuch that there is no neceſſity to prove them to be Apocryphal.

Of the Counterfeit Goſpels.

Counterfeit Goſpels.

NOthing more clearly evinceth the truth of this Maxim of Holy Scripture, *That the Father of Lies often changes himſelf into an Angel of Light*, than the great number of Books, that have been heretofore forg'd in imitation of the Sacred Writings. For as the Holy Ghoſt hath cauſed Goſpels, Acts, Epiſtles, and a Revelation to be written, ſo in like manner the Devil to counterfeit the Truth, hath procur'd ſeveral Goſpels, Acts, Revelations, and Epiſtles, to be deviſ'd by his Miniſters, which have alſo been attributed to the Apoſtles. To begin with the Goſpels,

Gospels, besides the four that are Canonical and true, there were in the Primitive Ages of the Church several others that were fictitious and substituted in their room as well by the Hereticks as by some Catholicks. *Counterfeit Gospels.*

Among these last, we may reckon the Gospel according to the *Egyptians*, and that according to the *Hebrews*, which though spurious, yet have been quoted by Catholick Authors as Works compos'd by the Orthodox. The Gospel according to the *Egyptians* is cited by (*a*) *Clemens Alexandrinus*, as also by *Epiphanius* (*b*,) who declares, that the *Sabellians* made use of this Gospel to confirm their Error, because it contain'd divers Mystical Expressions concerning *Jesus Christ*, some whereof might perhaps be applied by them to prove, that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost were but one Person.

The Gospel according to the *Hebrews*, written (as it is reported by St. *Jerome*) in the *Syriack* Tongue with *Hebrew* Characters, is yet more remarkable among the Ancients; It is quoted by *Hegesippus* (*c*,) by *Ignatius* (*d*,) by *Clemens Alexandrinus* (*e*,) and by *Origen* in several places, particularly in his Eighth Treatise on St. *Matthew*, where he produced a considerable Fragment out of it (*f*;) St. *Jerome* (*g*) translated it into *Greek* and *Latin*, as he has often told us, observing likewise in one place, that some were of opinion, that this Gospel was the Original of St. *Matthew*'s, which was reputed to have been written in *Hebrew*; nevertheless it is certain, that the Gospel according to the *Hebrews* was different from that of St. *Matthew*, as well on the account, that all those things which are related by the ancient Writers concerning this Gospel, and among others the History of the Woman accused before *Jesus Christ* (*h*,) are not to be found in St. *Matthew*'s Gospel, as in regard, that they are clearly distinguished by *Eusebius* and St. *Jerome*, who had a perfect knowledge of both those Gospels. Add to this, that St. *Jerome* translated the Gospel according to the *Hebrews*, whereas the Author of the Version of St. *Matthew*'s Gospel is unknown, and that in the Gospel according to the *Hebrews*, the Scriptures of the Old Testament are cited according to the *Hebrew* Text, whereas St. *Matthew* in his hath followed the Translation of the *Septuagint*. This Gospel is not different from that which is called by *Origen*, the Gospel of the Twelve, nor from the Gospel of the *Nazarenes*, as appears from the Testimony of St. *Jerome*, by whom they are often confounded: Moreover, the *Ebionites* made use thereof to prove their Doctrine.

Besides these two Gospels so often cited by the ancient Writers, that are lost, there is yet extant a Book, Entituled, *Proto-Evangelium Jacobi*, published by *Neander*, and inserted in the *Orthodoxographa*. This Book is full of idle Tales and frivolous Relations concerning (*i*) the Nativity, Life, and Delivery of the Virgin *Mary*; The Gospel of *Nicodemus* likewise, annexed to that of St. *James* in the same

(*a*) *Quoted by St.* Clemens.] *Stromat. Lib.* 3 *pag.* 452. St. *Clement* cites an Expression of Jesus Christ to *Salome*, taken from this Gospel: *I am come to destroy the Works of the Woman*, and by the *Woman* he understands *Concupiscence*. Moreover, in *pag.* 465. after having produced another passage on the same subject, cited by the Heretick *Cassianus*, he replies first that it is not found in the four Gospels that are acknowledged by us, and afterward endeavours to apply a good sense to it.

(*b*) *By St.* Epiphanius.] *Hæres* 26. The *Valentinians* likewise made use of this Gospel.

(*c*) *By* Hegesippus.] In *Eusebius*, *Lib.* 4. *chap.* 22.

(*d*) *By St.* Ignatius.] In this Epistle to the Inhabitants of *Smyrna*, where he cites two passages that are observed by St. *Jerome*; the first is, *In carne eum post Resurrectionem vidi, & scio esse*; *I saw him in the flesh after his Resurrection, and I know that he is.* The second is this, *Palpate, quia non sum dæmonium incorporale*; *Handle me, and you shall perceive that I am not a Phantom without a Body.*

(*e*) *By St.* Clement.] *Strom. Lib.* 2. *pag.* 380. where we read this Sentence, ὁ θαυμάσας βασιλεύσει, καὶ ὁ βασιλεύσας ἀναπαύσεται.

(*f*) *Wherein he produceth a considerable fragment.*] It is a passage that contains the Answer of Jesus Christ to the rich young Man mention'd in St. *Mark*'s Gospel, *chap.* 10. and in St. *Luke*, *chap.* 18. expressed in other words. Moreover, *Origen* in his Eleventh Tome upon St. *John*, cites another passage of this Gospel, wherein the Holy Ghost is call'd the Mother of *Christ*.

(*g*) St. *Jerome* quotes it very often in his Catalog. *Voce Ignat. & voce Jacobus, Lib.* 2. in *Matth. chap.* 7. and 12. *Lib.* 3. *contra Pelagianos.*

(*h*) *The History of a Woman accused before Jesus Christ.*] *Eusebius, in Hist. Lib.* 3. declares, that the History of the Adulterous Woman was recorded in this Gospel. Moreover, St. *Jerome* affirms, that it was related therein, that Jesus Christ appear'd to St. *James*, who had bound himself with an Oath not to eat, until he had seen our Saviour risen from the dead; and in his Third Book against the *Pelagians*, he informs us, that it was written in this Gospel, that the Mother of our Lord, and of St. *John* the Baptist spoke to him thus: *John the Baptist baptizeth for the remission of sins, let us go and be baptized*; and that Jesus Christ replied to them, *have I sinned, that I should go and be baptized?*

(*i*) *This Book is full of idle Tales and frivolous Relations.*] Here's a Specimen of the Fables contain'd in the *Protevangelium Jacobi*. *Joachim was elected among the Nations of the Twelve Tribes*; Reuben *admonished him, that it was not lawful for him to offer sacrifice, because he had no incense, whereupon he retir'd for grief into the Wilderness, and fasted there* 40 *days.* Anne *mourned, and her Servant* Judith *advis'd her to take a Laurel Tree: therefore she went into a Garden, where she lamented, that she was not like unto a Bird that had a Nest in the Laurel Tree. The Angel appear'd unto her, and told her, that she should have a Son*; *This Angel descended, and delivered the same thing to* Joachim; *he beheld himself in the Plate, or in the Ephod of the High Priest, and saw not that he had sinned. The Virgin was able to go when she was six months old*; *she was bred up by Angels in the Temple*; *she was Married to* Joseph, *because a Dove flew out of a little Staff, that was given to him by the High-Priest. St.* Joseph *having perceived that she was with Child, caused her to drink the Water of Jealousie according to the Law*, &c.

place,

Counterfeit Goſpel.

place is equally full of Fables relating (*k*) to the Paſſion and Reſurrection of *Jeſus Chriſt*, as the former is of thoſe that belong to the Life of the Virgin *Mary*.

However, although thoſe Goſpels are unworthy of Credit becauſe they are ſo fooliſh, yet they do not contain any groſs Errors, as thoſe do that were forg'd by the Hereticks, no part whereof now remains in our poſſeſſion; ſuch were the Goſpels aſcrib'd to St. *Peter*, to St. *Thomas*, and to St. *Matthias*, mention'd by *Euſebius*, Book 3. Chap. 25. as alſo thoſe of St. *Bartholomew*, and of the Twelve Apoſtles, cited by St. *Jerome* in his Preface to St. *Matthew*; The Goſpel of *Philip*, which was that of the Gnoſticks (according to the Teſtimony of *Epiphanius*, *Hær.* 26.) and was uſed by the *Ebionites*, *Baſilides*, and *Apelles*. The Goſpel of *Judas* ſubſtituted by the *Gajanites*, who honour'd that Traitor, as St. *Epiphanius* and *Theodoret* aſſure us, when they ſpeak of theſe Hereticks. And laſtly, the Goſpels of *Thaddeus*, *Barnabas*, and *Andrew*, and thoſe that were counterfeited by *Heſychius*, together with a Book concerning the Infancy of *Jeſus Chriſt*, and another relating to the Genealogy of the Virgin *Mary*, attributed to St. *Matthew*, and reckon'd by *Gelaſius* in the number of Apocryphal Writings that were forg'd by Hereticks.

(*k*) *Is equally full of Fables.*] Here's another Specimen of the Fables recived in the Goſpel of *Nicodemus*. Pilate *ſent for him by a Meſſenger, this Meſſenger worſhiped him; all the Soldiers did ſo in like manner againſt their wills; and the Enſigns bowed themſelves twice before him.* The Hiſtory of the Evangeliſts is intermix'd with divers Fables. Jeſus Chriſt is made to anſwer *Pilate*'s Queſtion. What is Truth? *Nicodemus* is repreſented ſpeaking, as alſo thoſe whom our Saviour had healed; and the Woman that was cured of the iſſue of Blood is called *Veronica*. Moreover, the Author of this Goſpel deſcribes the Reſurrection of *Jeſus Chriſt*, adding many things concerning him; he introduceth the dead that were raiſed at his Reſurrection, entertaining one another with abſurd and impertinent Diſcourſes, declaring that they made the ſign of the Croſs, he introduces the Devil reaſoning very ridiculouſly concerning our Saviours deſcent into Hell; And laſtly, he feigns, that after his Reſurrection, *Pilate* having commanded the Jewiſh Books to be brought to him, they acknowledged that Jeſus Chriſt was the *Meſſiah*, and rehearſeth ſeveral other Tales of the like nature.

Of the Counterfeit Acts of the Apoſtles, and of the falſe Revelations.

Counterfeit Acts of the Apoſtles, and falſe Revelations.

FOraſmuch as the Acts of St. *Luke* contain only a very ſmall part of the Tranſactions of ſome of the Apoſtles, ſince he gives no account of the proceedings of all, neither doth he deſcribe at large even all the Actions of thoſe that are mention'd by him; They that applied themſelves to the counterfeiting of theſe Records, were furniſhed with great variety of matter, wherein they might exerciſe their deceitful Arts. The firſt that practiſed this Artifice, was a certain Prieſt, and a Diſciple of St. *Paul*, who being inflamed with a falſe Zeal for his Maſter, forged under the name of St. *Luke* the Acts of *Paul* and *Thecla*, and was convicted of this Impoſture by St. *John*, as we are aſſured by *Tertullian*, and after him by St. *Jerome*. However, the ſimplicity of this ancient Prieſt might be more eaſily excuſed, in regard that he had no ill deſign; but we cannot but be ſeized with horror when we reflect on the enormous practices of the Hereticks, who have preſumed to write the Acts of divers Apoſtles at their pleaſure, wherein they have obtruded their deteſtible Errors. Such were the Acts of St. *Peter* and St. *Paul* deviſed by the *Manichees*, and mentioned by *Philaſtrius*, in which the Apoſtles were introduced, affirming that the Souls of Men and of Beaſts were of the ſame nature, and working Miracles to cauſe Dogs and Sheep to ſpeak: The Acts of St. *Andrew*, of St. *John*, and of the Apoſtles in general, ſubſtituted by the ſame Hereticks, according to the Teſtimony of St. *Epiphanius*, *Philaſtrius*, and St. *Auguſtine* (*a*:) The Acts of the Apoſtles counterfeited by the *Ebionites*, and cited by S. *Epiphanius* in his deſcription of their Hereſie: The Doctrine, Preaching, Voyages, and Diſputes of St. *Peter*, falſly attributed to St. *Clement*, containing the Errors of the *Ebionites*, and the (*b*) Hiſtory of St. *Paul*'s being ſnatch'd up into Heaven, being a Work compiled by the *Gajanites*; whereof the Gnoſticks likewiſe made uſe, and St. *Epiphanius* aſſures us, *Hæreſ.* 8. The Acts of St. *Philip*, and of St. *Thomas* received among the *Encratites* and the *Apoſtolicks*, as is alſo obſerved by the ſame St. *Epiphanius* in *Hæreſ.* 47, and 61. The Memoirs of the Apoſtles invented by the *Priſcillianiſts*: The Itinerary of the Apoſtles rejected in the ſecond Council of *Nice*, *Acts* 5. to which may be added ſeveral falſe Relations, as that of the Lots of the Apoſtles rejected in the Decretal: The Writings of the Apoſtles compiled by *Dictinius*, and diſallowed in the Synod of *Braga*, *chap.* 17. *A Book of the Prieſthood of Jeſus Chriſt*, cited by *Suidas*, the Author whereof pretended to prove that our Saviour was deſcended from the Tribe of *Levi*, and that he was reckoned by the *Jews* among the Prieſts: A

(*a*) *Philaſtr. Hæreſ.* 48. *Epiph.* 47. and St. *Aug. Lib. de fide contra Manich.*

(*b*) In Greek ἀναβατικὸν Παύλου: This might admit divers ſignifications, but St. *Epiphanius* determines it to ſignifie an Account of St. *Paul*'s being lifted up to Heaven. It contained abſtruſe Matters, and ſeemed to be the ſame with the *Secrets or Revelation* of St. *Paul*. St. *Auguſtin* quotes this Book *in Joan. Tract.* 98.

Tract,

Tract, Intituled, *Liber Apostolicus*, which was a Rhapsody devised by *Marcion*, and whereof St. *Epiphanius* makes mention: And a Book concerning the Death and Assumption of the Virgin *Mary*, ascribed to St. *John*; as also the the Interrogations of the Blessed Virgin composed by the Gnosticks, together with another Book, concerning her Genealogy, published by the same Authors.

Counterfeit Acts of the Apostles, and false Revelations.

Lastly, there are several counterfeit *Apocalypses* or Revelations, as the Revelations of the great Apostle forged by *Cerinthus*: The Apocalypse of St. *Peter*, which *Eusebius* in *Book* 3. *chap.* 25. of his History reckons in the number of those spurious Books that are not Heretical, and which (as *Sozomen* affirms) was read every year about the time of *Easter* in the Churches of *Palestine*. And the *Revelation*, or the Secrets of St. *Paul*, which was heretofore very much esteemed by the Monks: The *Egyptians* (according to the Testimony of *Sozomen*) boasted that they had it in their possession, and it is inserted in the Catalogue of Apocryphal Books by *Gelasius*, together with the Revelations of St. *Thomas* and St. *Stephen*. None of these Books are now extant, neither ought we to be troubled for their loss.

Of the Epistle to the Laodiceans, *and some others attributed to* St. Paul.

St. Paul's Letter to the Laodiceans.

BEsides the fourteen Epistles of St. *Paul*, some of the ancient Writers have likewise cited one directed to the *Laodiceans*, and indeed, we have at present an Epistle mentioned by St. *Anselm*, *Sixtus Senensis*, and *Stapulensis*, which is inserted in some *German* Bibles (*a*) and is written in St. *Paul's* Name to the *Laodiceans*. It is not certain whether this be the same with that which was used when St. *Jerome* lived (*b*) however it is evident, that that which we now have in our possession, doth not appertain to St. *Paul* (*c*) and that that which was extant in St. *Jerome's* time, was generally rejected, as he declares in his Catalogue; *ab omnibus explodituv*. That which gave occasion to the forging of this Letter (as is observed by *Theodoret*) is, that St. *Paul* at the end of his Epistle to the *Colossians*, exhorts them to cause the Epistle that he had sent to them to be read by the *Laodiceans*, and to read among themselves that from *Laodicea*; this hath induced some to believe, that there was an Epistle written to the *Laodiceans* at the same time with that to the *Colossians*; and this also gave *Marcion* the opportunity of altering the Title of the Epistle to the *Ephesians*, and giving it the name of the Epistle to the *Laodiceans*. But this Error is founded on the ignorance of the *Greek* expression; for no mention is made in this place of any Epistle of St. *Paul* to the *Laodiceans*, but of one written from *Laodicea*. Some are of opinion that this is the Epistle to *Timothy*, which they imagine to have been written from that City. But it may be much more probably affirmed with St. *Chrysostome*, *Theodoret*, *Photius*, and *Oecumenius*, that it was an Epistle written to St. *Paul* from *Laodicea*, by the Christians of that City, and for this reason it is called in the Vulgar Translation the Epistle of the *Laodiceans*.

Moreover, as it hath been concluded from this place in the Epistle to the *Colossians* mis-interpreted, that St. *Paul* wrote a Letter to the *Laodiceans*; so in like manner some have inferred, that he wrote a third Epistle to the Christians of *Corinth*, from a passage taken out of his first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, *ch.* 5. *v.* 9, 10, and 11. *viz. I wrote unto you an Epistle, not to company with Fornicators, &c.* But (as St. *Chrysostome* observes) this Epistle is the very same that he then wrote, and the Sense is, *When I even now wrote unto you in this Letter, not to keep company with Fornicators, I do not mean the Fornicators of this World.*

(*a*) *Inserted in some* German *Bibles.*] It was published in *Latin* by *Pistorus*, and afterwards annexed to the *German* Bibles printed at *Ausburg*, *Worms* and *Amsterdam*; [Particularly in those Bibles which *Elias Hutterus* set out in *Hebrew*, *Greek*, *Latin*, and *German*, in *Quarto*.

(*b*) *Whether this be the same as that which was used when St.* Jerome *lived.*] That which gives occasion to doubt, whether this Epistle be the same with that which was published heretofore, is that *Philastrius* affirms in *chap.* 88. That that which was extant in his time contained several Errors; and there are none in that which we now have. Moreover, that which is cited by St. *Epiphanius* was composed out of several Sentences of the Epistle to the *Ephesians*.

(*c*) *That which we now have in our possession doth not appertain to St.* Paul.] It is not comfortable to the Style of St. *Paul*; it is extremely concise, even shorter than that to *Philemon*, neither hath it any one particular Subject.

Of

Of the Epiſtle of St. Barnabas.

The Epiſtle of St. Barnabas.

JOSEPH, Sirnamed by the Apoſtles *Barnabas*, that is to ſay, the Son of Conſolation (*a*,) who was a *Levite*, and a Native of the Iſle of *Cyprus* (*b*,) laboured even as much as the Apoſtles themſelves in eſtabliſhing the Foundation of the Chriſtian Religion. Some of the ancient Writers (*c*,) affirm, that he was one of the 72 Diſciples of Jeſus Chriſt; but St. *Luke* makes mention of him after ſuch a manner, as induceth us rather to believe, that he was not admitted into the Fellowſhip of the Apoſtles until after our Saviour's Death. However it be, it is evident, that ever ſince that time he hath been reputed as one of the principal Preachers of the Goſpel, and was deſervedly reckoned in the number of the Apoſtles. We have no certain account of his Life, but only what we find ſet down by St. *Luke* in the *Acts*.

He hath written (ſays St. *Jerome*) an Epiſtle, which is full of Edification for the Church, although it be not Canonical: This Epiſtle is often cited by St. *Clemens Alexandrinus* (*d*) and *Origen* (*e*,) who do not in the leaſt doubt, but that it belongs to him whoſe Name it bears. It is true indeed that *Euſebius* and St. *Jerom* place it in the Rank of Apocryphal Books (*f*,) nevertheleſs they do not deny that it was written by St. *Barnabas*; on the contrary they attribute it to him, declaring only, that it ought not to be eſteemed of the ſame Authority as the Canonical Books, becauſe although it really belongs to St. *Barnabas*, yet it is not generally received by the whole Catholick Church.

And it is upon this account that this Epiſtle is not amongſt the Canonical Writings, becauſe to cauſe a Book to be placed in this Rank, it is not only ſufficient that it was compoſed by an Apoſtle, or a Diſciple of the Apoſtles, but it is likewiſe requiſite that it ſhould be received as Canonical throughout all the Churches of Chriſt; otherwiſe the Treaty of *Hermas*, and the Epiſtle of St. *Clement*, ought alſo to be inſerted in the Catalogue of Canonical Books. Therefore it is a very weak Argument to affirm, that the Epiſtle of St. *Barnabas* doth not appertain to this Apoſtle, becauſe that if it were certainly his, it would have been reckoned in the number of the Canonical Writings; ſince before a Book cannot be owned as Canonical, it is neceſſary, whoſoever is the Author thereof, that it ſhould be acknowledged by the whole Church; becauſe there are Books written by the Apoſtles, or their Diſciples, that were not heretofore, and are not as yet placed in the Rank of Canonical Writings, that is to ſay, thoſe that are rejected by ſome, and received by others as Canonical ἀντιλεγομένων ὑ ἔν ὅμως τοῖς πολλοῖς. In the ſecond are comprehended thoſe Books that are not allowed as Canonical by any; but ſuch as were not forged by Hereticks, as thoſe are that belong to the third Rank. The Epiſtle of St. *Barnabas* ought to be reckoned among the firſt of theſe ſorts, at leaſt among the ſecond; which although Apocryphal, may nevertheleſs belong to thoſe to whom they are attributed, as the Book of the *Paſtor*, and others. And although St. *Jerome* declares in his Epiſtle to *Læta*, that thoſe Books are Apocryphal, that do not belong to the Authors whoſe Name they bear, yet he too often makes uſe of this Term in another ſignification. Now that *Euſebius* and St. *Jerome* believed that the Epiſtle of St. *Barnabas* was written by him, appears from hence that they conſtantly impute it to him; *Euſeb. lib. 6. chap. 13. Item ex Barnabæ, Clementis, & Judæ Epiſtolis.* It is certain, that he judged that the Epiſtles of St. *Clement* and St. *Jude* were really compoſed by thoſe whoſe Names they bear; and in another place, *Judæ Epiſtolam intelligo, item Barnabæ Epiſtolam, & Revelationem quæ dicitur Petri.* Where he makes a particular mark on this laſt Book, *viz.* That it is aſcribed to St. *Peter*, but he doth not declare the ſame thing with reſpect to the Epiſtle of St. *Barnabas*; on the contrary he barely affirms, that it is his, as the Epiſtle of St. *Jude* belongs to St. *Jude*. St. *Jerome* likewiſe ſpeaks expreſly to the ſame effect; *Barnabas unam ædificationem Eccleſiæ continentem Epiſtolam compoſuit, quæ inter Apocryphas numeratur.* Which plainly ſhews, that he did not believe it to be Apocryphal, becauſe of its being falſly attributed to St. *Barnabas*, ſince on the contrary he himſelf imputes it to him, in affirming that it is Apocryphal.

(*a*) *That is to ſay, the Son of Conſolation.*] In Greek υἱὸς παρακλήσεως, *The Son of Conſolation*, or of *Exhortation*. *Oecumenius* on the *Acts. chap.* 36. and *Notkerus* in his Martyrology follow the firſt Interpretation; but St. *Jerome* ſeems to embrace the later.

(*b*) *A Native of the Iſle of* Cyprus.] This Iſland of *Cyprus* was full of *Jews*, and a very great number of them were maſſacred therein under the Reign of the Emperor *Trajan*, according to the Teſtimony of *Dio*, *Euſebius*, and *Oroſius*.

(*c*) *Some of the ancient Writers.*] Thoſe are St. *Clemens*, *Alex. Stromat. lib.* 2. *Euſeb. Hiſt. lib.* 1. *chap.* 12. and *lib.* 2. *chap.* 1. St. *Epiphan. Tom.* 1. *contra Hæreſ.* & *Dorotheus*. But *venerable Bede* rejects their opinion, becauſe St. *Luke* in the 4th Chapter of the *Acts* declares, That *Barnabas* was one of thoſe that laid the Price of the Lands, and other Poſſeſſions that were then ſold, at the Apoſtle's Feet; for though this doth not abſolutely hinder, but that he might have been one of the Diſciples of Jeſus Chriſt; yet St. *Luke* ſeems thereby to inſinuate, that this was the beginning of his Converſion to Chriſtianity.

(*d*) *By St.* Clemens Alexandrinus.] *Stromat. lib.* 2. *p.* 373, 375, 389, 396, and 410. *Lib.* 5. *p.* 571, 572, 577, and 578.

(*e*) *Origen.*] *Lib.* 1. *Con. Celſum*; and *Lib.* 3. περὶ ἀρχῶν; and *Euſebius*, *lib.* 3. *Hiſt. c.* 25 *Lib.* 6 *c.* 13. and *c.* 14. *Tertullian* in his Book *De Pudicitiâ* tells us, That St. *Barnabas*'s Epiſtle was more generally received by the Catholick Church than the *Paſtor*. But he takes St. *Paul*'s Epiſtle to the *Hebrews* to have been written by St. *Barnabas*.

(*f*) *In the Rank of Apocryphal Books.*] *Euſebius* divides the Apocryphal Books into three Ranks, the firſt contain thoſe that come neareſt to the Canonical

tings and on the contrary there are others, the Writers whereof are not certainly known, that have been formerly, and are now, inserted in the Canon of Holy Scripture, as in the *New Testament*, the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, and the *Revelation*; and several Books in the *Old*, the true Authors of which cannot be positively shewn. Besides, though it were true, that all Books are Canonicall, which we know to have been written by Men who had Authority to make them so, yet who hath assured us, that St. *Barnabas* ought to be included in this number, rather than St. *Clement*, or *Hermas*? The Catholick Church hath a Right to declare it, and since she has not done it, this is a sufficient Warrant to reckon his Epistle amongst the Apocryphal Writings, though it be really his. *The Epistle of St. Barnabas.*

Furthermore it hath been objected, that this Epistle is unworthy of St. *Barnabas*, and that it is not credible that so great an Apostle who was full of the Holy Ghost, and the Colleague of St. *Paul*, should be the Author of the most part of those things that are therein contained; such are the forced Allegories, the extravagant and incongruous Explications of Holy Scripture, the various Fables concerning Animals, and several other Conceits of the like nature that are comprised in the first Part of this Epistle. To this I answer, That notwithstanding these defects, St. *Clement*, *Origen*, *Eusebius*, and St. *Jerome*, attributed it unto him; and I am of the opinion, that it is a very great piece of Impudence for any one to imagine himself to be more clear-sighted in this matter, than those exquisite Criticks of Antiquity: They lived much nearer the time of the Apostles than we do: They had a great number of Books composed by their Disciples which are now lost; and consequently, they were more capable than we are of judging of the Style and manner of Writing of the Apostles, and their Companions and Disciples. If then they have found that the Allegories, Mystical Explications and Fables, that are found in the Epistle of St. *Barnabas* might be his, with what right can we positively assert, that they cannot be his? Certainly they must needs have but a very little knowledge of the *Genius* of the *Jewish* Nation, and of the Primitive Christians that were Educated in the Synagogue, who obstinately believe that these sort of Notions could not proceed from them; on the contrary, this was their Character; They had learned of the *Jews* to turn the whole Scripture into Allegory, and to make Remarks on the peculiar Properties of those living Creatures that were prohibited to be eaten; therefore it is not to be admired that St. *Barnabas*, being by Nation a *Jew*, and writing to his own Country-men, hath allegorically explained divers passages of the *Old Testament* in applying them to the *New*, and found out several Moral Reflections upon the Proprieties of those Creatures that were not permitted to be eaten by the *Jews*. The Epistle of St. *Clemens Romanus*, and the *Stromata* of St. *Clemens Alexandrinus*, are full of this kind of Allegories and Figurative Expressions. The History of the *Phœnix*, related by St. *Clement* in his Epistle to the *Corinthians*, so much celebrated among the Primitive Christians, seems to be more Fabulous than that which is alledged by St. *Barnabas* in this Epistle concerning the Properties of certain Animals; and the Allegory of the Blood of Jesus Christ typified by the Scarlet Thread of the Harlot *Rahab*, in the Epistle of St. *Clemens Romanus*, is as far fetch'd as the greatest part of those of St. *Barnabas*. But what necessity is there to produce farther Proofs of a Matter of Fact that is so evident, since it is sufficiently known to all Men, that the Writings of the Primitive Christians are generally full of such Fables and Allegories?

Lastly, the Author of this Epistle is accused for representing the Apostles as the most flagitious Persons in the World before their Conversion; but his Words have been taken in too strict and literal a Sense; for he intended not to say, that they were the wickedst Men in the World, but only that they were great Sinners (*g*.)

It is not known to whom the Epistle of St. *Barnabas* is directed, because we want the Title; it appears from the Body of this Letter, that it was written to some converted *Jews* that adhered too much to the Law of *Moses*: It is divided into two Parts, in the first of which he shews the unprofitableness of the Old Law, and the necessity of the Incarnation and Death of Jesus Christ, producing divers passages of Scripture relating to the Ceremonies and Precepts of the Old Law, which he explains Allegorically when he applies them to our Saviour and the New Law: The Second Part comprehends particular Moral Instructions, containing several Rules and Directions concerning what ought to be done, and what ought to be avoided.

This Epistle was first published (*h*) in *Greek*, together with the ancient Version by *Menardus*, and this Edition was Printed at *Paris* by *Piget* in the Year 1645.

Afterwards the famous Dr. *Isaac Vossius* caused it to be Reprinted with the Epistles of St. *Ignatius* Revised and Corrected from three Manuscripts, *Anno Dom.* 1646.

Lastly, *Cotelerius* published it, adding a new Translation *è Regione*, together with the old Version, entire, and certain Critical Remarks at the end. It is prefixed at the beginning of his Collection of the Works of the ancient Fathers, Printed at *Paris* by *Petit*, *Anno* 1672.

(*g*) *That they were great Sinners.*] Thus the following Words ought to be interpreted, *Super omne peccatum peccatores*. Many very devout Persons have often used this Phrase, *I am the greatest Sinner that ever lived in the World*, and other Expressions of the like nature, which are not to be understood literally.

(*h*) *Was first published in* Greek, *&c.*] It is said, that there was an older Edition than *Menardus*'s printed in *England* by the order of the Learned *Usher*, but that the whole Impression was burnt. We may add to these, another Edition of this Epistle published by *Maderus* in *Germany* at *Helmstadt*. [There have been two other Editions of this Epistle, one at *Oxon*, 1685. in *Duodecimo*, wherein all that is in the old *Latin* Version that is not in the *Greek*, as also all that is in the *Greek* that is not in the old Version, is printed with Red Letters: Lastly, Mr. *Le Moyne* has set it out in his *Varia Sacra* with large Comments at *Leyden*, in *Quarto*, 1685.]

The Epiſtle of St. Barnabas.

The *Greek* Text of the four or five firſt Chapters is wanting in all theſe Editions, but they are extant in *Latin* in the ancient Verſion, which, although barbarous and defective, hath nevertheleſs ſerved to correct the *Greek* Original in ſome places.

Of the Liturgies that are falſly attributed to the Apoſtles.

The Liturgies of the Apoſtles.

WE need only to reflect on what we find Recorded in the Epiſtle of St. *Paul* to the *Corinthians*, concerning the Adminiſtration of the Holy Sacrament of the *Euchariſt*, and upon the Accounts of St. *Juſtin*, and other Primitive Fathers of the Church, to be perſwaded that the Apoſtles and their Succeſſors celebrated the *Euchariſt* with great Simplicity. This hath been obſerved by all thoſe that have written concerning *Liturgies* (*a*) who have unanimouſly agreed, that the celebration of the *Maſs* was perfomed in thoſe Primitive Ages without much Ceremony, and that they uſed but few Prayers; but by little and little others were added, and ſeveral viſible Ceremonies were annexed, to render the Service more venerable to the People. In fine, the Churches afterwards regulated, and committed to Writing, the manner of Celebrating it, and this is what they called *Liturgies*, which being compiled conformably to the various Cuſtoms of divers Places, are likewiſe found to be different. And foraſmuch as Men are naturally inclined to make ſome Alterations in their Exterior Habit, many things from time to time have been ſucceſſively added to them.

This ſingle Remark is ſufficient to ſhew, that the *Liturgies* that bear the name of the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts, were not actually compoſed by them: But to prove this clearly, and beyond contradiction, we ſhall only examine them one after another.

The *Liturgy*, or *Greek* and *Latin Maſs*, attributed to St. *Peter*, and publiſhed by *Lindanus* in the year 1589. from a Manuſcript of Cardinal *Sirlet*'s that was not very ancient, and which was afterwards Printed at *Paris* by *Morellus*, *Anno* 1595. cannot be St. *Peter*'s for the following Reaſons; ſince mention is made therein of St. *Sixtus*, *Cornelius*, and St. *Cyprian*: The Virgin *Mary* is called the *Mother of God*, a Term that was not generally in uſe, until after the Condemnation of the *Neſtorian* Hereſie; The Canon of the *Latin Maſs* which is reputed by St. *Gregory*, to have been compoſed by a *Scholaſtick*, that is to ſay, a Learned Man of the Fifth Century, is entirely inſerted therein: Moreover it contains divers Litanies taken from the *Sacramentarium* of St. *Gregory*, and the *Liturgies* of St. *Baſil* and St. *Chryſoſtom*: There are alſo Prayers for the *Patriarch*, a term altogether unknown before the end of the Fourth Age of the Church, and for the *moſt Religious Emperors*. In ſhort, if St. *Peter* had been the Author of this *Liturgy*, it would have been uſed by the Church of *Rome*, neither would it have lain hid during ſo many Ages. Theſe Reaſons made the Learned Cardinal *Bona* ſay, that this Liturgy was forged, and that it was in all probability compiled by a *Grecian* Prieſt *Latinized*, becauſe it is collected partly from the *Greek Liturgy*, and partly from the *Latin*, and the name of St. *Peter* was prefixed to it, either that it might obtain more Authority, or becauſe a great part of the *Liturgy* of the Church of *Rome* was comprehended therein.

The *Maſs* of the *Ethiopians* that bears the name of St. *Matthew*, appears more evidently to be forged. There are Collects for Popes, Kings, Patriarchs, and Arch Biſhops: The Twelve Apoſtles are therein invocated: The Four Evangeliſts are cited, as alſo the Synods of *Nice*, *Conſtantinople*, and *Epheſus*: The *Nicene* Creed is inſerted with the Particle *Filioque*: Moreover, mention is likewiſe made of St. *Athanaſius*, St. *Gregory*, and St. *Baſil*, together with the *Epact*, the *Golden Number*, and the *Triſagion*; which plainly ſhews that this *Liturgy* is of a very late date.

One ought to give the ſame Judgment of the *Liturgy* of St. *Mark*, publiſhed by Cardinal *Sirlet* and Printed at *Paris* by *Morellus*; for we find therein the word *Conſubſtantial*, and the *Triſagion* There are alſo ſeveral Prayers for the King, and even for S. *Mark* himſelf, and mention is made of Chalices, Deacons, Subdeacons, Chanters, Monks, Religious Perſons, &c. which Circumſtances are apparent Demonſtrations of its novelty.

There remains only the *Liturgy* attributed to St. *James*, which divers Learned Men have taken much pains to vindicate, but to no purpoſe; for although it is more ancient than thoſe that we have already examined, ſince it is cited in the Synod that was holden in the Emperor's Palace in *Trullo*

(*a*) *By all thoſe that have written concerning Liturgies.*] Gregorius Papa Lib. 7. Ep. 63 ad Joan. Syracuſ. *Mos Apoſtolorum fuit, ut ad ipſam ſolummodo Orationem Dominicam, oblationis Hoſtiam conſecrarent.* Walafridus Strabo de Reb. Eccleſ. Cap. 21. *Quod nunc agimus multiplici orationum, cantilenarum, & conſecrationum officio, totum hoc Apoſtoli, & poſt ipſos, ut creditur, proximi orationibus, commemoratione Paſſionis Dominicæ, ſicut ipſe præcepit, agebant, ſimpliciter proficiente de hinc Religione amplius acta ſunt à Chriſti cultoribus Officia Miſſarum.* Remigius Akiſſiodorenſis de Celeb. Miſſ. Lib. 1. *Nam Miſſam B. Petrus Apoſtolus primus omnium Antiochiæ dicitur celebraſſe, in quâ tres tantummodo orationes in initio fidei profitebantur, incipientes ab eo loco ubi dicitur; Hanc igitur oblationem,* See Stephan. Auguſtodun. *de Sacramento Altaris, c.* 20. Benno. Aug. *de Off. Miſſ. c.* 1. Rupert. Tuit. *Lib.* 2. *de divi. Off. c.* 1. Hug. de S. Victor. *de Divi. Lib.* 2. *Cap.* 11. Honorat. Auguſtod. *in Gemm. An. Lib.* 1. Durand. de Mende *Rat. Off. Lib.* 4. *Cap.* 1. Radulphus Tongrenſ. *de Canon obſervat. S.* Antonin. *in Summ. Maj. Tit.* 13. *cap.* 5. Caſſand. *de Liturg. c.* 18. *Polydore Virgil*, and others that have treated of Rituals and of the Ceremonies of the Maſs.

after

after the Fifth General Council, yet we ought not to say, that St. *James* was the Author thereof, or that it was composed in his time. For, 1. the Virgin *Mary* is called in this Liturgy the *Mother of God*; and the Son and the Holy Ghost are said to be Consubstantial with the Father, terms that were altogether unknown in St. *James*'s time: But supposing that they were not, is it credible, that this Authority should not be alledged in the Councils of *Nice*, *Ephesus*, and *Constantinople*? 2. We find therein the *Trisagion* and the *Doxology*, that is to say, the *Sanctus* and the *Gloria Patri*, which were not generally recited in the Church until the Fifth Century; for though it might be proved that they were in use before, yet it must be confessed, that it was not the general custom of the Church. 3. There are Collects for those that were shut up in Monasteries: Can any Man say, that there were Monasteries in the time of St. *James*? 4. There is mention made of Confessors, a term that was not inserted in the Divine Offices, till a long time after St. *James*, even according to the Confession of *Bellarmin.* 5. In this Liturgy there is mention made of Churches, Incense, Altars, *&c.* can it be imagined that these things were used in St. *James*'s time? 6. We find therein very many Citations of the Epistles of St. *Paul*, the greatest part whereof were written after St. *James*'s death; neither ought we to object with the Cardinals *Bona* and *Bellarmin*, that these things were afterwards inserted, because it is not probable, that they should be added in so many places; besides, the Connexion and the Ceremonies of this whole Liturgy do not agree with the time of the Apostles. *The Liturgies of the Apostles.*

I shall not here speak of other Liturgies cited by some Authors, such are those of the Twelve Apostles mentioned by *Abraham Ecchellensis*, and that of St. *Barnabas* quoted by a certain Monk, because they are unknown to me; neither shall I examine that which is comprised in the Constitutions of St. *Clement*, nor that which is extant in the Writings that are attributed to St. *Dionysius* the *Areopagite*, in regard that these Books being forged, as I shall hereafter shew in another place, it is not to be doubted but that the Liturgies which they contain, are in like manner fictitious.

Of the Apostles Creed.

Of the Apostles Creed.

HAving already discoursed of the Works of every one of the Apostles in particular, it remains, that we should now give some account of those that are reputed to be composed by them in general; The most Authentick among these is the Apostles Creed, which is generally believed to have been made by all the Apostles. But Authors are not agreed about the time wherein it was written by them, nor concerning the manner how it was compil'd, nor the design they had in making it. Some are of Opinion with *Ruffinus* (*a*.) that they compil'd it in the very same year that *Jesus Christ* died, a little after the descent of the Holy Ghost; whereas *Baronius* and others conjecture, that they did not finish it till the Second year of the Reign of the Emperor *Claudius*, a little before they were separated. As to the manner of their drawing it up, some have imagined, that every one of the Apostles pronounced (*b*) his Article, and that for this reason it is called a *Symbol*, as consisting of divers Sentences: Others believe, that it was compiled by them after they had conferred all together; and there are some also who assert, that all the Disciples had a share therein. Lastly, as to their design in composing it, some determine that it was, that they might be all found unanimously to agree in one and the same Doctrine (*c*,) and others, that it was for the benefit of the People, that they might be able to propound to them an Abridgment of the Christian Faith, which should be easie to be understood, and to be retained in their Memory. The Etymology of the word *Symbol* is yet more uncertain (*d*;) for some affirm, that the

(*a*) *Ruffinus.*] *In Exposit. Symboli*: *Isidore*, *lib.* 2. *de Off.* c. 22.

(*b*) *Every one of the Apostles pronounc'd his Article.*] This is the opinion of the Author of the 115 Sermon, *De Tempore apud Aug.* Of St. *Leo*, *Ep.* 13. now 27. Of *Venant Foretunat. in exegesi Symb. Apost.*

(*c*) *Some determine that it was, that they might be all found unanimously to agree in one and the same Doctrine.*] The former opinion is maintained by *Ruffinus*, and the later by the modern Authors.

(*d*) *The Etymology of the Word* Symbol, *is yet more uncertain.*] The *Greek* Word Σύμβολον, properly signifies a *Note*, *Sign*, or *Mark*; therefore the Mystical Signs and Notes of *Pythagoras* were called Σύμβολα Πυθαγόρεια. *Herodian* uses the Word to denote a Military Signal. Other Authors, as *Dion Cassius* and *Suetonius*, apply it to signify Signs or Marks, and certain Tickets that were given to those that were to be admitted to publick Shews, and for the distribution of Largesses Some say, that the Word *Symbolum* among the *Latins* signifies an Entertainment, where every one pays his Club, or even the Club it self; but this does not belong to the Neuter *Symbolum*, but to the Feminine *Symbola*, and in *Greek* Συμβόλη, as may be seen in *Aristophanes*'s Scholiast, in *Athenæus* and *Plutarch*; therefore it ought to be read in *Terence*'s *Andria*, *Symbolam dedit*, and not *Symbolum*. *Aulus Gellius*, *lib.* 6. *c.* 1. makes use of the Word *Symbola* to signifie one Man's share in a Reckoning, and declares, that this Term was also attributed to those Questions that were Expounded by *Taurus* the Philosopher in the Presence of divers Persons. St. *Cyprian* is the first that applied the Word *Symbol* to denote an Epitome or Abridgment of the Christian Faith. *Ep.* 45. *Optatus* calls the Hereticks, The Deserters of the true *Symbol*, alluding to a Military Signal. And, to the same effect, St. *Chrysologus*, in *Hom.* 62. declares, That the *Symbol* is the Covenant that we make with God in Baptism.

Of the Apoſtles Creed.

Creed is ſo called, becauſe it is as it were the diſtinguiſhing Mark and Character of Chriſtians (*e*); others, becauſe it was compoſed of the Sentences of ſeveral Perſons; and laſtly, others, on the account of its being made in a general Conference.

However, although it is an Opinion eſtabliſhed on very good grounds, that this Creed was made by the Apoſtles, and it cannot be denied that they all preached and taught the Articles therein contained after one and the ſame manner, as the main Points of the Doctrine of Jeſus Chriſt, in which it was neceſſary that all Chriſtians ſhould be inſtructed; yet it may be juſtly doubted without incurring the imputation of raſhneſs, whether they were aſſembled together to compoſe this Creed, and whether they wrote it word for word, as it is now received in the Church of *Rome*; nay there are very weighty Reaſons, whereby it appears, that this Opinion, though commonly received, is nevertheleſs very improbable.

For Firſt, neither St. *Luke* in the *Acts*, nor any Eccleſiaſtical Author before the Fifth Century hath made any mention of this Aſſembly of the Apoſtles, and none ever affirmed, that they compoſed the Creed of the Church of *Rome*, either by conferring together, or by pronouncing every one a particular Article.

Secondly, the Fathers of the Three firſt Ages diſputing againſt the Hereticks, endeavour to demonſtrate by many Arguments, that the Doctrine contained in the Creed, is that of the Apoſtles, but they do not affirm that it was compiled by them; and yet there could not have been a ſtronger, or more convincing proof brought againſt thoſe Hereticks, than to have ſaid thus to them; You impugn the Doctrine of the Creed, and yet it is certain, that the Apoſtles were the Authors thereof, therefore you impugne the Doctrine of the Apoſtles. However they did not argue after this manner; On the contrary, they prove by Tradition, and the Conſent of the Apoſtolical Churches, that the Doctrine compriſed in the Creed, is that of the Apoſtles.

Thirdly, if the Apoſtles had made a Creed, it would have been every where the ſame throughout all Churches, and in all Ages; all Chriſtians would have learnt it by Heart; all Churches would have repeated it after the very ſame manner; in fine, all Authors would have expreſſed it in the ſame terms. Now the contrary is evident; for it is certain, that not only in the ſecond and third Centuries, but alſo in the fourth, there were many Creeds, and all, though the ſame as to the Doctrine, yet differed in the Expreſſion. In the ſecond and third Ages of the Church, we find as many Creeds as Authors (*f*,) and the ſame Author ſets the Creed down after a different manner in ſeveral places of his Works, which plainly ſhews, that there was not then any Creed that was reputed to be the Apoſtles, nor even any regulated and eſtabliſhed Form of Faith. *Ruffinus* in the fourth Century compares three ancient Creeds of the Churches of *Aquileia*, *Rome*, and the *Eaſt*, and we may obſerve in theſe three Creeds, none of which perfectly agrees with the common one, very conſiderable differences in the terms, as appears from the Table that is ſubjoyned at the end of this Article. St. *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem* in his *Catechetick Lectures* produceth a particular Creed, that was uſed by the Church of *Jeruſalem* when this Father wrote. The Authors that have written Commentaries on the Creed, as St. *Auguſtine* in his 119th Sermon, St. *Maximus*, *Petrus Chryſologus*, *Fortunatus*, and others, omit divers Expreſſions that are inſerted in our Apoſtolical Creed, among others this at the end, *The Life Everlaſting*; and St. *Jerome* obſerves in his Epiſtle to *Pammachius*, that the Creed concludes with theſe words, *The Reſurrection of the Body*.

It is evident from theſe Reflections, that although the Creed be the Apoſtles as to the Doctrine which it contains, nevertheleſs it is not theirs, as to all the terms, and that they did not draw up any one form of Faith comprehended in a ſet number of words, which they were all obliged to uſe: But that having learn'd the ſame Faith from Jeſus Chriſt, they likewiſe taught it to all thoſe that were converted to the Chriſtian Religion, and inſtructed them all in the ſame Myſteries. That they that were thus trained up in this Faith, had it ſo deeply imprinted on their Mind, as (St. *Juſtin* and St. *Irenæus* obſerve) that they were always ready to give an account thereof, and as often as they ſhould be required to do it, without making uſe of any one particular form; and from thence proceeds the difference of the Creeds that are ſet down by the Fathers. And Laſtly, that for the aſſiſtance of the Memory, certain forms of theſe Articles of Faith, were afterwards compiled, which were found to be different according to the diverſity of the Churches wherein they were uſed. For I doubt not in the leaſt, that beſides the above-cited Creeds, there were many others of which we have no knowledge, from whence it muſt be inferred, that Jeſus Chriſt is the Author of the Doctrine contained in the Creed, and that the Apoſtles preached and publiſhed it throughout the whole World; but that it cannot be determined by whom theſe Forms were collected, wherein this Doctrine is compriſed.

(*e*) *The diſtinguiſhing Mark and Character of Chriſtians.*] This Etymology is produced by *Maximus Taurinenſis*, and *Venantius Fortunatus*. It hath been likewiſe obſerved by *Ruffinus*, *Iſidorus Hiſpalenſis*, *lib.* 2. *de Off. c.* 22. and *Durandus de Mende*, *lib.* 4. *Rationalis*, *c.* 25. But the ſecond and third Etymology are more common; and the laſt is maintained by *Ruffinus*; S. *Aug. Serm.* 181. *de Tempore*; *Iſidore*, *lib.* 2. *div. Off. c.* 22. *Rabanus Maurus*, *lib.* 2. *Init. Clerical cap.* 56. *Durandus ſupra*: *Eucherius*, *Homil. de Symb.* and *Innocent. III. lib.* 2. *De Sacris Miſſæ Myſteriis*, *c.* 49. The firſt however is the moſt probable.

(*f*) *As many Creeds as Authors.*] St. *Irenæus* exhibits a Creed, *l.* 1. *c.* 2. and another in *lib.* 2. *c* 1. *Tertullian* made uſe of three different Creeds in three ſeveral places, *In præſcript. lib. contra Praxeam*, *& de Virginibus velandis*. See *Origen. lib.* 1. *Peri Arch. & in Dialog. contra Marc. Optat. lib.* 1. All which Creeds are different from the Vulgar.

It

It may be objected, that St. *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, *Lucifer Calaritanus*, and St. *Jerome* affirm, that the Creed is the Rule of Faith, which the Church hath received from the Apostles; That St. *Ambrose* says, that the Church of *Rome* hath preserved the Apostolical Creed in its purity without Alteration; That St. *Augustine*, *Ruffinus*, *Leo*, *Maximus Taurinensis*, *Fortunatus*, *Petrus Chrysologus*, and a great many others (*g*) have taken it for granted as a thing beyond Controversie, that the Creed was composed in an Assembly of the Apostles, that this Opinion is Authorized by the Church, and that it seems to be a rash Presumption to doubt of it; And lastly, that all Catholicks are agreed in this Judgment, and that none but Hereticks, or at least Persons that are suspected of Heresie, durst presume to call it in question. *The Epistle of St.* Barnabas.

To these Objections I answer first, that the Testimonies of St. *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, and *Lucifer*, rather overthrow the Vulgar Opinion, than establish it; for these Fathers do not assert, that we have received the Form of Faith from the Apostles, but only the Faith and Doctrine that was communicated to them by Jesus Christ; therefore if there were any force in the Objection, it must be concluded, that our Saviour is the Author of the Creed. Moreover, it is further to be observed, that by the Phrase *Rule of Faith* used by *Tertullian*, *a set Form of Faith* is not to be understood, but *the Faith it self*, which he declares to have been founded by Jesus Christ; and *Lucifer Calaritanus* doth not discourse of the Creed, but only of the Faith of the Church as it relates to our Saviour's Divinity. Lastly, when St. *Jerome* says, that the Faith of the Creed, which is an Apostolical Tradition, was not written on Paper, or with Ink, but was engraved on the Fleshly Tables of the Heart; he gives us to understand, that he meant nothing else, but that the Faith and Doctrine comprehended in the Creed proceeds from the Apostles, who have taught it to all the Faithful. After the same manner, when St. *Ambrose* assures us, that the Creed was preserved in its purity by the Church of *Rome*, he doth not speak of the Form of the Creed, but of the Doctrine therein contained. As for the other Authorities that are alledged, they are of little moment. *Ruffinus* is the first, and the only Person among the Authors of the Fifth Century, that asserts, that the Creed was composed by the Apostles, and yet he proposes this Opinion, as a matter that depended only on a popular Tradition; St. *Augustin* never approved it, for he doth not so much as mention one word thereof in his 119th Homily, and the 115th which might be cited to this purpose, cannot be proved certainly to be his: In fine, the other Authors who lived after *Ruffinus*, have taken this History from him, and are too modern to give a certain Testimony of a matter of Fact so ancient as this is; We may also add, that it is related by none but the *Latins*; that the *Greeks* never spoke of it, and that even they that produce it, do in no wise agree among themselves, concerning its Circumstances, as hath been already shewn. To conclude, there is no rashness in departing here, from the Vulgar Opinion, since it is meerly a Critical Question, that hath no regard to Faith, because it is granted on all sides, that Jesus Christ is the Author of the Doctrine comprised in the Creed, and that the Apostles taught it to all the Christians. Besides, they that maintain the common Opinion, are at last obliged to subscribe to our determination when they are urged; and to acknowledge, when it is objected to them, that the ancient *Roman* Creed was different from our Vulgar; that our Creed is not the Apostles as to the words, but as to the Sense, which comes to our Opinion at last. And besides it is not unusual in Critical Matters to forsake an Opinion that hath been generally received, and to embrace that of some Learned and Judicious Men, even of those that are suspected not to be Orthodox. Thus all the World is at present agreed in this, that the Apostolical Constitutions and Canons were not written by the Apostles, as we shall shew in the following Article, and yet scarce any Man presumed so much as to doubt thereof, before *Erasmus*.

(*g*) *And a great number of other Authors.*] S. *Irenæus. lib.*1.*cap.*2. *Tertullian, de Præscript. c.* 37. *&* 13. *de vel. Virg. c.* 1. *Lucifer, lib.* 2. *contra Const. Hier. Ep. ad Pammach.* St. *Ambrose, Ep.* 7. *lib.* 1. As also *Ruffinus in Expos. Symboli, Aug. Serm.* 115. *Maximus*, St. *Leo, Fortunatus, &c.*

A TABLE, wherein the Four ancient CREEDS *are compared.*

The VULGAR. (Maſſes Creed)	*That of* AQUILEIA.	*The* ORIENTAL.	*The* ROMAN.
I. I Believe in one GOD the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth.	I. I Believe in one GOD the Father Almighty, *In the ancient Editions of* Morellus *and* Cauchius, *we read,* In Deo Patre Omnipotente; *The Ablative Caſe being put inſtead of the Accuſative* Deum; *but this was a fault of the Tranſcriber.*	I. I Believe in one GOD the Father Almighty inviſible and impaſſible.	I. I Believe in GOD the Father Almighty.
II. And in *Jeſus Chriſt* his only Son our Lord.	II. And in *Chriſt Jeſus* his only Son our Lord.	II. And in our only Lord *Jeſus Chriſt* his Son.	II. And in *Jeſus Chriſt* his only Son our Lord.
III. Who was Conceived by the Holy Ghoſt, Born of the Virgin *Mary*.	III. Who was born of the Holy Ghoſt of the Virgin *Mary*.	III. *The ſame as in that of* Aquileia.	III. *The ſame as in that of* Aquileia.
IV. Suffered under *Pontius Pilate*, *was* Crucified, dead and buried, he deſcended into Hell.	IV. *Was* Crucified under *Pontius Pilate*, and *was* buried, *he* deſcended into Hell.	IV. *Was* Crucified under *Pontius Pilate*, and *was* buried.	IV. *The ſame as in the* Oriental.
V. The third Day he roſe again from the Dead.	V. *The ſame.*	V. *The ſame.*	V. *The ſame.*
VI. He aſcended into Heaven, *and* ſitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty.	VI. He aſcended into Heaven, *and* ſitteth on the right hand of God the Father.	VI. *The ſame as in that of* Aquileia. *ſaving that ſome add,* Almighty, *as in the* Vulgar.	VI. *The ſame as in that of* Aquileia.
VII. Frome thence he ſhall come to judge the Quick and the Dead.	VII. *The ſame.*	VII. *The ſame.*	VII. *The ſame.*
VIII. I believe in the Holy Ghoſt.	VIII. And in the Holy Ghoſt.	VIII. *The ſame as in that of* Aquileia.	VIII. *The ſame as in that of* Aquileia.
IX. The Holy Catholick Church, the Communion of Saints.	IX. I Believe the Holy Church. Pamelius *adds* Catholick, *but falſly; for there is no more expreſſed by* Ruffinus *than theſe words,* The Communion of Saints.	IX. *The ſame as in that of* Aquileia.	IX. *The ſame as in that of* Aquileia.
X. The Forgiveneſs of Sins.	X. *The ſame.*	X. *The ſame.*	X. *The ſame.*
XI. The Reſurrection of the Body.	XI. The Reſurrection of this Body.	XI. *The ſame as in the* Vulgar.	XI. *The ſame as in the* Vulgar.
XII. *And* the Life everlaſting Amen.	XII. *Wanting.*	XII. *Wanting.*	XII. *Wanting.*

Of

Of the Canons and Constitutions attributed to the Apostles.

Apostolical Canons & Constitutions.

THE Opinions of Authors are extremely divided, as to the Canons that are commonly called Apostolical. *Turrianus* and some others have determined, that they were all composed by the Apostles: *Baronius* and *Bellarmine* except the 35 last, which are rejected by them as Apocryphal, but they have made no difficulty to admit the first 50. *Gabriel Albaspinæus* Bishop of *Orleans*, and others, have believed, that although these Canons are not written by the Apostles yet that they were very ancient, as being properly a Collection of the Canons of divers Councils that were holden before that of *Nice*; this Opinion is likewise maintained by the Learned Dr. *Beverege*, in a Book lately published by him, Entituled, *Vindiciæ Canonum, &c.* calling by this Name the Collection of 85 Canons attributed to the Apostles. Lastly, M. *Daillé* affirms, that these Canons are not only falsly ascribed to the Apostles, but are also of a much later date, and were not collected until about the end of the Fifth Century. We shall now proceed to examine these Opinions, and to establish that of *Albaspinæus*, which seems to be most probable.

It is not very difficult to prove, that these Canons were not compiled by the Apostles themselves; we need only peruse them, to be convinced, that they contain divers things that never were, nor indeed could be decreed by the Apostles (*a*); some whereof relate to certain Questions that were not debated until many years after their death (*b*). But it ought to be observed, that they are usually styled by the ancient Writers, *Ancient Canons*, *Canons of the Fathers*, and *Ecclesiastical Canons*; Titles that are likewise prefixed to them in several Manuscripts, as *Cotelerius* has observed: And if they are sometimes called or entituled *Apostolical*, it cannot be upon the account of their belonging to the Apostles; but it is sufficient that some of them have been made by Bishops that presided over the Church a little after the Apostles, because they that lived at that time were generally called *Apostolical Men*. The Author of the Apostolical Constitutions is the first that attributed these Canons to the Apostles, and he hath said some things to induce us to believe, that they were actually composed by the Apostles (*c*). Therefore these Canons are not the Work of an Impostor, who hath forged them under the Name of the Apostles, but only a Collection that hath been falsly imputed to them, that it might be esteemed more Authentick, And I am apt to believe, that no Person was

(*a*) *Diverse things that never were, nor indeed could be established by the Apostles.*] In the first Canon it is Decreed, that a Bishop should not be Ordained but by two or three Bishops; whereas it is certain, that in the time of the Apostles one single Bishop was sufficient to Ordain another. In the third it is determined, that the First-Fruits should be so presented to the Bishop and Priest, as that they should be brought immediately to them, and not offered on the Altar. In the fourth it is provided, that Oil and Incense only should be offered on the Altar Now it is not probable, that any such things were offered in the time of the Apostles. In the fifth Canon it is ordained that the Feast of *Easter* should not be celebrated after the *Jewish* manner: If this had been determined by the Apostles, the Controversie between *Victor* and the *Asiaticks* might have been easily decided; but it was not, and *Victor* only alledg'd the Tradition of his Ancestors: In like manner the 21 Canon against those that made themselves Eunuchs would have been produced by *Demetrius* against *Origen*, and *Origen*'s action would not have been justified by *Alexander* and *Theoctistus*, if there had been then extant a Canon of the Apostles, that had so precisely forbidden it. In the 34th and 35th Canons mention is made of the right of Metropolitans, and of the distinction of Bishopricks, which were not fixed at that time. In the 50th Canon it is decreed, that he that did not baptize or dip a Child thrice in the Water should be deposed; This practice, though very ancient, is later than the Apostolical times. The 52d is against the Errors of the *Montanists* and *Novatians*. The 60th is against Books forged by the Hereticks after the death of the Apostles And the 66th is against the Sabbatical Fast. The 69th regulates fasting in *Lent*. In the following Canons are contained several Injunctions concerning Oil, Vessels of Gold and Silver, and Vails consecrated in Churches, things that were not known in the time of the Apostles The last Canon comprehends a Catalogue of Sacred Books which could not be written by the Apostles. In the 45th, 46th, and 47th Canons the Baptism of Hereticks is rejected as null and void. This question was not resolved by the Apostles. Moreover the style of these Canons is not like the Apostles; and the matter is very different from that which was usually treated by them; neither were the names of *Clerk*, *Bishop*, *Altars*, *Sacrifices*, *&c.* so common in the Apostolical times.

(*b*) *Questions that were not debated until many years after their death.*] *Viz.* The questions relating to the Feast of *Easter*, the Baptism of Hereticks, as also concerning those that made themselves Eunuchs; those that would not admit Sinners to repentance; those that fast on Sundays, *&c. Vide supra.*

(*c*) *To induce us to believe that they were actually composed by the Apostles.*] As for Example in the 29th Canon, where it is ordained, that those Bishops that should obtain the Episcopal Dignity by Money, should be deposed, *as Simon was by St. Peter*; he hath added *by me Peter*. For these words are not found in the Epistle of *Tarasius* to Pope *Adrian*, nor in the Edition of *Dionysius Exiguus*. Moreover in the 5th Canon, we read at present *the Lord hath declared unto us*; whereas in the *Greek* Manuscripts, and in the Edition of *Zonaras* and *Balsamon*, it is simply expressed, *the Lord hath declared*; and in that of *Joannes Antiochenus*, *Our Lord hath declared*. Lastly in the 82d Canon there is this expression, *as our Brother* Onesimus, and in the last, *our Acts*, where it ought to be read simply as in the *Arabick* Paraphrase, *as* Onesimus, and *the Acts of the Apostles*.

more

Apoſtolical Canons & Conſtitutions.

more capable of performing this Artifice, than the above cited Author of the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions (*d*), who hath in like manner aſcribed many other Writings to the Apoſtles, and hath inſerted theſe Canons entire in his third Book.

As for the Antiquity of them, it is apparent that they are very ancient, and that a great part of them (if not all) were decreed by Councils that were holden before that of *Nice*: For firſt, they do not contain any thing (according to my judgment) but what is conformable to the Diſcipline that was obſerved in ſome Churches at the end of the Second Century, throughout the Third, and in the beginning of the Fourth. Secondly, they comprehend certain Ordinances that are known to have been made in thoſe times: As for Example; There is a Canon that prohibits the Celebration of the Feaſt of *Eaſter* with the *Jews*, now we are aſſured, that this was Decreed in divers Synods aſſembled in the time of Pope *Victor*. Moreover there are three, wherein the Baptiſm of Hereticks is rejected, as void and of no effect, which is declared by *Firmilian* and *Dionyſius Alexandrinus* to have been determined in the Councils of *Synnada* and *Iconium*, that were holden ſome time before them. But who can believe, that theſe Canons were made or counterfeited at a time when Perſons baptized by Hereticks were generally admitted without re-baptizing them? And it cannot be imagined, that they were forged by S. *Cyprian*, or *Firmilian*, on purpoſe to authorize their Diſcipline; it is much more reaſonable to believe, that they really are the very Canons of the Synods of *Iconium* and *Synnada*, which have been falſly attributed to the Apoſtles, not by theſe Saints, but by later Authors. Thirdly, It is clearly proved, that the greateſt part of theſe Canons are more ancient than the Council of *Nice*, becauſe they are often cited in this Council, and thoſe that were conven'd not long after, as well as by the Authors who wrote in the Fourth Century (*e*), under the name of *Ancient Laws, Canons of the Fathers, Eccleſiaſtical Canons*, and even *Apoſtolical*, which is different from what they call *Cuſtoms, Manners*, or *Diſcipline*, concerning which there are no written Rules or Injunctions. Therefore it is certain, that theſe Canons are ancient, that they have been erroneouſly aſcribed to the Apoſtles, and that they are a Collection of Ordinances of divers ancient Synods that were holden before the Council of *Nice*, but it is not known when this Collection was made, nor who collected it, nor even whether it conſiſts of thoſe 85 Canons that are now extant, or of a leſſer number. However, it is probable, that it was compiled at ſeveral times, and that ſome Canons have been ſucceſſively added, becauſe no order is obſerved therein, as alſo becauſe that the Canons relating to one and the ſame Subject are often found ſeparated, beſides ſome Contradictions.

The Objections propounded by Mr. *Daillé* againſt the Apoſtolical Canons, manifeſtly prove againſt *Turrianus* that they were not compoſed by the Apoſtles, but they do not in the leaſt impugn our opinion. As for Example; It is objected by him, That there are in theſe Canons certain terms that were not uſual in the time of the Apoſtles, as *Clerk, Lecturer, Laick, Metropolitan, &c.* But he cannot deny that theſe terms were uſed in the third Age of the Church. That which is ordained concerning Lent, and againſt faſting on Sundays or the Sabbath, may belong to the third Century ſince the ſame things are found in the Works of *Tertullian*. The Canons againſt thoſe that make

(*d*) *I am apt to believe that no perſon was more capable of performing this Artifice.*] It is ſuitable to the temper of this Author, who deſigned to paſs every where for a Diſciple of the Apoſtles; for which reaſon he has given us divers Conſtitutions under their name, attributing to every Apoſtle ſome particular Conſtitutions and Liturgies, at the end whereof he annexed theſe Canons with the above-mentioned additions; and he likewiſe adds in the name of the Apoſtles: *This is what we thought fit to command you O ye Biſhops, continue to obſerve theſe things.*

(*e*) *They are often cited*] In the firſt Canon of the Council of *Nice*, the ſecond of the Apoſtles is alledged, concerning thoſe that make themſelves Eunuchs, and in the fifth Canon of the ſame Council, the 12th and 32d is cited relating to Excommunication. In the ninth Canon of the Council of *Antioch* the 34th is quoted concerning the Metropolitan; in the 20th Canon of the ſame, the 10th about Excommunication; in the 21ſt Canon, the 14th prohibiting Biſhops to leave their Dioceſſes; and in the 23d Canon the 76th, that a Succeſſor ought not to be elected. In the Synod of *Conſtantinople* convened in the year 394, the 14th Apoſtolical Canon is quoted, of the Juriſdiction of Biſhops. In the Council of *Epheſus*, Acts 7. col. 788. we find the 35th cited concerning Ordinations; and in Act. 1. the 74th is alledged relating to the three Admonitions that ought to precede Eccleſiaſtical Cenſure. Moreover *Alexander* in *Theodoret*, lib. 1. c. 4. cites the 12th, as alſo *Athanaſius*, *Epiſt. ad omnes Orthodoxos*, where he likewiſe alludes to the 29, 30, and 75th Canons. The 34th is alledged by *Arſenius*, in like manner the 30th, 35th, and 81ſt are quoted by Pope *Julius* in his Epiſtle. St. *Baſil* in the 43d Canon plainly cites the 24th of the Apoſtles, under the name of an ancient Canon; in the 12th Canon the 77th concerning Bigamy; and in the firſt the 47th relating to the Baptiſm of Hereticks. Laſtly *Theodotius* in *Cod. Lib.* 3. *de Summa Trinitate* quotes the 17th under the name of an Apoſtolical Canon.

M. *Daillé* replies, that all theſe Quotations do not relate to the Apoſtolical Canons, but to the Diſcipline, Cuſtoms, and Traditions that proceeded from the Apoſtles; however this anſwer hath no probability; for the word Canon ſignifies written Laws, and the Council of *Nice* diſtinguiſheth Canons from Cuſtoms, which he therein called αρχαια ἔθη. Moreover M. *Daillé* adds, that certain Canons and ancient Laws are often cited that are not included in the Apoſtolical, and he produceth two Examples, the firſt whereof is taken from the 13th Canon of the *Nicene* Council, and the 2d from the 21ſt of that of *Ancyra*. But firſt, the Apoſtolical or Eccleſiaſtical Canons are not cited by name in theſe two, but only in the firſt *an ancient and Canonical Law or Cuſtom*, παλαιον καὶ κανονικον νομον, and in the ſecond, ἀρχαιον ὅρον, *an ancient definition*. Secondly, nothing hinders but that theſe words may be underſtood of ſome ancient definitions of Synods; as for example, the Law wherein it was ordained to receive the *Lapſi* at the point of death, cited in the firſt Canon, was made in the Eaſtern and *African* Churches before the Council of *Nice*, if we may give credit to the Teſtimony of *Dionyſius Alexandrinus in Ep. ad Stephanum*, produced by *Euſebius*, Lib. 7. chap. 4. and 5.

them-

themselves Eunuchs, might be composed by *Demetrius* against the Error of *Origen*. The Canons concerning *Easter*, are apparently those of the Councils that were convened under *Victor*; and others relating to the Baptism of Hereticks, are probably those of the Councils of *Synnada* and *Iconium*. Upon the perusal of all the Objections alledged by M. *Daillé*, it will appear, that although they are extremely weighty against the Opinion of *Turrianus*, yet they are of no force against ours (*f*). *Apostolical Canons and Constitutions.*

It ought then to be esteemed as certain, that not only the first 50 Canons, but likewise the following 35. are very ancient, though they do not belong to the Apostles. Therefore they have been always much esteemed by the *Greeks*, as being of great Authority. *Joannes Antiochenus*, who lived in the time of the Emperor *Justinian*, hath inserted them in his Collection of Canons; and they are commended by *Justinian* himself in his sixth *Novel*. They are in like manner approved in the Synod that was holden in the Imperial Palace, after the fifth General Council: Cited in the seventh Oecumenial Council, and allowed by St. *Joannes Damiscenus*, and *Photius*, but with this difference, that the first, who was no great Critick, attributed them to the Apostles, and the other that was more quick-sighted in these matters doubted whether they belonged to them. However they have not always met with the same Reception among the *Latins*. Cardinal *Humbert* hath rejected them, and *Gelasius* hath placed them among the Apocryphal Books as well because they were falsely ascribed to the Apostles, as because he found among them some Canons, that authorised the Opinion of St. *Cyprian* concerning the Baptism of Hereticks. *Hinchmar* favourably explains *Gelasius*'s Notion, declaring, that he did not insert them among those Books that were Apocryphal and full of Errors, but only in the number of those, with respect to which this Rule of St. *Paul* ought to be observed, *Try all things, and hold fast that which is good*. *Dionysius Exiguus* hath translated the first 50, and hath prefixed them to his Collection, taking notice however, that some Persons would not acknowledge them; and perhaps this is the reason that *Martinus Braccarensis* would not admit them into his Collection of Canons; but *Isidore* hath made no difficulty to afford them a place in his, and ever since they have been always accounted as a part of the Canon Law. It is further to be observed, that as soon as they appeared in *France*, they were generally well received there, and were first urged in the cause of *Prætextatus* under the Reign of King *Chilperic*, wherein their Authority was allowed, as we are informed by *Gregorius Turonensis* in the fifth Book of his History, *Chap* 19. where he takes notice, that there was an Appendix added to the Collection of Canons, which contained certain Canons, *as being writ by the Apostles, quasi Apostolicos*, and cites one of them, which is the 25th Apostolical, but according to a different Version from that of *Dionysius Exiguus*. Lastly, *Hinchmar* Bishop of *Rheims* observes, that they were annexed to the beginning of a Collection of Canons compiled for the use of the Church of *France*, separately from the others. and as for their Authority and Antiquity, he is altogether of our opinion, which he explains in these words, in the 24th Canon, *The Canons* (says he) *that are called Apostolical, Collected by some Christians, were written in a time when the Bishops could not freely assemble together, nor hold Councils; they contain many things that may be allowed, but they likewise establish others that ought not to be observed.*

I cannot say the same thing of the Apostolical Constitutions, as I have done of the Canons, *viz*, that they are not supposititious, but that in process of time a false Title happened to be attributed to them; for the Author of the Constitutions is an Impostor, that endeavours every where to pass for *Clement* a Disciple of the Apostles, and who imputes to them all in general, and to every one in particular, divers Ordinances that are in no wise consonant to the Apostolical ones; such are those concerning Churches built in the form of Temples, Catechumens, Energumens, Fasts, Liturgies, Unction,

(*f*) *They are of no force against ours.*] However, some of the most material of M. *Daille*'s Reasons may be objected to us; for instance, he affirms that St. *Athanasius* in the matter of *Leontius* the Eunuch, cites the Canon of the Council of *Nice*, and not the Apostolical, which shews (says he,) that it was not as yet known; Moreover, that it is not quoted by St. *Epiphanius* against the *Valesian* Hereticks: That St. *Basil* reckons the triple immersion in Baptism amongst the unwritten Tradition, and consequently, that the Canon of the Apostles in which it is ordained, was not composed in the time of this Father: That this Canon was made against those Hereticks that Baptized with a single Immersion, and that the *Eunomians* were the first that followed this practice. These are the Arguments of M. *Daille* that can be urged against us, but it is very easie to refute them. St. *Athanasius* cites the Apostolical Canon rather than that of *Nice*. St. *Epiphanius* produceth no Canon against the *Valesians*; but only the Holy Scripture. St. *Basil* and the other Fathers understand by unwritten Tradition all those matters that are not contained in the Sacred Writings. Lastly, the Canon concerning triple Immersion was not made against Hereticks, but to prevent the negligence of Priests. The 84th Canon might indeed be objected with much more probability, wherein we find the Books of the *Maccabees*, together with the Epistles and Constitutions of St. *Clement* among the Canonical Writings. But it must be replied to this Objection, that this Canon is corrupted, that the Books of the *Maccabees* are not extant in the Greek Copy of *Joannes Antiochenus*, and it may easily be discerned, that the Epistles and Constitutions of St. *Clement*, have been added by the Author of the *Apostolical Constitutions*, who endeavoured to pass for St. *Clement*, to raise the reputation of this Book. It may be proved that this Canon is ancient, because the Books of the Old Testament that were not inserted in the Canon of the *Jews*, and the Revelation are omitted. Lastly, It is asserted against us, that these Canons were unknown to the Authors of the Fifth Century, that they are not cited by *Eusebius*, nor included in the *Codex Canonum* of the Catholick Church; but all these Objections are frivolous, for the Ecclesiastical Writers of the fourth Age have often referred to these Canons. *Eusebius* indeed hath not mentioned them, but neither doth he take notice of the Canons of the *Nicene* Council, and in fine it is not to be wondred at that they are not found in the Code of the Universal Church, which did not contain all the ancient Canons, no more than that of the *African* Church comprehended those that were made by St. *Cyprian* or *Agrippinus*.

Apoſtolical Canons and Conſtitutions.

Prayers for the Catechumens and Energumens; the Ordination of Deacons and Deaconeſſes; Virgins, Confeſſors, Subdeacons; The Benediction of Oyl and Water; The Firſt-Fruits of Tyths, Feſtival Days, the Celebration of *Eaſter*, and many other things that were not practiſed in the time of the Apoſtles, not to mention a great number of Abſurdities and Miſtakes of time, together with ſome Errors that are contained therein (*g*), which evidently demonſtrates beyond contradiction, that theſe Conſtitutions were not compoſed by Apoſtles, and even that they do not belong to St. *Clement*, as we ſhall ſhew more at large in diſcourſing concerning the Works of this Father, where we ſhall likewiſe endeavour to diſcover at what time they were forg'd.

I ſhall add nothing concerning the Nine Canons that are alſo attributed to the Apoſtles, and are reported to have been made by them in a certain Council of *Antioch* unknown to all Antiquity; becauſe there is no queſtion but that they are fictitious; neither are they at preſent maintained by any (*h*).

(*g*) *A great number of Abſurdities and miſtakes of time, together with ſome Errors that are contained therein.*] As in Book 1. That the Beards of Women ought to be ſhaved, and not thoſe of Men. In Book 2. Ch. 1. That all Biſhops ought to be 50 years old. In Chap. 57. it is ordained, That the Goſpel according to St. *John* ſhould be read; which was not written until the 97th year of our Lord, after the death of the Apoſtles. In Chap. 11. the Author aſſerts, That the Biſhop preſides over Kings and Magiſtrates; and in Book 3. Chap. 2. That third Marriages are an Intemperance, and the fourth a manifeſt Debauchery. In Book 6. Chap. 6. mention is made of the *Ebionites*, whoſe Errors ſprang up after the deceaſe of the Apoſtles. In the 14th Chapter, *James* the Son of *Zebedee* is introduced as preſent at *Jeruſalem* after the time of his death. In Book 8. Chap. 4. it is declared, That the Conſtitutions were made in the preſence of St. *Paul* and the Seven Deacons; now it is certain that St. *Stephen*, one of the ſaid Seven Deacons, died before the Converſion of St. *Paul*. In Book 1. Chap. 32. Female Slaves are permitted to ſuffer themſelves to be deflowred by their Maſters. Moreover this Author is accuſed of *Arianiſm*.

(*h*) *Neither are they maintained at preſent by any.*] This Synod is unknown to St. *Luke*, and to all the ancients; for although it is ſaid to be cited by *Innocent* I. *Ep.* 18. it is a miſtake, ſince he only mentions the Council of *Jeruſalem*; and whereas it is written, Antiochenam *Eccleſiam quæ meruit apud ſe celeberrimum Apoſtolorum Conventum. The Church of* Antioch, *which deſervedly had the moſt famous Convention of the Apoſtles celebrated there*, it ought to be read *propter ſe, near that City*; for it is apparent, that this Pope ſpake concerning the Synod of *Jeruſalem*, which was the moſt famous Convention of the Apoſtles. Moreover, not ſo much as one of the ancient Authors makes mention of theſe Canons, and indeed they are altogether abſurd: It is ſaid in the firſt, that the Chriſtians were called *Galileans*, a name that was not attributed to them until after the death of the Apoſtles. In the third Canon it is decreed, that the Chriſtians ſhould live *Anagogically*, a harſh and inſignificant Term. In the 9th Canon the Synagogue is called *Beſhuine*; and in the 8th it is ordained, that there ſhould be Images in the Churches, a practice that was not in uſe in the time of the Apoſtles. This Canon is cited by *Gregorius Peſſinuntius* in the ſecond Council of *Nice*, but it is well known that many Apocryphal Records were alledged in that Council.

Of ſeveral Books attributed to Prochorus, Linus, *and* Abdias, *and of the Acts of the Paſſion of St.* Andrew.

Prochorus, Linus, Abdias, &c.

IN the time of the Apoſtles there lived a certain Perſon named *Prochorus*, one of the Seven firſt Deacons, and there is now extant a Book under his name, containing the Life of St. *John*, which is Printed among the *Orthodoxographa*, and in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*. But *Baronius*, *Bellarmin*, *Lorinus*, the Maſter of the Palace, and in a word, all thoſe that have written concerning Eccleſiaſtical Authors both *Roman* Catholicks and Proteſtants unanimouſly agree, that it is a ſuppoſitious Book, and unworthy of him whoſe Name it bears; and indeed, it is a Narrative full of abſurd Fables and Tales. It is related there, that St. *John* caſt himſelf at the Feet of the Apoſtles, deſiring to be exempted from going into *Aſia*; That after he was taken out of the Caldron of boiling Oyl, a Church was built in Honour of him; That he compoſed his Goſpel in the Iſle of *Patmos*, &c. The Stile of this Book argues its Author to be a *Latin*, or a *Greek*, and not an *Hebrew*. Laſtly, we find therein the words *Trinity* and *Hypoſtaſis*.

The two Books attributed to *Linus* concerning the Paſſion of St. *Peter*, and St. *Paul* are likewiſe generally rejected, as fictitious and full of Fables. They ſay, that *Agrippa* was Governor of *Rome* in the time of St. *Peter*, who ſuffered Martyrdom without the knowledge of *Nero*; That this Emperor was offended that he was put to Death; That part of the *Roman* Magiſtrates were Chriſtians; and that the Wife of *Albanus* departed from her Husband againſt his Will, following the advice of St. *Peter*. In fine, both theſe Books are full of Errors, Falſities, Fictions, and notorious Untruths; in the laſt of which mention is made of the Epiſtles of St. *Paul* to *Seneca*, and of *Seneca* to St. *Paul*.

We muſt likewiſe give the ſame Judgment upon the Book imputed to *Abdias*, that contains divers extremely fabulous Relations concerning the Lives of the Apoſtles, and was Printed by it ſelf in the years 1557, 1560, and 1571; at *Baſil*, *Anno* 1532, and at *Paris* in 1583; it is alſo inſerted in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*. At firſt they tried to make it paſs for a Book compoſed in *Hebrew*, by a Diſciple of Jeſus Chriſt, named *Abdias* of the City of *Babylon*, Tranſlated into *Greek* by *Eutropius*, and

into

into *Latin* by *Julius Africanus*; but now the whole World is convinced of this Error, and it is generally agreed, that it was forged by an Impostor, that falsly pretends to be a Disciple of Jesus Christ, who nevertheless cites *Hegesippus*, and *Julius Africanus*, whom he could not have seen if he had lived in our Saviours time; and lastly, he relates many fabulous Narrations concerning the Life of Jesus Christ and his Apostles, which it would be too tedious here to rehearse. *Prochorus*, *Linus*, *Abdias*, &c.

Men are divided in their Censures upon the Acts of the Passion of St. *Andrew* written by the Priests of *Achaia*, which are inserted in the History of the Saints published by *Surius*, *Baronius*, *Bellarmine*, and some other Criticks of the Church of *Rome* admit them as Authentick, but they are rejected by many. The ancient Ecclesiastical Writers know no other Records of St. *Andrew* than those that were corrupted by the *Manichees*, mentioned by St. *Augustine*, *Philastrius*, and Pope *Innocent* (*a*), and which are reckoned by *Gelasius* in the number of Apochryphal Books. But it is certain that those were different from these whereof we now discourse; it is also evident, that these last Acts of the Passion of St. *Andrew*, have been cited by none but Authors that lived since the Seventh or Eighth Century, as by *Remigius Altissiodorensis*. *Petrus Damianus*, *Lanfrank*, *St. Bernard*, and *Ivo Carnutensis*, which is the cause that we can have no assurance that they are very ancient. Thirdly, the Mystery of the Trinity is not only explained in these Acts after such a manner as gives us occasion to suspect, that he that wrote them lived after the Council of *Nice*; but he likewise propagates the Error of the modern *Greeks*, in affirming, that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father, and remains in the Son. It is indeed objected, that there are Manuscripts wherein these words are not expressed, but who knows, whether they have not been omitted in some, rather than added in others? Therefore this History ought at least to be esteemed, as a dubious Writing, *that cannot be applied* (as St. *Jerome* declares,) *to prove any Doctrine of Faith.*

The account of the Life and Death of St. *Matthias* was forged by an Author who pretends to have received it from a *Jew* that Translated it out of the *Hebrew* Tongue. We ought also to place in the rank of Apocryphal and fabulous Books, the Life of St. *Mark* and the History of St. *Clement*, together with that of *Apollinarius*, set down in the Collection of ancient Histories compiled by *Laurentius de la Barre*. And we need only read them over to be convinced of their falsity.

(*a*) *Mentioned by St.* Augustin, Philastrius, *&c.*] *St. Aug. lib. de Fide contr. Manichæos.* Philastr. *lib de Hæres. N.* 40. Innocentii I. *Epist. ad Exup.* Gelasius *in conc. Roman.*

Of the Books of the Sibyls, Mercurius Trismegistus, *and* Hystaspes: *Of the Letters of* Lentulus *and* Pilate, *concerning* Jesus Christ: *Of the Epistles of* Seneca *to St.* Paul, *and of those of St.* Paul *to* Seneca: *And of a Passage in the History of* Josephus.

WE joyn all these prophane Records together, that have been heretofore alledged in favour of the Christian Religion, that so we may examine them; and although we should reject them, yet we do not believe that we do any wrong to Religion, which is sufficiently furnished with solid and convincing Proofs, without standing in need of those that are false or dubious. We begin with the Verses that are attributed to the *Sibyls*, which are frequently cited by the ancient Writers to to convince the *Pagans* of the Truth of the Religion of *Jesus Christ*; but before we proceed to Examine them, it would be expedient to give some account of these *Sibyls* and their Books. *Sibyls.*

It is difficult to assign a true Etymology of the Word *Sibyl*; *Lactantius*, and after him St. *Jerom* affirm, that the *Sibyls* were so called, because they were the Interpreters of the Decrees of the Gods; and that their Name consisted of two *Greek* Words (*a*), signifying the *Counsel of the Gods*, which being written in the *Æolick* Dialect compose that of *Sibyl*. It is derived by some from an *Hebrew* Word, and by others from an obsolete *Latin* Adjective (*b*), that signifies, *Subtil* or *Acute*; but this later Conjecture is false, since the Word *Sibyl* was used by the *Greeks* before the *Latins*. The most probable opinion is, that the Name of *Sibyl*, which was proper to the famous *Delphick* Prophetess, afterwards became common to others, as that of *Cæsar*, peculiar only to *Julius*, was after him appropriated to all the succeeding Emperors.

(*a*) *Consisted of two Greek words.*] These two words are Διὸς βέλη, and in the *Eolick* Dialect σίὸς βέλη, *Lactantius*, Lib. 1. c. 6. *Hierom.* Lib. 1. *in Jovin.* It is objected against this Etymology that the *Adjective* σιβύλλινος, the Three last Syllables whereof compose a Dactyl, make it manifest that the word *Sibylla* cannot be derived from σίὸς βέλη.

(*b*) *From an obsolete Latin Adjective.*] This Adjective is *Sibus*, which according to *Festus* signifies the same as *Acutus*, or *Callidus*; a *quick*, or *crafty Man.*

Sibyls. Nothing is ſo uncertain as the Number and Names of the *Sibyls* (*c*), many of the ancient Writers mention but one; ſome ſpeak of her of *Cuma*, and others of her of *Delphos*. *Strabo* and ſome others diſtinguiſh two *Erythræan*. *Solinus* produceth three, her of *Delphos*, her of *Erythræ*, and her of *Cuma*. *Pauſanias* names four, the *Libyck*, the *Delphick* or *Erithæan*, the *Cuman* and the *Babylonian*. *Ælian*, *Varro*, *Lactantius*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, and moſt other Writers, reckon ten, and ſome add others to the number, but they do not agree about their Names, nor the place of their Habitation, and they often confound them one with another.

However, it is certain, that the Name of *Sibyls* was given to certain Women, who being tranſported with *Enthuſiaſm* (*d*), and an extravagant Fury, cauſed either through a violent Inflammation of Choler, or by the poſſeſſion of *Dæmons*, pronounced divers obſcure and enigmatical Sentences that paſſed among the Heathens for Oracles and Predictions. It is reported, that the Sibyl of *Cuma* wrote them on the Leaves of Trees (*e*), and that a Collection of them was offered by a certain Woman to *Tarquinius* (*f*) King of the *Romans*, who bought part thereof, which he cauſed carefully to be laid up in an Urn or Stone-pot, and to be placed in the *Capitol*, having created Officers on purpoſe, whom he called *Duumviri*, whoſe Office it was to keep thoſe Oracles with care, and to conſult them upon urgent occaſions. The number of thoſe that executed this Commiſſion was by little and little increaſed, for there were afterwards ten, and at laſt fifteen, conſtituted for this purpoſe; and very ſevere Puniſhments were inflicted on theſe perſons, if they ſuffered the Books of the Sibyls to be ſeen. It is related by *Dioniſius*, *Halicarnaſſæus*, and *Valerius Maximus*, that one of theſe *Duumviri*, was put to death as a Parricide, that is to ſay, he was ſow'd up alive in a Sack, and thrown into the Sea, for permitting ſome of the Sibylline Verſes to be tranſcribed. Theſe Books were thus preſerved until the year 671, after the Foundation of *Rome*, which was the 83d before the Nativity of *Jeſus Chriſt*. But the *Capitol* being burnt in that year, theſe Books were likewiſe conſumed with the reſt of the Ornaments of this Palace, as is obſerved by *Dionyſius Halicarnaſſæus*, *Pliny*, and other Authors. When the *Capitol* was rebuilt, the Conſuls made a Propoſition to the

(*c*) *Nothing is ſo uncertain as the Number and Names of the* Sibyls.] *Plato* in his *Phædrus* mentions but one *Sibyl*, neither doth he declare to what place ſhe appertained. The Author of the Book *de Mirabilibus Auſcultationibus* in *Ariſtotle*, ſpeaks of her of *Cuma*. *Diodorus Siculus Lib.* 4. gives an account of her of *Delphos*, affirming that ſhe was named *Daphne*, and was the Daughter of *Tireſias*; but *Virgil*, *Pauſanias* and *Suidas* call her by the name of *Manto*, and St. *Clement* by that of *Artemis*. *Dioniſius Halicarnaſſæus*, *Pliny*, *Juvenal*, &c. mention but one *Sibyl*: However it doth not follow, that they knew no others. *Strabo. Lib.* 13 and 17. aſſures us, that there were two at *Erythræ*, and that the Second called *Athenais* lived in the time of *Alexander* the Great. *Stephanus de Urbibus* and *Capella*. Lib. 2. *de Nuptiis Philologiæ* reckon likewiſe two, *Erophile* a Native of *Troy*, who came to *Cuma*, and *Symmachia* of the City of *Erythræ*. *Solinus* in *Polyhiſt.* c. 8. produceth three, the *Delphick* named *Eriphile*, who was more ancient than *Homer*, the *Erythræan*, and the *Cuman*. *Ælian Var. Hiſt.* Lib. 2. c. 35. reckons ten, the *Erythræan*, the *Samian*, the *Egyptian*, the *Sardian*, the *Cuman*, the *Jewiſh*, and four others. St. *Clement*, *Stromat.* Lib. 1. *Manto* (ſays he) and a multitude of Sibyls; the *Samian*, the *Colophonian*, the *Theſſalian*, the *Theſprotick*, &c. *Lactantius* in *Lib.* 1. recites ten after *Varro*: The firſt is that of *Perſia* mentioned by *Nicaver*, who wrote the Hiſtory of *Alexander* the Great: The ſecond of *Lybia*, cited by *Euripides*. 3. The *Delphick* alledged by *Chryſippus*, in Lib. *de Divinatione*. 4. The *Cuman* in *Italy*, whom *Nævius* and *Piſo* mention, the former in his Hiſtory of the *Punick* War, and the later in his *Annals*. 5. The *Erythræan* whom *Apolladorus Erythræus* affirms to have lived in his City. 6. The *Samian*, concerning whom *Eratoſthenes* hath written. 7. The *Cuman*, called by ſome *Amaltheæa*, and by others *Demophile*, or *Herophile*. 8. The *Heleſpontick* born in the Countrey about *Troy*, and in the Town of *Marpeſſus*. 9. The *Phrygian*, who Propheſied at *Ancyra*. 10. The *Tiburtina* named *Albunea*, who uttered her Oracles at *Tybur*, near the River *Anio* now called *il Teverone*, at the bottom whereof it is reported, that her Statue was found holding a Book in her hand. *Iſidore* hath followed the Catalogue of *Lactantius*, but *Suidas* reckons up Twelve: Some with *Pauſanias*, confound the *Erythræan* with the *Delphick*, the *Phrigæan*, the *Samian*, and the *Colophonian*. Others as *Capella*, and the Author *de Mirab. Auſcultat.* joyn the *Cuman*, and the *Erythræan*, St. *Juſtin* makes no Diſtinction between the *Babylonian* and the *Cuman*; according to the Opinion of ſome, the *Perſick* is the moſt ancient, others attribute the greateſt Antiquity to the *Cuman*, and St. *Clement* to the *Delphick*.

(*d*) *Tranſported with Enthuſiaſm.*] We need only read the Deſcription, that is made by all the ancient Authors of the manner how the *Sibyls* uttered their Oracles: See *Virgil* in *Æneid.* *Lucan.* *Claudian* in *Panegyrico Honorii*, *Plutarch. de Orac. Pythiæ*, &c. It was ſo evident among the Heathens, that they were poſſeſſed, that they applyed the word σιβυλλαίνειν, to ſignifie, *to Play the Madman*, Diod. Lib. 4. Now this fury that deprived them of their Senſes, cannot be eſteemed as an Inſpiration of the Holy Ghoſt, but as an Effect of their being poſſeſſed with a Dæmon, and intoxicated with the Exhalations of inflamed Choler; for in my Opinion, it is an Imagination without any Ground to affirm with St. *Jerom*, that they received the Gift of Propheſying from God, in recompence of their Virginity.

(*e*) *Wrote them on the Leaves of Trees.*] Virgil, Æneid. 6. *Foliis tantum ne carmina manda.* Juvenal. *Credite me folium recitare Sibyllæ.*

(*f*) *Was offered by a certain Woman to* Tarquinius.] This Hiſtory is recorded by many ancient Authors; ſome affirm, that thoſe Books were Preſented to *Tarquinius Superbus*, and others, to *Tarquinius Priſcus*. It is Reported, that the Woman who bought them had Nine Volumes, which ſhe offered to Sell at a dear Rate, but perceiving that *Tarquin* would not give her what ſhe required, ſhe burnt Three of them; that afterwards having demanded as much for the other Six, as ſhe had done for the Nine, and being repulſed, ſhe burnt Three more, when at laſt the King being aſtoniſhed at her boldneſs, bought the Three that were left at the ſame Price that ſhe had asked for the Nine. See *Dionyſius Halicarnaſſæus. Antiquit.* Lib. 4. *Aulus Gellius* and *Lactantius*. *Pliny* reckons but Three Books inſtead of Nine; and affirms, that Two of them were burnt.

Senate,

Senate, to send Ambassadors into *Greece* to *Erythræ*, as also into *Asia*, to collect the Oracles of the Sibyls, and to transmit them to *Rome*: Whereupon *Octacilius Crassus*, and L. *Valerius Flaccus* were deputed to go unto *Attalus* King of *Pergamus*, who brought out of *Asia* a thousand Verses attributed to the Sibyls, which they had gathered together throughout all the Parts of that Region from the Copies of divers private Persons. But forasmuch as there were many things therein that seemed to be false or superfluous, fifteen Men were appointed to Revise and Correct them, and after this Correction they were placed in the *Capitol* in the room of the others. In the time of *Augustus*, these Books were again reviewed, above two thousand Verses attributed to the Sibyls were burnt by the Command of this Emperor, and those that were allowed to be Genuine, were inclosed in two Golden Boxes in the Temple of *Apollo*. Some are of opinion, that these Writings were burnt in the Conflagration of *Rome* under *Nero*, but they have not produced any convincing Proofs of this matter. However, it is certain, that as long as there were Pagan Emperors at *Rome* (*g*), the Oracles ascribed to the Sibyls were carefully preserv'd there, to which they had Recourse on all extraordinary and emergent Occasions, and *Julian* the Apostate designing to re-establish all the ancient Heathen Superstitions, caused the Sibylline Books to be diligently sought for, and consulted. *Sibyls.*

There are now extant many *Greek* Verses attributed to the Sibyls, which are divided into eight Books; but at present it is almost generally agreed throughout the whole World, that they are a fictitious Work, as the Time in which the were written (*h*), the Stile (*i*), and the Things therein contained (*k*), do most clearly demonstrate. And if it be certain, that the eight Books, which we now have in our possession under the Name of the *Sibyls* are counterfeit, it is no less true, that those that were in the hands of the Fathers, and which they cited, were equally spurious, and also that they were not much different from those that we have at this day; I affirm therefore, First, That the Books of the Sibyls, alledged by the Fathers, were not really those Sibylline Oracles that the *Romans* preserved, with so much Care; For besides that these last were so strictly kept, that a Copy of them could not be procured by any means whatsoever, much less common, as those were that are quoted by the Fathers, which were every where visible; it is plain, that they comprehended such matters as were altogether different from those that are usually found in the Writings of the Fathers. For in the former prophane Things were only comprised, concerning the Ceremonies of the Heathens, whereas the later

(*g*) *As long as there were Pagan Emperors at* Rome.] See *Dio* in *Tiberius and Nero*, *Spartian* in the Life of *Adrian*, *Julius Capitolinus* in that of *Gordian*. *Trebellius Pollio*, in that of *Gallienus*, and *Vopiscus* in that of *Aurelian*, *Aurelius Victor*, *Ammianus Marcellinus*, Lib. 24. *Zozim.* Lib. 2. *Procop*, Lib. 1.

(*h*) *As the time in which they were written.*] It is certain, that the Sibyls were later than *Moses*, however the Author of this Counterfeit Work affirms, that the Sibyl was in *Noah's* Ark, and nevertheless it is declared in Book III that these Oracles were written 1500 years after the *Grecian* Empire was Established. Now after whatsoever manner this may be understood, it follows that all these Predictions concerning the *Jews* and *Moses*, are forged, since these 1500 years continue till the Destruction of *Jerusalem*. In Book V. we are informed by the Author, that he saw the second Ruin of the *desirable* House; which is plainly to be understood of the last Destruction of *Jerusalem*. He says in Book VIII. That after *Trajan*, intimated by the Letter *T*, one should Reign whose Name was to be taken from the *Adriatick* Sea, this is *Adrian*; and that after him Three should Govern at a time, that is to say, *Antoninus*, *Marcus* and *Lucius*, and that the last should obtain the Supreme Government, which shews that this was written at the beginning of the Reign of *Marcus Aurelius*, or at the end of that of *Antoninus*; for in regard that *Lucius* was the youngest, it was natural to foretell that he should live longest.

(*i*) *The Style.*] It appears, that he that counterfeited these Books, was not really transported with Enthusiasm, but only pretended to be so: The Verses of the Sibyls were obscure and without Order, whereas these are not very Irregular: The Affairs of the Emperors are therein Historically digested, and not after a Prophetical manner: The style contains nothing of that Impetuosity and Enthusiasm that is every where Conspicuous in the Expressions of the Sibyls, neither is it like that of *Homer* who took many Verses from those Propheteresses, if we may believe *Diodorus*: Moreover the Author of these Sibylline Books was illiterate; for he derives the Name of *Adam* from ἀδὴς; in the second Book he affirms, that the Four Letters of his Name signifie the Four Quarters of the World; thô, in Hebrew and Chaldee, there are but three; he feigns that the Letters of the Name of God, Compose the number 1697. which is not true, unless it be written in Greek after a barbarous manner from the Name of JESUS, which he makes to consist of four Vowels, and two Consonants, he extracts the Number of 888 years, and from that of *Rome* 948. he vouches the Fables of the *Titans*, as true Histories; Moreover he says, that the Mountain *Ararat* is in *Phrygia*; that the River *Euxotas* is in *Epirus*, and that *Gog* and *Magog* are *Ethiopians*, which shews that this Impostor was ignorant of the Hebrew Tongue, of Geography and History, which we cannot say of the Sibyl.

(*k*) *And the things therein contained.*] There are certain Principles in these Books, that were not imbibed by any but the ancient Christians; the Author is of the Opinion of the *Millenaries*, he believes *Nero* to be Anti-Christ, that the Souls of Men shall remain in Hell until the Resurrection, that the Fire of the Judgment shall serve instead of Purgatory, that the Terrestrial Paradise shall be preserv'd, and that at last the wicked shall be delivered from Hell Fire: he likewise maintains divers other Opinions of the ancient Christians. Lastly, it cannot be doubted, but that the Accounts in these Books, of the Nativity, Life and Actions of Jesus Christ, have been taken from the History of the Evangelists: And indeed, the Prophets have said nothing that comes near the Plainness, that appears in the Books of the Sibyls. I shall omit many other Reasons.

Sibyls. were full of Predictions and Inſtructions relating to Chriſtianity. The Books of the Sibyls were never conſulted among the *Romans*, without extracting from them ſome Superſtitions perfectly Pagan (*l*). They were informed therein, that they ought either to offer ſome ſort of Sacrifice to the Gods, or to faſten a Nail in the *Capitol*, or to celebrate ſome particular Games to the Honour of *Jupiter*. At another time it was found to be neceſſary to cauſe the Statue of *Æſculapius* to be brought to *Rome*, to erect a Temple to *Venus*, to offer Sacrifices to the Infernal Deities, and to appeaſe the Heathen Gods with peculiar and extraordinary Solemnities. Laſtly, Nothing was ever gathered from theſe Books, but Ceremonies that were abſolutely prophane. On the contrary, the Fathers alledge nothing out of the Writings of the Sibyls, but what relates to the Chriſtian Religion, and to the true Worſhip of God. Is there any probability, that theſe Propheteſſes ſhould have uttered Things ſo different, and that they ſhould have taught in one and the ſame Book, the way of Worſhipping the True God, and the greateſt Superſtitions of the Gentiles? Who can imagine that theſe Books that were kept by the *Romans* to Authorize all their Superſtitious Rites, and which they eſteemed as the moſt ſublime and refined part of their Religion, ſhould contain far clearer Prophecies concerning *Jeſus Chriſt*, than all that was ever declared by the *Jewiſh* Prophets? Moreover, not only the Books of the Sibyls that are now extant ſpeak of our Saviour in ſuch plain Expreſſions, as look more like a Hiſtory than a Prophecy; But the ſame thing may be ſaid of the Books cited by the Fathers, that comprehend the ſame Predictions, and even more diſtinct. For can there be a plainer Prediction concerning *Jeſus Chriſt*, than the Verſes produced by *Euſebius* in the Prayer attributed to *Conſtantine*?

There is but one God, who is alſo the Saviour;
Who has ſuffer'd for us;
Who is mark'd out in theſe Verſes.

The Acroſtick quoted in the ſame place is not more obſcure. Can any thing be ſpoken more expreſly concerning the Creation of the World, the laſt Judgment, and the Life Everlaſting, than what is produced by *Theophilus Antiochenus*, as proceeding from a Sibyl? All the other Sibylline Verſes recited by the Fathers, are written almoſt after the very ſame manner on every particular Subject, and this obliged the Author of the *Exhortation to the Gentiles*, attributed to St. *Juſtin*, to affirm, that the Sibyl had foretold the Advent of *Jeſus Chriſt* in clear and evident Terms, Σαφῶς καὶ σατρῶς. Now what an abſurdity is it to believe, that the Heathens, from whom God had concealed the Coming of his Son, and whom he ſuffered to walk in Darkneſs, ſhould have more notable Prophecies among them, than all thoſe of the *Jews*, to whoſe Cuſtody he had committed the Sacred Writings, and to whom he had given the knowledge of the *Meſſiah*.

Moreover, this Argument might be urged farther, and it might be demanded from whence the Sibyls could receive the knowledge of the *Meſſiah*. It is alledged by ſome, that they were Inſpired by God; and by others that they took from the Holy Scripture, all that they uttered concerning Religion; but there is no probability neither in the one nor the other Aſſertion; for what likelihood is there that God ſhould inſpire Sorcereſſes and Prieſteſſes of falſe Gods, that deluded Mankind, to cauſe them to adore the *Dæmons* with which they were poſſeſſed? Or who can imagine, that God ſhould make uſe of ſuch Inſtruments to reveal his Myſteries ſo clearly to the World; and on the other ſide, how could they draw thoſe Truths out of the *Old Teſtament*, that are but very obſcurely expreſſed therein, and which the *Jews* themſelves could ſcarcely underſtand.

It remains only for a more full demonſtration of the falſity of the Sibylline Oracles that were uſed by the Fathers, to ſhew, that they differed very little from thoſe that ſtill bear the ſame Title. To evince this, it will be ſufficient to obſerve, that excepting three or four Paſſages, all the others quoted by the ancient Authors, being very numerous, are expreſſed in equivalent Terms in the Sibylline Books that are read even at this day. Now the ſtrongeſt Argument that can be alledged to prove that a Work is ancient, is, that thoſe Paſſages that have been cited by the ancient Writers are found therein. Do we not frequently demonſtrate the Antiquity of an infinite number of Books, only becauſe a particular Paſſage recited by ſome ancient Author, is there to be found? Why then may it not be concluded after the ſame manner, that the Sibylline Books, thô forged, are the ſame with thoſe that were formerly extant? And this Proof is of ſo much the more force, becauſe this may be urged not only againſt one ſingle Paſſage, but very many, that are alledged by different Authors, and alſo becauſe the Sibylline Oracles ſtill remain in the ſame Language in which they were cited. Moreover it is not to be admired, that there are ſome Paſſages which are not found therein, and that there are others which are not Verbally expreſſed, becauſe ſome places in theſe Books are wanting; and it hath been often obſerved, that the ancient Writers are not uſually very exact in their Quotations, but adhere to the Senſe rather than the Literal Expreſſion. It might likewiſe be added, that all that is related by the ancient Fathers concerning the Books of the Sibyls that were heretofore in uſe, is comformable to theſe: The Author of the *Exhortation to the Gentiles* affirms, that the Stile of the Sibylline Writings was not very polite; theſe are of the like nature; they were then reported to contain divers Anachroniſms, and this defect is alſo at preſent obſervable among them. They Treated concerning *Jeſus Chriſt*, the laſt Judgment, Hell, &c. all theſe Things are in like manner compriſed in thoſe that

(*l*) *The Books of the Sibyls were never conſulted among the* Romans, *without extracting from them ſome Superſtitions perfectly Pagan.*] See *Livy* in many places, *Varro, de Ling. Lat.* Lib. 5. *Cicero* in *Verrina ult. Tacitus* Lib. 15. *Suetonius* in *Jul.* Num. 97. *Plin.* Lib. 5. chap. 17. *Solyn. Polyhiſt.* Chap. 10. *Val. Maxim.* Lib. 1. Numb. 1, and 10. *Plutarch* in the Lives of *Publicola, Fabius* and *Marius*. *Pauſanias* in *Phocaicis*. *Capitolinus* in *Gordiano*. *Trebellius Pollio* in *Galients*, and *Vopiſcus*, in *Aureliano & Floriano*. *Sext. Aurel. Victor* in *Claudio*. *Amnian. Marcellin.* Lib. 22, and 23. *Macrob. Saturnal.* Lib. 1. chap. 17.

We

we now have in our possession. Lastly, these last are very ancient, and belong to the time of the most ancient Fathers; for some Opinions may be found there, that could not be maintained but in the Primitive Ages of the Church: Such are the Errors of the *Millenaries*; That *Nero* is Anti-Christ; That the end of the World was near at hand; That it should happen in the time of *Antoninus*; That *Rome* should soon be destroyed 948 years after its Foundation, and many other things that could never be asserted by later Christians, who would have been very far from admitting such Notions, when they were convinced of the falsity of these Predictions. Upon the whole matter it ought to be concluded, that the Books of the Sibyls were certainly forged in the Second Century, but it is difficult to determine the precise time, and by whom this was done; all that can be alledged as most probable is, that they began to appear about the end of the Reign of the Emperor *Antoninus Pius.* (*m*). *Sibyls.*

M. *Vossius* in his last Book gives us an Hypothesis of the Sibylline Oracles somewhat different from this; he acknowledgeth that the ancient Writings of the Sibyls which were preserved until the burning of the *Capitol*, were entirely prophane, and differed from those that are cited by the Fathers; but he maintains, that among those that were brought from *Greece* by *Octacilius Crassus*, there were some Prophecies inserted that had been received from the *Jews*, who pretended that they were written by the Sibyls, in which the Coming of the Messiah was foretold, and that these were cited by the Fathers under the Name of *The Books of the Sibyls*, which Title was actually attributed to them.

This Hypothesis, which is well enough contrived, yet lies liable to many Difficulties; for first, the Collection of Oracles ascribed to the Sibyls, that was made after the burning of the *Capitol*, related no less to the *Pagan* Superstitions, than the ancient Verses ascribed to the Sibyl of *Cuma*. Secondly, Since the Predictions concerning *Jesus Christ*, expressed in the passages of the Sibylline Books, and quoted by the Fathers, are clearer than those that were contained in the Prophecies of the *Jews*, there is no probability that they could proceed from any of that Nation. Lastly, The Doctrine comprised in the Books of the Sibyls, seems rather to be that of a Christian than of a Jew, since the Coming of *Jesus Christ*, is therein manifestly foretold; The Resurrection of the Dead, the Last Judgment, and Hell Fire, are expressly described in plain Terms; and mention is made of the *Millennium*, of the appearing of Anti Christ, together with many other Things of the like nature, which could not be related, but by one that had been instructed in the Christian Religion. Therefore it is much more probable, that the Writings attributed to the Sibyls were forged by a Christian, rather than by a *Jew*.

However, none ought to be surprised that we reject those Books as supposititious, which have been quoted by the Ancients as real, and it must not be imagined, that we thereby contemn the Authority of the Fathers, or that we impugn the Truth; on the contrary, we should do an Injury to it, if we should endeavour to support it by false Proofs, especially when we are convinced of their Forgery. The Fathers are to be excused for citing the Sibylline Verses as true, because they had not examined them, and finding them published under the Name of the Sibyls, they really believed that they were theirs; but they that are certainly informed of the contrary, would be inexcusable if they continued to rely on such Testimonials, or refused ingenuously to confess what the Truth obliged them to own. And indeed it ought not to be admired, that the Fathers did not examine these Books critically; it is sufficiently known, that they wholly applied themselves to Matters of the greatest Consequence at that time, and that they often happened to be mistaken in prophane Histories and to cite fictitious Books; such are the Works of *Hystaspes*, and *Mercurius Trismegistus*, which they almost always joyned with those of the Sibyls; as also the Acts of *Pilate*, Apocryphal Gospels, divers Acts of the Apostles, and a great number of other Records that have been undoubtedly forged.

But altho the most part of the ancient Writers cited the Oracles of the Sibyls, yet there were even then many Christians that rejected them as Counterfeit, and could not be perswaded to approve the practice of those that made use of their Testimony, whom in derision they called by the Name of *Sibyllists*. This is attested by *Origen*, in his Fifth Book against *Celsus*: *Celsus* (says he) *Objects, that there are Sybillists amongst us, perhaps, because he hath heard it reported, that there are some amongst us who reprove those that affirm, that the Sibyl is a Propheteſs, and call them Sibyllists.* St. *Augustine* hath likewise acknowledged the falsity of these pretended Oracles; and as often as he makes mention of them, he declares that he is not not convinced of their Truth, particularly in *Lib.* 18. *c.* 45. *De Civit Dei. Were it not* (says he) *that it is affirmed, that the Prophecies that are produced under the Name of the Sibyls and others concerning* Jesus Christ, *were feigned by the Christians.* And in *cap.* 47. *It may be believed, that all the Propheeies relating to* Jesus Christ, *that are not contained in the Holy Scriptures, have been forged by the Christians: Wherefore there can be nothing more solid in confuting the Pagans, than to alledge these Prophecies that are taken from the Books of our Enemies.*

(*m*) *They began to appear about the end of the Reign of Antoninus Pius. Possevinus* affirms, that these Books were written under the Reign of *Commodus*; but he is deceived in taking the Conflagration mentioned in Book V. for the Fire of the Temple of *Vesta*, that happened in the time of that Emperor, for the Temple of *Jerusalem* is to be understood in this place, which is called the *desirable House*, and *the Guardian Temple of God*. We have already shewn, that the Author had seen *Lucius* and *Marcus*, but that he knew not the later Emperors. All the Fathers that have quoted the Sibylline Books, wrote either under the Reign of *Antoninus Pius*, or after that time, *Josephus* indeed and *Hermas* cite the Sibyls, but in general Terms, and there were possibly some Verses extant under their Names, even in the time of *Josephus*, who produceth one of them concerning the Tower of *Babel*, Lib. 1 *Ant.* c. 5.

But

Sibyls. But the Heathens (ſay they,) doubted not of the truth of the Predictions of the Sibyls that were urged by the Fathers; they only put another ſenſe upon them, nay, they even proceede ſo far as to own, that the Sibylline Verſes foretold the Nativity of a certain new King, and a conſiderable Revolution. This is mentioned by *Tully* in divers places; moreover when *Pompey* took the City of *Jeruſalem*, it was commonly reported, that the Sibyl had foretold, that Nature deſigned a King for the People of *Rome*; the Senate was likewiſe aſtoniſhed at it, and, by reaſon of this Prediction, refuſed to ſend a General, or an Army, into *Egypt*. *Lentulus* (according to the Teſtimony of *Cicero* and *Salluſt*,) flatter'd himſelf, that he ſhould become this King that was intimated by the Sibyl. Others have interpreted this Prophecy, with reſpect to *Julius Cæſar* or *Auguſtus*, as is obſerved by *Cicero* and *Suetonius*. *Virgil*, in his Fourth Eclogue, produceth the Verſes of the *Cuman* Sibyl, foreſhewing the Birth of a new King that ſhould deſcend from Heaven. In ſhort, it is moſt certain, that the Gentiles acknowledged that the Books of the Sibyls were favourable to the Chriſtians, inſomuch that the later were prohibited to read them, as appears from the words of *Aurelian* to the Senate, recited by *Vopiſcus*. *I admire, (* ſays he) *Gentlemen, that you ſhould ſpend ſo much time in conſulting the Writings of the Sibyls, as if we were debating in an Aſſembly of Chriſtians, and not in the principal place of the Roman Religion.*

Theſe Arguments ſeem to be very plauſible, but if we examine them, we ſhall find that they contain nothing that is ſolid: The Pagans never ſubmitted to the Authority of theſe Books of the Sibyls that were quoted by the Fathers; on the contrary it is manifeſt, that *Celſus* was perſwaded that they were forged by the Chriſtians; and St. *Auguſtine* plainly declares, that this was the general Opinion of all the Gentiles. The Sibylline Verſes mentioned by *Tully* were *Paracroſticks*. that is to ſay, the firſt Verſe of every Sentence comprehended all the Letters in order, that began the following Verſes; now among all the Verſes of the Sibyls, only thoſe cited by *Conſtantine* are compoſed in *Acroſticks*. As for the Aſſertion, that in the time of *Pompey*, *Julius Cæſar*, and *Auguſtus*, there was a general report, that it was foretold in the Sibylline Books, that a new King ſhould be born within a little while; we may eaſily reply with *Tully*, that the Verſes attributed to the Sibyls by the Heathens were made after ſuch a manner, that any ſenſe whatſoever might be put upon them; and that, perhaps, mention might be made therein of a certain future King, as it is uſual in this kind of Prophecies. Therefore when the Grandeur of *Pompey* began to be formidable to the *Roman* Empire, they thought it fit to make uſe of this pretence, to prevent him from going into *Egypt* with an Army. And *Lentulus*, to whom this Charge was committed, being Governor of *Syria*, vainly flattered himſelf with this Prediction, which might peradventure be further confirmed by the Prophecies of the *Jews*, who expected the coming of the *Meſſiah*, believing that he ought to be their King.

Afterwards when it happened that *Julius Cæſar*, and *Auguſtus* after him, actually made themſelves Maſters of the *Roman* Empire, the Prophetical Expreſſions of the Sibyls were interpreted in their favour; neither was it neceſſary on this account, that they ſhould clearly point at the Coming of *Jeſus Chriſt*, as it is expreſſed in the Writings of the Sibyls that are alledged by the Fathers; but it was ſufficient, that they mentioned a future King, which is the uſual practice of all thoſe that undertake to utter Predictions of extraordinary Events. This gave occaſion to *Virgil*, who intended in his fourth Eclogue to compoſe Verſes in Houour of *Pollio* his Patron, as alſo to Extol *Auguſtus* at the ſame time, and to deſcribe the Felicity of his Reign; this, I ſay, afforded him an opportunity to do it with greater Majeſty, to make uſe of the name of the Sibyl, and to pronounce theſe Verſes:

Ultima Cumæi venit jam carminis ætas;
Magnus ab integro ſæclorum naſcitur ordo:
Jam nova progenes Cœlo demittitur alto;
Jam redit & Virgo, redeunt Saturnia regna.

By which nothing elſe is meant, but that at the Nativity of *Saloninus* the Son of *Pollio*, under the Conſultate of his Father, and the Reign of the greateſt Prince in the World, the Golden Age ſhould return, as it was foretold by the Sibyl; That Plenty and Peace ſhould flouriſh throughout the whole Univerſe, and that the Virgin *Aſtræa*, the Goddeſs of *Juſtice*, who had abandoned the Earth at the beginning of the Iron-Age, ſhould deſcend again from Heaven: What is there in all this, that reſembles the Prophecies concerning *Jeſus Chriſt*? Or rather, what is there that is not altogether prophane, and feigned by an Heathen Poet, who only makes uſe of the Sibyls Name to flatter the Ambition of *Auguſtus*, and to add greater Authority and Luſtre to that which he ſays in his Commendation? Laſtly, the Words of *Aurelian* do not intimate, that the Chriſtians were forbidden by the Pagans to read the Sibylline Books, but only that the Chriſtians looked upon them as prophane Writings, which in no wiſe related to their Religion, and to which they gave no Credit.

THE Books that are attributed to *Hyſtaſpes*, and *Mercurius Trimegiſtus* and cited likewiſe by the ancient Fathers, are not more Genuine than the Verſes of the Sibyls. There is nothing now extant of *Hyſtaſpes*, and this Author was altogether unknown to the ancient Heathens; but the ſame thing cannot be ſaid of *Mercurius* Sirnamed *Triſmegiſtus* (*n*), who is mentioned by the moſt

(*n*) *Sirnamed* Triſmegiſtus.] In Greek τρισμέγιστος, the *Egyptians* call him *Thaaut*; ſome affirm, that he was ſtyled *Triſmegiſtus* by the *Grecians*, becauſe he was a great King, a great Prieſt, and a great Philoſopher; others as *Lactantius*, that this Name was attributed to him, by reaſon of his incomparable Learning.

ancient

ancient Pagan Writers (*o*) as an incomparable Perſon, and an Inventer of all the Liberal Arts and Sciences. He was an *Egyptian*, and more ancient than all the Authors, whoſe Works are ſtill extant: He is believed to be as Old as *Moſes*; he either wrote, or at leaſt it is ſaid that he wrote, Twenty five, or Thirty thouſand Volumes. But we have only two Dialogues at preſent under his Name, one whereof is called by the Name of *Pœmander*, and the other of *Aſclepius*, who are the principal Speakers. The firſt Treatiſe is concerning the Will of God, and the ſecond Treats of the Divine Power; theſe have been cited by the ancient Fathers, to prove the Truth of our Religion, by the Authority of ſo famous an Author. But it is certain that they cannot be his (*p*), for the Author of theſe Treatiſes is a Modern *Platonick* Chriſtian, who argues from the Principles of that Philoſophy, and hath taken from the Holy Scripture, that which he writ concerning the Word of God, and the Creation of the World.

Hyſtaſpes, and Mercurius Triſmegiſtus.

IT were needleſs to ſhew the falſity of a Letter attributed to *Lentulus*, and directed to the Senate and People of *Rome*, concerning the Actions of Jeſus Chriſt, ſince the Forgery is apparent: It is pretended to have been written by *Lentulus*, as Governor of *Jeruſalem*, although he never was ſo; the Superſcription thereof is inſcrib'd *to the Senate and People of* Rome; whereas ever ſince there were Emperors, it was the general Cuſtom among the Governors of *Provinces* to write immediately to them: Moreover the Contents of this Letter are ridiculous, there is a mean and unworthy Deſcription of the Perſon of Jeſus Chriſt, as particularly it is ſaid, that his Hair was of a light Colour, long and looſe after the manner of the *Nazarenes*; the Style is alſo very far from the Purity and Elegancy of the Age wherein *Auguſtus* lived. In ſhort, this Letter is not ſo much as mentioned by any of the ancient Writers,

A Letter of Lentulus.

THE Letter of *Pilate* to *Tiberius* on the ſame Subject, concerning the Miracles of Jeſus Chriſt ſeems to be more Authentick; for it is recorded by *Tertullian* in his *Apologetick*, that *Tiberius* being informed of the ſupernatural and wonderful Operations, that were performed by our Saviour in *Paleſtine*, which were ſo many Teſtimonies of his Divinity, made report thereof to the Senate, and determined, that he ought to be Enrolled among the Gods; but that the Senate having rejected this Propoſition, *Tiberius* nevertheleſs perſiſted in his Opinion, and forbad his Subjects to perſecute the Chriſtians. It is added, a little after by the ſame Author, that *Pilate* being a Chriſtian in his Heart, wrote to *Tiberius* concerning the Reſurrection of Jeſus Chriſt. *Euſebius* in the ſecond Book of his Hiſtory *Chap.* 2. produceth this paſſage of *Tertullian*, and giving a large Account how the fame of our Saviour was ſpread abroad, and came to the Ears of *Tiberius*, he ſays, that *Pilate* ſent a Letter to the Emperor, according to the uſual Cuſtom of the Governors of *Provinces*, who were obliged to give an Account of the moſt remarkable Occurrences that happen'd within their Juriſdiction, and that he wrote to him concerning the Reſurrection of Jeſus Chriſt, avouching that he had been informed of his Miracles by many, and that a great number of People eſteemed him as a God, after he roſe again from the Dead. We find in the *Orthodoxography*, after the Epiſtle of *Lentulus* another attributed to *Pilate* and directed to *Tiberius*, wherein the ſame things are contained. But it is difficult to determine whether this Letter was extant in the time of *Euſebius*, or afterwards forged from his Story. However, there are divers learned Men, that doubt of the Truth of this Hiſtory, which hath but very little probability in its Foundation; for what Likelihood is there that *Pilate* ſhould tranſmit theſe things in writing to *Tiberius*, relating to a Man whom he had condemned to Death? And although he had writtem them, it is credible that *Tiberius* ſhould have made a Propoſition to the Senate, for the admitting this Perſon into the number of the Gods upon the bare report of a Governor? And if he had propounded it, who can doubt but that the Senate would have immediately ſubmitted to his Judgment? Therefore, though this Relation cannot be abſolutely charged with Falſhood, yet it ought at leaſt to be accounted as dubious. [Dr. *Pearſon* late Biſhop of *Cheſter* in his Lectures upon the Acts of the Apoſtles (*p.* 64. 65.) vindicates the Truth of this Story againſt the Objections of *Tana-*

Pilate's Letter.

(*o*) *Mentioned by the moſt ancient Pagan Writers.*] *Plato* in *Phædrus* declares, that he invented the Characters of Letters together with Arts and Sciences. *Cicero* in Lib. 3. *de Natura Deorum* aſſures us, that he governed the *Egyptians*, and that he gave them Laws and found out the Characters of their Writings; It is Recorded by *Diodorus Siculus*, that he taught the *Grecians* the Art of diſcovering the Secrets of the Mind. And we are informed by *Jamblichus*, who quotes *Manetho* and *Seleucus*, that he wrote above Thirty five thouſand Volumes. S. *Clemens Alexandrinus* in *Stromat.* Lib. 6. makes mention of Forty two Books of this Author, and gives an Account of the Subject of ſome of them. The Works of *Mercurius Triſmagiſtus*, are cited as favourable to the Chriſtian Religion by the Author *of the Exhortation to the Gentiles*, ſaid to be St. *Juſtin*, by *Lactantius* in the Fourth Book of his *Inſtitutions*, by St. *Clement*, in Lib. 1. *Stromat.* by St. *Auguſtine*, in *Tract. de* 5. *Hæreſ.* and in *Lib.* 8. *De Civit. Dei*, Chap. 23. by St. *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, in *Lib.* 1. *contra. Julianum*, and by many others.

(*p*) *But it is certain that they cannot be his.*] The Eternity and Divinity of the Word is clearly explain'd in the *Pœmander*, and the Author of this Book attributes to the Son, the quality of being Conſubſtantial with the Father; he declares, that he is the Son of God our God, who proceeds from the Intellect of the Father, and he makes uſe of the very words of the Septuagint, in deſcribing the Creation of the World: he Diſcourſeth of the Fall of the firſt Man. In ſhort, he Copies out ſeveral paſſages of the Old and New Teſtament, and follows the Principles of the Modern *Platonick* Philoſophy. But the Book Entituled *Aſclepius* hath not quite ſo great a Tincture of Chriſtianity: The Author Treats therein of Idolatry after an exquiſite manner; he explains the Greek word ἄθεος, he Tranſcribes many things out of the Holy Scriptures, and the Works of the *Grecian* Writers: Laſtly, he foretels the Extirpation of the *Egyptian* Religion.

Pilate's Letter.

quil Faber ſo fully, that I ſhall ſet down his Reaſons at large: And 1. He ſays, that *Tertullian* might have taken his Information from the Acts of the Senate, wherein the Votes and Acts of every day were conſtantly ſet down. 2. He obſerves from *Suetonius*, that *Tiberius* acquainted the Senate with every thing that he was informed of, whether publick or private, of great or of little Concern. 3. He obſerves that *Tiberius* often took no notice when the Senate decreed things againſt his own Opinion; and this alſo is expreſly affirmed by *Suetonius*. 4. The Senate refuſed to Rank Jeſus Chriſt amongſt the Gods out of a Compliment to *Tiberius*, who had before refuſed Divine Honours, Commanding that no Statues of his ſhould be Erected in their Temples, unleſs for Ornament; they might probably therefore ſuſpect that this was propos'd by *Tiberius*, who never ſpoke his mind plainly in any thing, to enſnare them, who could not attribute thoſe Honours to any Body elſe which *Tiberius* had forbidden to be paid to himſelf, without making that Perſon greater than *Tiberius*. 5. It is not probable that *Pontius Pilate* ſhould neglect ſo remarkable a thing, as the Crucifixion and Reſurrection of Jeſus Chriſt, when all the Governors of particular Provinces were obliged to ſend Relations of every one that was conſiderable under their Governments to the Emperors who ſent them: And the Queſtion is not, as *Faber* miſ-underſtood it, whether the *Chriſtians* then made any conſiderable Figure in the World; but whether upon *Pilate*'s tranſmitting an Account to *Tiberius*, of the Death and Reſurrection of Jeſus Chriſt at *Jeruſalem*, when he was Procurator of *Judæa*, the Emperor did not propoſe to the Senate that this Jeſus Chriſt might be ranked amongſt the Gods; which being poſitively aſſerted by *Tertullian*, cannot be diſproved by any Negative Arguments that may at this time of day be brought againſt it.

But though theſe Reaſons which are urged by this great Man againſt *Tanaquil Faber*, ſufficiently vindicate the Truth of *Tertullian*'s Authority in this Matter; yet that is no Argument why the Epiſtle that goes under *Pilate*'s Name ſhould be Genuine. *Pilate* ſent this Account of Jeſus Chriſt in the Acts of his Adminiſtration, not in a particular Letter to the Emperor. The Acts are quoted by *Juſtin Martyr*, *Euſebius*, *Epiphanius*, and St. *Chryſoſtome*, and this Letter was made in all probability when the Original Acts were loſt.]

Epiſtles of Seneca *to St.* Paul, *and of St.* Paul *to* Seneca.

BUT we have reaſon to reject the Thirteen Epiſtles, as well thoſe of *Seneca* to St. *Paul*, as the others of St. *Paul* to *Seneca*, as undoubted Forgeries; althô St. *Jerome*, and St. *Auguſtine* ſeem to own them as Authentick. For (1) Theſe Epiſtles are not written according to the ſtyle of St. *Paul*, nor in that of *Seneca* (*q*). 2. It is declared therein, that in the Fire that happen'd in *Rome* under *Nero*, there were only 132 Houſes burnt, which is a manifeſt falſhood ſince it is certain, that a great part of the City was conſumed as *Tacitus* informs us (*r*). 3. The date of theſe Letters is falſe (*s*). 4. They contain nothing that is worthy of *Seneca*, or of St. *Paul* (*t*). Laſtly, it may be eaſily diſcerned, that they were feigned by ſome Perſons, meerly to gratifie their Fancy, and to Exerciſe their Faculty of Invention.

A late Author acknowledging, that the Epiſtles extant at this day under the Name of *Seneca* to St. *Paul*, and of St. *Paul* to *Seneca* are counterfeit, and yet not daring to affirm, that St. *Jerom* and S. *Auguſtine*, who believed them to be Genuine were deceived, hath imagined that the real Letters of St. *Paul* to *Seneca*, and of *Seneca* to S. *Paul* were loſt ſince their time; and that thoſe that we now have in our Poſſeſſion, were ſubſtituted in their room. But beſides that the reſpect that we have for theſe two Fathers, ought not to hinder us from believing, that they might be miſtaken in a matter of ſo little moment (*u*): It is alſo to be obſerved, that they do not poſitively aſſert, that thoſe Epiſtles were Authentick, but only that they were generally reputed to be ſo; and that they were read under their Names: (*x*) Moreover it might be eaſily demonſtrated, that the Letters which remain in

(*q*) *Are not written according to the ſtyle of St.* Paul, *nor in that of* Seneca.] The ſtyle of thoſe that are attributed to *Seneca* is Barbarous, and full of words that are ſcarce Latin. The Epiſtles aſcribed to St. *Paul*, do not ſuit with the Gravity of this Apoſtle, and contain Compliments rather than ſolid Inſtructions.

(*r*) *As it is related by* Tacitus.] He informs us, that of Fourteen quarters of the City of *Rome*, there remained but four entire, that there were three, the Houſes whereof were wholly conſumed, that very little was left in the other Seven, and that thoſe that were left were half burnt.

(*s*) *The Date of theſe Letters is falſe.*] One of them is Dated under the Conſulate of *Aprianus* and *Capito*, that is, *Vipſanius* and *Capito*, Five years before the burning of *Rome*, and the other under the Conſulate of *Phrygius* and *Baſſus*. But it was under the Conſulate of *Lecanius Baſſus*, and *Licinius Craſſus*, that this Fire happened: And the Letter is Dated in *March*, whereas the Fire did not begin (according to the report of *Tacitus*) till *May* following.

(*t*) *They contain nothing that is worthy of* Seneca *or of St.* Paul.] There is ſcarcely one Moral Notion in thoſe of *Seneca*, or one Chriſtian Precept in thoſe of St. *Paul*.

(*u*) *In a matter of ſo little moment.*] It is certain, that the Fathers have often cited Apocryphal and Counterfeit Books, as we have already ſhewn; *Natalis Alexander* himſelf the Author of the Opinion, which we now confute, Confeſſes it, and on the very ſame Account rejects the Epiſtle of Jeſus Chriſt to *Abgarus*, that of *Abgarus* to Jeſus Chriſt, that are more Authorized by the ancient Writers than thoſe Letters of *Seneca*.

(*x*) *But only that they were generally reputed ſo to be.*] St. *Jerom* in *Catalog. I reckon* Seneca *in the number of Eccleſiaſtical Authors, by reaſon of certain Letters which are read by many under the Name of* Seneca *to St.* Paul, *and of St.* Paul *to* Seneca. *St.* Aug. *Ep.* 14. *now the* 153. Seneca *of whom certain Letters are read written to St.* Paul. *But in Lib. de Civit. Dei*, Chap. 11. He declares that *Seneca* neither commended nor cenſured the Chriſtians, and that he hath made no mention of them; therefore he did not believe that theſe Letters were his.

their hands at present, and those that were extant in the time of St. *Jerome* are the same, for he declares that *Seneca* wished in one of his Epistles, to be among his Followers, what S. *Paul* was among the Christians, which bears a great Analogy with what we find in the 11th Letter of *Seneca* to Saint *Paul* (*y*). It is not known, when or by whom these Epistles were forged, and it is difficult to determine, whether it were on their Account, that there is this passage in the false Acts of the Passion of St. *Linus*, that *Seneca* and St. *Paul* wrote divers Letters one to another; or whether the Narrative of this Author, gave the hint to those that forged these Letters, as Cardinal *Baronius* conjectures.

Epistles of Seneca to St. Paul, and of St. Paul to Seneca.

LAstly, among all the profane Monuments that might be quoted for the Confirmation of the Truth of the Christian Religion, none seems to be more considerable than this passage of *Josephus*, taken from Book 18. chap. 4. of his *Jewish Antiquities*, wherein he declares: That, *at that time there was a wise Man named* JESUS, *(if we may only call him a Man; for he wrought many Miracles, and taught the truth to those that received it with joy,) who had a great number of Disciples, as well among the Jews as the Gentiles; that he was the* CHRIST, *and that being accused by the chief of his Nation, he was crucified by* Pilate's *Order: That nevertheless, he was not abandoned by those that loved him, because he had appeared unto them alive on the Third day, as was foretold by the Prophets, and that he was the Author of the Sect of the Christians, which remains at this day.*

A Passage of Josephus, *concerning Jesus Christ.*

This Testimony of *Josephus* is produced by *Eusebius*, St. *Jerome*, and several others after them, as a Record very important for the establishing of the Christian Faith; but in these later times, when Matters began to be examined more accurately, there have been, and there are even at present many learned Men, who maintain that this passage doth not really belong to *Josephus*, and it must be Confessed, that their Conjectures are not altogether to be disallowed; for they affirm,

1. That the style is intricate, not very fluent, and different from that of *Josephus*, whose Expressions are generally clear and elegant.

2. That it is evident, that this passage was inserted afterwards into the Texts of *Josephus*; because the Coherence of the following Sentence is interrupted; for immediately after the end thereof, we read, *About that time the Jews began to be afflicted again, with another Calamity*, words that have no manner of Relation to what went before, concerning our Saviour: but which manifestly appertain to the Account of the Massacre of the *Jews*, whom *Pilate* had caused to be slain in *Jerusalem*, that came just before this Passage concerning Jesus Christ; which plainly shews (say they) that it doth not belong to *Josephus*, and that it hath been afterwards added.

3. They argue, that in case this Passage were taken separately, yet even then it might be easily perceived, that those are the words of a Christian, and not of a Jew; since Jesus Christ is therein called God, his Miracles and Resurrection is acknowledged, and it is declared, that these things were foretold by the Prophets; How can it be imagined that this should proceed from a Jew, especially *Josephus*, who seems to doubt of the Miracles recorded in the Books that were written by Hebrew Authors?

4. What probability is there, that *Josephus* a Person extremely addicted to the Interest of his own Nation, should speak so honourably of Jesus Christ, whom he did not believe to be the *Messiah*, (as is observed by *Origen* in his Book against *Celsus*) and that he should accuse his Country-men, as having unjustly put him to Death?

5. *Josephus* describing in the same Book, *Chap.* 8. the Martyrdom of St. *James*, declares, that he was the Brother of Jesus Christ; now if he had made mention of him in some of his preceding Chapters he would not have failed to take notice thereof, or at least, he would in this place have added somewhat in his Commendation.

6. This Testimony (say they) is not only unknown to the Authors that lived before the time of *Eusebius*: but *Origen* expressly denies, that *Josephus* wrote any thing concerning our Saviour; *It is very strange*, (says he, in *Tom.* 2. in *Matth. That* Josephus *who did not acknowledge* Jesus Christ *as the* Messiah, *should give so Authentick a Testimony concerning the Innocency of St.* James. Would he have spoken to this effect, if there had been in his time so remarkable an Evidence of the Divinity of Jesus Christ in the Works of *Josephus*, as that which is now extant therein? *Theodoret* hath also observed, that *Josephus* knew not our Saviour. But nothing is more considerable than the silence of *Photius* as to this Matter, who making an exact Epitome of the Books of *Josephus*, takes no notice of this passage concerning Jesus Christ, which he would not have omitted, if it had been then found in all the Copies of the Writings of *Josephus*, and if he had believed that it was written by him. *Biblioth. Cod.* 238.

Lastly, that which deserves a more particular Reflection is, that it is remark'd by *Photius* in another place, that there was extant in his time a Book concerning the Universe attributed to *Josephus*, which he judged to be fictitious, in regard that Jesus Christ is too honourably mentioned therein, and he adds afterwards, that he hath been since informed that this Book was written by *Caius* a Priest of

(*y*) *Which bears a great Analogy with that which we find in the* 11*th Letter of* Seneca *to St.* Paul.] According to St. *Jerom*; *Optare se dicet servus ejus esse loci apud suos, cujus sit* Paulus *apud Christianos.* In the 11th Letter of *Seneca* we find the following Expression. *Cum sis vertex, & Altissimorum montium cacumen, haud te indignum in prima facie Epistolarum nominandum censeas---nam qui meus tuus apud te locus, qui tuus velim ut meus.* If *apud tuos* were put instead of *apud te*, these words would express S. *Jerom's* Sense; and they seem not to be capable of admitting any other; however it is evident, that he alludes to this place.

A Paſſage of Joſephus concerning Jeſus Chriſt.

Rome; Perhaps this paſſage, which is at preſent in his *Antiquities*, was taken from this *Caius*, who bore the Name of *Joſephus*.

Hue'ius replies to theſe Teſtimonies of *Origen*, *Theodoret*, and *Photius*, that thoſe Authors happened to meet with certain Manuſcripts of *Joſephus*, in which this Paſſage had been ſtruck out by the Jews: But this Anſwer ſeems rather to weaken its Authority; for if there were ancient Manuſcripts, wherein it was not expreſſed, we have yet more reaſon to doubt of its Veracity; and the Arguments that have been already produced ſufficiently ſhew, that it is more probable, that it hath been added in ſome Manuſcripts by the Chriſtians, than left out in others by the Jews. However, I ſhall not undertake to decide this Queſtion, but ſhall leave it to the Judgment of the Reader to determine; whether the Authority of *Euſebius*, St. *Jerome*, and all the Manuſcripts of *Joſephus* that we have at preſent in our Poſſeſſion, ought to be preferred before the above-cited Conjectures of the learned, the general Teſtimonies of *Origen*, *Theodoret*, and *Photius*, and perhaps ſome ancient Manuſcripts of *Joſephus*, that are long ſince loſt.

H E R M A S.

THERE are Three things to be examined in this Book of the *Paſtor*, attributed to *Hermas* which is one of the moſt famous Books of Antiquity *(a)*. 1. Who is the Author thereof? 2. Whether it be Canonical or not? 3. Whether it be a uſeful Book; as alſo, whether it deſerves the Eſteem and Reputation that it formerly had?

The firſt Queſtion may be eaſily determined. It bears the Name of *Hermas*, and all the ancient Writers have cited it under this Name; it appears likewiſe from the Antiquity thereof, that it might poſſibly be written by that *Hermas*, whom St. *Paul* ſalutes at the end of his Epiſtle to the *Romans*. *Origen*, *Euſebius*, and St. *Jerome*, have made no difficulty of aſſerting it; however, it cannot be doubted, but that the Author of this Book was called *Hermas*, and that the Name of *Hermes* hath been attributed to him by ſome Authors through a miſtake, which gave occaſion to certain Modern Writers, to aſcribe this Book to one *Hermes*, the Brother of Pope *Pius* I. *(b)*. But this Imagination is ſufficiently refuted by the Teſtimony of all the ancient Fathers, who conſtantly call him *Hermas*, beſides the Author of this Book was a *Greek*, and his Writings were more known amongſt the *Greeks*, than

(a) One of the moſt famous Books of Antiquity.] The Book of *Hermas* entituled *The Paſtor*, hath been admitted by many Churches as Canonical. S. *Irenæus* cites it under the Name of Scripture, Lib. 4. chap. 3. *Bene ergo pronunciavit Scriptura quæ dicit primo omnium crede, quoniam unus eſt Deus, &c.* This Paſſage is found in the *Paſtor*, Lib. 2 Mand. 1. *Clemens Alexandrinus* produceth ſeveral other Expreſſions, as taken from a Book of great Authority, *Lib.* 1. *Stromat. p.* 311, and 356. *Lib.* 2 *p.* 360, 379, 384, and 385. *Lib.* 4. *p.* 503. *Lib.* 6 *p.* 679. It is likewiſe cited by *Origen* as a Book of Holy Scripture, *Homil.* 10. in *Joſ. Homil.* 1. in *Pſal.* 37. *Homil.* 13. in *Ezek. Lib.* 1. Περὶ Ἀρχῶν, *c.* 3. *Lib.* 2. *c.* 1. *Lib.* 2. in *Matth. c.* 24. 42. *t.* 1. *Comment in Joannem, Lib.* 10. in *Ep. ad Rom.* where he declares, that the ſame *Hermas* mentioned in this place of the Epiſtle of S. *Paul*, is the Author of the *Paſtor*, *item in Oſeam*, *Philocal. c.* 8. Although he obſerves in other places, that it was not generally received in *Homil.* 8. in *Numb. Lib.* 4. Περὶ Ἀρχῶν, *Philocal. c.* 2. and *Homil.* 35. in *Luc.* It is reported by *Euſebius*, *Lib.* 3. *ch.* 3. that ſome reckoned it among the Canonical Writings, and others in the number of good Eccleſiaſtical Books, that were neceſſary for new Converts, *Lib.* 3. *c.* 25. He placeth it amongſt the Apocryphal Books, and obſerves *Lib.* 5. *c* 8. that it is quoted by S. *Irenæus* St. *Athanaſius* cites it in *Lib. de Incarnat. Verbi*, and in *Lib. de Decret. Synodi Nicænæ*, p. 252. *Edit. Pariſ.* 266. where he expreſly declares, that it is not included in the Canon. He quotes it again in his Epiſtle to the Biſhops of *Phrygia*, *p.* 396. and in his Paſchal Epiſtle he inſerts it in the Catalogue of Books that are not Canonical. *S. Jerom*, in *Lib. de Scriptoribus*, affirms, that it is a uſeful Book, but almoſt unknown to the *Latins*. In his Prologue, he placeth it in the rank of Books that are not Canonical. In *Comment. in Hoſeam*, *c.* 7. *v.* 9. he cites it, adding theſe words, *Si cui tamen placet, ejus recipere Lectionem.* In his firſt Book on *Habakkuk*, *ad c.* 1. *v* 14. he calls it *Apocryphal*, and finds fault with a fooliſh Thought in the Book. *Ruffinus* on the Creed reckons it among the Eccleſiaſtical Books, though not Canonical. It is cited by *Caſſian. Collat.* 8 *c* 12 13, and 17. And S. *Proſper* rejects it as a Book of no Authority, *Ut nullius Authoritatis, contra Collat c* 30. *Gelaſius* inſerts it in the Liſt of Apocrypha Books. And laſtly, *Maximus* cites it in *Lib.* 4 *De divinis nominibus.* This ſhews, that notwithſtanding its various fortune, it hath been always very famous.

(b) To impute this Book to one Hermes, *the Brother of Pope* Pius I.] The Author of *Damaſus*'s Pontifical, *Regino*, the Author of the Letter of Pope *Pius* I. and ſome other modern Writers, are in this Error, and they ſeem to have taken it from the Author of the Poem againſt *Marcion*, who affirms, that *Hermas*, who wrote this Book, was the Brother of *Pius*; *Poſt hunc deinde Pius, Hermas cui Germine frater Angelicus Paſtor cui tradita verba locutus.* But he calls him, *Hermas* and not *Hermes*; It is true indeed, that we find in the Verſion of *Origen* Περὶ Ἀρχῶν made by *Ruffinus*, *Lib.* 1. *c.* 3. and *Lib* 4. *c.* 2. *Hermes* inſtead of *Hermas*; but it is a fault of the Tranſcriber, for in the *Greek* Text of the laſt Fragment that is extant of the *Philocalia*, it is read *Hermas*, and not *Hermes*; and *Ruffinus* himſelf in other places calls him *Hermas*. Moreover all the ancient Writers, as St. *Clement*, *Tertullian*, *Origen*, *Euſebius*, S. *Jerom*, and others above-mentioned, always call him *Hermas*, and never *Hermes*. *Baronius* and ſome others diſtinguiſh two Books, one written by *Hermes* the Brother of *Pius*, which Treated of *Eaſter*, and the other by our *Hermas*; but ſince they ground their Opinion only on the Authority of modern Writers, in attributing a Book to this pretended *Hermes*, a Perſon unknown to all Antiquity, their Conjecture ſeems to be without any probability.

the

the *Latins*, as is observed by *S. Jerom*, which would not have happened, if it had been composed by the Brother of Pope *Pius*. Hermas.

As for the Authority of this Book, it is certain that it hath been heretofore received in many Churches as Canonical, and that *S. Irenæus*, *S. Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Origen*, and even *Tertullian*, *in Lib. de Oratione*, cite it as a part of Holy Scripture: nevertheless it cannot be doubted, that it hath been rejected by divers other Churches, (*c*) and esteemed only as a Treatise, that might be used to very good purpose for the Edification of Christians: But there have been very few ancient Authors, that have not set a high Esteem on this Book, and it hath been almost always cited by the Fathers, as a Work of great Authority (*d*)

It hath been so much valued by Modern Authors, and there are very few at present that commend it; or that have the same regard to it, as those that lived in the primitive Ages of the Church. And indeed, if we may judge by the Method according to which it is written, and by the things therein contained, it doth not seem to deserve much Esteem. The First Part Entituled the *Visions*, is full of many Revelations, that are explained to *Hermas* by a Woman representing the Church; they all relate to the State of the Church, and the manners of the Christians. The Second Part which is most useful, is called the *Ordinances*, wherein are comprized divers Precepts of Morality, and pious Instructions, which the Pastor or Angel of *Hermas* prescribes to him. The Third Part is called *The Similitudes*, because it begins with several *Similes* or Comparisons, and concludes with Visions. These three Books comprehend very many Moral Instructions concerning the Practice of Christian Virtues; but the great number of Visions, Allegories, and Similitudes, make them tedious, and all these Moral Truths would, in my opinion, have been more useful, if the Author had propounded them simply, as the Apostles have done in their Epistles.

We have lost the Original *Greek* Text of these Three Books; and there remains only a Version which is Printed in the *Orthodoxagrapha*, as also in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, and hath been likewise published separately by *Barthius*, and lastly by *Cotelerius*, together with the *Greek* Fragments extracted from Ancient Authors. It is not known when, nor by whom this Translation was composed; some attribute it to *Ruffinus*: and others affirm, that it was made in the Primitive Ages of Christianity, when the Writings of *Hermas* were not altogether unknown to the *Latins*. However it be, this Version is not amiss, since it exactly agrees with the *Greek* Passages cited by *S. Clement*, *Origen*, *Antiochus*, and some other Ancient Writers.

[There have been other Editions of *Hermas*'s *Pastor*, besides these which M. *Du Pin* mentions: It was first published by *Jacobus Faber* at *Paris*, 1513. Then at *Strasburg*, 1522. And it was lately published from two MS. Copies at *Oxon*, with short Notes in 12°. *A. D.* 1685.]

(*c*) *It cannot be doubted that it hath been rejected by divers other Churches.*] *Origen* acknowledgeth, that it was Thrown out of the Canon of Holy Scripture by many Christians; *Tertullian*, in *Lib. de Pudicitiâ*, replies to certain Persons, who objected it to him, that this Book was rejected by divers Orthodox Churches. *Eusebius*, *S. Athanasius*, *S. Jerom*, and *Ruffinus* above-cited, reckon it among those Writings that are not Canonical, yet such as may be useful for the Instruction of Christians; and *Gelasius* placeth it amongst the Apocryphal Books.

(*d*) *It hath been cited as a Book of great Authority.*] *Tertullian* censures it, but after he turned *Montanist*, *Origen* observes that it was contemned by some Christians, but that he had a great Esteem for it. *S. Jerom* in one place accuseth it of Nonsense, but in others he commends it. *S. Prosper* throws it aside as a Book of no Authority; but it was because he scarce knew it.

S. CLEMENS ROMANUS.

ST. *Clement* the Disciple, and Coadjutor of the Apostles (*a*,) was ordained Bishop of *Rome* after *S. Anacletus* (*b*), in the year of our Lord 93. Divers Books are attributed to him, some of which are really his, others are Ancient tho' suppositious, and others are both counterfeit and modern: And indeed we can only reckon among those that were certainly composed by this Bishop the two Epistles to the *Corinthians*, the first whereof, so famous among the Ancient Authors (*c*.) was undoubtedly written by him. *Irenæus* Book 3. chap. 8. speaks thus. *In the time of St.* Clement. *S. Clemens Romanus.*

(*a*) *St.* Clement *the Disciple and Coadjutor of the Apostles.*] This is the same *Clement* whom *S. Paul* mentions, *Phil.* 4. *v.* 3. reckoning him in the number of those that had laboured together with him in propagating the Gospel, and that had assisted him in his Ministry; *With* Clement *also, and with other my Fellow Labourers, whose Names are in the Book of Life.*

(*b*) *Was ordained Bishop of* Rome *after* Anacletus.] He is reputed by *S. Irenæus*, *Eusebius*, and other ancient Writers, to have been the third Bishop of *Rome*, tho' some affirm, that he was the immediate Successor of *S. Peter*; but it is better in my Opinion to adhere to *S. Irenæus*.

(*c*) *So Famous among the Ancient Authors.*] *S. Irenæus* hath cited it, *Lib.* 3. *chap.* 3. *S. Clemens Alex.* Lib. 1. *Stromat.* p. 289 and *Lib.* 4. *p.* 516. *Lib.* 5. *p.* 686. *Lib* 6. *p.* 647. *Origen*, Lib. 2. Περὶ ἀρχῶν; chap. 3. In *Ioan.* 1 chap. 29. *Euseb.* Lib. 3. chap. 16, and 36. Lib. chap. 22, and 23. *S. Cyrill*, *Catech.* 18. *Epiph. Hæres* 27. N. 7. *Hieron*, in *Lib. de Virus illustribus*, and *Lib. adversus Jovin.* c. 7. *Comment. in Isaiam*, Lib. 14 chap. 52. vers. 13. *Comment. in Ep. ad Ephes.* Lib. 1. chap. 2. vers. 2. Lib 2 *ad* chap. 4. vers. 1. *Autor. Resp. ad Orthodox. apud Just.* Quæst. 74. *Photius*, *Cod.* 113.

(*says*

S. *Clemens Romanus.*

(ſays he) *upon occaſion of a great Diviſion that happened in the Church of* Corinth, *the Church of* Rome *wrote a very pathetical Letter to the* Corinthians, *to reſtore them to Peace, wherein ſhe ſtrengthens their Faith, and preacheth theſe Traditions that they had lately received from the Apoſtles.* This Epiſtle which is cited by S. *Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Euſebius,* S. *Jerom,* and *Photius,* was for a long time concealed, until at length Mr. *Patrick Young* having found it in an ancient Manuſcript (*d*) cauſed it to be Printed at *Oxford, Anno Dom.* 1633.

After the Holy Scriptures, it is in my Opinion, one of the moſt eminent Records of Antiquity. S. *Clement,* therein exhorts the Faithful of the Church of *Corinth,* that was in a diſturbance by the revolt of ſome Chriſtians, who refuſed to ſubmit to their lawful Paſtors, he exhorts them, I ſay, to a Re-union, and to ſeek after Peace; particularly he admoniſheth them to perſevere in the Obedience and Submiſſion that they owed to their Spiritual Guides, he cenſures thoſe that diſturbed the Church, and that promoted ſecret Cabals againſt their Miniſters on purpoſe to ſupplant them; He begins with putting them in mind of the Happineſs of that Peace which they had formerly enjoyed; afterwards he repreſents to them the misfortune of their preſent Diviſions, and proceeds to ſhew by many Examples, what lamentable Conſequences have always attended it, and how diſpleaſing it is to God; Moreover, he adviſeth them to repent, in practiſing Humility, Obedience, and Charity, in imitation of the Humility of *Jeſus Chriſt,* and the Mercy of God, through the Hope of a Reſurrection: From thence he takes an occaſion to recommend to the Faithful, the practice of many Chriſtian Virtues, and the Obſervation of a Regular Diſcipline: He declares to them, that it was very ill done to riſe up againſt the Paſtors and Biſhops that were Conſtituted by the Apoſtles, or Elected by the Faithful after their Death: He aggravates the heinouſneſs of their Crime that were the firſt promoters of this Diviſion, and earneſtly ſollicites them to return to their Duty by obeying their Miniſters, and by reuniting themſelves with the reſt of the Believers. Thus you have an account of the Subject of this Epiſtle written by S. *Clement* in the name of the Church of *Rome* to that of *Corinth,* about the end of the Perſecution raiſed by the Emperor *Domitian.* *The Style thereof* (ſays *Photius*) *is ſimple and clear, and it comes very near the natural and artleſs manner of Expreſſion uſed by the ancient Eccleſiaſtical Authors.* I ſhall add, that one may diſcern a great deal of Energy and Vigour, accompanied with much Prudence, Gentleneſs, Zeal, and Charity.

The ſecond Epiſtle of S. *Clement* is not ſo certainly known to be his; *Euſebius,* S. *Jerome,* and *Photius* obſerve, that there is reaſon to doubt of its being Genuine, becauſe it is not mentioned by the ancient Writers; nevertheleſs ſome of the Fathers have cited both theſe Epiſtles, as if they were of equal Authority (*e*.) The Fragment that is now extant of this laſt Letter publiſhed in *Latin* by *Wendelinus,* and in *Greek* by Mr. *Young,* is an Exhortation to the Practice of Repentance, and of divers Chriſtian Virtues on the account of the Mercy of God, and the Reward that is promiſed to the Faithful.

Beſides theſe two Epiſtles, ſeveral voluminous Books have been attributed to S. *Clement,* even in the Primitive Ages of the Church, that were not his; ſuch were (as *Euſebius* declares in the third Book of his Hiſtory, *chap.* 38.) the Diſputes of S. *Peter* and *Appion,* whereof the ancient Authors have made no mention, and which contain Matters that are far from the Purity of the Apoſtolical Doctrine: We may conjecture, that theſe Writings were part of the Book, Entituled, *Recognitiones Clementis,* which is likewiſe called, *The Voyages, Itinerary, or Acts of St.* Peter: This Work, thô fictitious, is ancient, being cited by *Origen* (*f*,) *Euſebius,* S. *Athanaſius,* S. *Epiphanius,* S. *Jerom,* and the Author of *The Commentaries on* S. *Matthew,* aſcribed to S. *Chryſoſtom*: *Ruffinus* hath made a Tranſlation thereof which is ſtill extant; *Gelaſius* hath inſerted it in the Catalogue of Apocryphal Books; and *Photius* obſerves, that there are Abſurdities and Errors to be found in it: And indeed it is a Writing full of Fables, Tales, Conferences, and ridiculous Diſputes feigned at pleaſure, and pretended to be holden between S. *Peter* and *Simon Magus,* concerning certain Events, and Occurrences that are related after a childiſh manner; but that which is more dangerous, is, that we may eaſily diſcover in ſeveral Paſſages thereof the Opinions of the *Ebionites,* tho' much palliated, together with many other Errors. In ſhort, this Book is of no uſe, if we reflect on the Style and Method in which it is written, or on the Things that are compriſed therein.

(*d*) *In an ancient Manuſcript.*] It is called *The Manuſcript of* Thecla, becauſe it was written with the hand of an ancient Virgin called *Thecla,* who lived, (as is generally believed) in the time of the firſt Council of *Nice.* Theſe Epiſtles have been ſince Printed in the Collection of *Cotelerius,* in *Labbee's* Edition of the Councils, and at *Helmſtadt* in the year 1654. [As alſo at *Oxford* in 1677.

(*e*) *Some of the Fathers have cited both theſe Epiſtles, as if they were of equal Authority*] The Author of the *Apoſtolical Conſtitutions, c. ult.* St. *Epiphan. Hæreſ.* 27. chap. 6. and 30 chap. 15. S. *Jerom, adverſus Jov.* chap. 7. *Photius Cod.* 126. *Damaſus,* Lib. 4. *Orth. Fidei.* S. *Dionyſius* of *Corinth* takes notice but of one ſingle Epiſtle, and there is ſome difference in the ſtyle of the ſecond, which makes us doubt of its Veracity. The Sibyls were heretofore cited therein, if we may give Credit to the Author of the Queſtions attributed to S. *Juſtin*; but he doth not declare, whether it were in the firſt Part, or in the ſecond, and part of the ſecond is loſt. Moreover. S. *Epiphanius* ſeems to mention other Epiſtles of S. *Clement.*

(*f*) *Being cited by* Origen.] *Tom.* 3. *Comment.* in *Geneſ.* in *Philocal.* chap. 22. and in *Matth.* chap. 26. *Euſeb.* lib. 3. *Hiſt.* chap. 3. and chap. 38. *Athanaſ.* in *Synopſ. Epiph. Hæreſ.* 30. chap. 25. *Hieron.* in *Catalog.* and Lib. 1. in *Jovin.* chap. 14. and *Comment. in Ep. ad Galat.* Lib. 1. chap. 18. *Ruffinus de Adulterat. Lib. Orig. Autor. op. imp. in Matth.* chap. 10. verſ. 15, 16, 42. *Photius, Cod,* 112, and 113.

I ſhall

I shall not pass the same censure upon the Apostolical Constitutions that are likewise falsly imputed to St. *Clement*, and which, thô written by a later Author (*g*.) yet contain many things very useful to the Discipline of the Church; It is not known by whom, nor when they were composed (*h*.) All that can be certainly affirmed is, that they are cited by S. *Epiphanius* (*i*.) and the Author of *The Commentary on* St. Matthew, falsly attributed to St. *Chrysostom*; but the passages which are produced by them not perfectly agreeing with those that are found in the Constitutions which are extant at this day, we may be induced to conjecture that they have been since corrupted, and so much the rather, because they are infected with the *Arian* Heresie (*k*.) and several other Errors. This is the Judgment that was given concerning them by the *Greek* Bishops in the Synod that was conven'd in the Imperial Palace of *Constantinople* after the fifth General Council. However, I admire that the Learned *Photius* (*l*) hath not made this Observation, and that he hath imputed the Errors of this Book to its Primitive Author. S. *Clement Romanus.*

It remains only to enquire, whether this Book be the same as that which is mentioned by *Eusebius* (*m*) and St. *Athanasius*, Entituled, *The Doctrine, or the Precepts of the Apostles*, τῶν ἁγίων διδαχαὶ, or διδαχὴ. This is the Opinion of *Nicephorus* (*n*,) *Zonaras*, and *Matthæus Blastares*; but it seems to me to be most probable, that *The Constitutions of the Apostles*, and the Book called their *Doctrine*, were two different Works which the likeness of their Titles hath caused to be confounded (*o*.)

(*g*) *Tho' written by a later Author.*] The Author of the *Recognitions* is not the same with the Author of the *Constitutions*, tho' some have been of this Opinion; for their style is different; the later is well versed in the Principles of the Christian Religion, and in the Rites of the Church, but the other is ignorant of these matters; moreover, they maintain a contrary Doctrine: The Author of the *Constitutions*, in *lib.* 8. *c.* 46. reckons the Sun, Moon and Stars, in the number of inanimate Creatures; whereas the Author of the *Recognitions* imagineth, that they have a Soul, in *lib.* 5. *chap.* 16. Lastly, the Author of the *Constitutions* was not an *Ebionite*, but he that writ the *Recognitions* was.

(*h*) *It is not known by whom, or when they were composed.*] It is certain that they do not belong to the Apostles, as we have already evidently demonstrated.

(*i*) *They are cited by St.* Epiphanius.] In *Hæres.* 45. this Father produceth a passage that is found in the beginning of the *Constitutions*, and in *Hæres.* 80. he cites another, which we read in *Lib.* 1. *Constitut. chap.* 3 concerning the Beads of Priest. In *Hæres.* 25. he quotes a passage taken from *Lib.* 5. *chap.* 14, and 17. relating to the Fasts enjoyned on *Wednesday* and *Friday*, as also on the Days before *Easter*. In *Hæres.* 70, he observes that the *Audians* made use of certain Constiturions, which tho' dubious, ought not altogether to be rejected, as containing nothing contrary to the Faith or Discipline of the Church. This may induce us to believe that the *Constitutions* which are now extant, have been corrupted since the time of *Epiphanius*, because the same thing could not be affirmed of those. Add to this, that in the same place *Epiphanius* cites a passage concerning *Easter*, wherein the Christians are admonished to celebrate that Feast together with the Jews, and the contrary is expresly declared in *Constitut*, *Lib.* 5. *chap.* 17. Moreover, in the same place, he produces other Testimonies, out of the *Constitutions* that are not found therein: Perhaps S. *Epiphanius* had not sufficiently examined this Work, or perhaps he cited it without Book, or on the Report of another; However it be, he acknowledgeth it to be dubious.

(*k*) *Because they are infected with the* Arian *Heresie.*] In *Lib.* 6. *chap.* 25. the Author reckons in the number of Hereticks, those that believe that JESUS *is the same with the God of the Universe*, but this might have been said in opposition to the *Sabellians*; and so much the rather since he adds, *and do not distinguish the Son and the Holy Ghost*. Many other Passages are likewise alledged, wherein he affirms, that the Son and the Word is the Servant, and Minister of God the Father. These are the Phrases used by the ancient Ecclesiastical Writers, but they have been suspected ever since the Council of *Nice*.

(*l*) *That the Learned* Photius.] He censures them on Three several Accounts, in *Cod.* 112. First, *ex malafictione*, from which (as he says) they may be vindicated; Secondly, by reason of some Expressions used by the Author, which are Contradictory to the Book of *Deuteronomy*, and for these he might likewise be excused; and Lastly, he chargeth him with *Arianism*, from which he cannot be cleared without offering him some violence.

(*m*) *Mentioned by* Eusebius.] *Euseb.* Lib. 3. chap. 25 *Athan. in Ep. Fest. & Synopsi.*

(*n*) *Of* Nicephorus.] *Niceph.* in *Stichometria. Zonaras* in *Ep. Ath. Mat. Blastares* in a Collection of Canons that is not Printed.

(*o*) *Which the likeness of their Titles hath caused to be confounded.*] There are many Reasons to prove, that these are two different Books, for first S. *Athanasius* reckons the Book of the *Doctrine of the Apostles, among those that were usually read to the* Catechumens, whereas the Constitutions were composed rather for the use of Bishops, and we find it prohibited in the last Canon to publish them, or to discover the Contents thereof to all sorts of People. Secondly, the Book of *the Doctrine of the Apostles*, contained only Two hundred Verses according to the *Stichometria* of *Nicephorus*, which cannot agree with the Constitutions that are more voluminous. Thirdly, in the Index of Scripture made by *Anastasius Nicenas*, διδαχαὶ and διδασκαλία Κλήμεντος are mentioned as distinct Books, and in some Manuscripts the Constitutions are Entituled διδασκαλία. Fourthly, in the Epitome of S. *Athanasius* διδαχὴ. and κλημεντια are distinguished; therefore this Work was not attibuted to St. *Clement*. Fifthly, when *Eusebius* Discourses of the Writings of S. *Clement*, he takes no notice of the Apostolical Constitutions, neither have the Ancients mentioned them. The *Arians* might have objected them, in Vindication of their Heresie, and the Orthodox would have been obliged to make a Reply, but this is not done by either Party; therefore they are of a later Date, than *the Doctrine of the Apostles*, that was known to *Eusebius*, and S. *Athanasius*. These Reasons howsoever probable they may seem to be, are not altogether Irreprehensible; to the First it is replied, that the Constitutions were made for the use of all Christians, as appears from the first Words thereof; that the last Canon might perhaps be of a later Date; that S. *Athanasius* observes only, that this Book was useful for the instructing of Catechumens in the Discipline, and Faith of the Church, tho' it was not Canonical, which may be very safely affirmed of these Constitutions. In Answer to the Second it is alledged, that there were two Editions of the Costitutions, one more large, being that which is now extant; and another that was an Epitome thereof, and perhaps *Nicephorus* makes mention

S. *Clemens Romanus.*

mention of this laſt under the Name of *The Doctrine of the Apoſtles*: Beſides that there are ſome Manuſcripts wherein there are 6000 Verſes, and beſides the Length of every particular Verſe is not known. Thirdly, that the Diſtinction of διδαχὴ and διδασκαλία is nothing to the purpoſe, the one poſſibly was an Abridgment of the other; neither is it certain whether *The Conſtitutions*, be the Books now called διδασκαλία. Fourthly, the *Clementinæ* are a Work different from the Conſtitutions, as well as *The Doctrine of the Apoſtles*. Laſtly, the ancient Writers have not cited every thing that occurred to them; the *Arians* have not made all the Objections that were obvious; and the Orthodox have not replyed to every particular Circumſtance that might be objected againſt them. Theſe are the Anſwers, that are propounded to thoſe that diſtinguiſh this Book of *The Doctrine of the Apoſtles* from *The Conſtitutions*, and I ſhall leave it to the Determination of the Reader, whether they do not cauſe greater Difficulties; for my part, I believe the former Opinion to be more probable.

It is therefore extremely difficult to determine when the Conſtitutions aſcribed to the Apoſtles firſt appeared, ſince the Author of them is abſolutely unknown, neither can it be proved whether they were at firſt the ſame as they are now. We can only conjecture, that it is moſt probable that the Conſtitutions aſcribed to the Apoſtles, or St. *Clement* belong to the third, or rather the fourth Century; and that they have been from time to time corrected, altered, and augmented, according to the various Cuſtoms of different Ages and Countries (*p.*)

Thoſe that we have at preſent are not in *Greek*. *Crabb* gives us a *Latin* Epitome of them in his Second Edition of the Councils, Printed *Anno* 1557. The firſt entire Verſion that ever appeared, was made by *Bovius*, and inſerted by *Surius* in the Collection of Councils, which he ſet forth in the years 1567, and 1585. *Nicolinus* publiſhed another Tranſlation of the Conſtitutions compoſed by *Turrianus*, together with the Annotations of the ſame Author; this was Printed at *Venice*, in 1563, and at *Antwerp* in 1578. Afterwards *Binius* cauſed it to be Reprinted in his firſt Edition of the Councils, *Anno Dom.* 1606. but he did not think fit to allow it a place in his Second Edition of the year 1608. *Fronto Ducæus*, a Jeſuite, is the firſt that publiſhed a *Greek* and *Latin* Edition of thoſe Conſtitutions at the end of *Zonaras*, which was annexed to the new Collection of Councils. They are divided into eight Books, containing a great number of Precepts relating to Chriſtian Duties, eſpecially to thoſe of Paſtors, and concerning the Ceremonies and Diſcipline of the Church, of all which it would be too tedious to give a particular account. They that are deſirous to be further informed, may have recourſe to the Titles of the Chapters that are prefixed to theſe Tracts.

The laſt Work attributed to St. *Clement*, is a Collection of divers pieces, Entituled, *Clementinæ*, and there hath been a Book under this Title for ſome time: The Author of the Epitome of the H. Scriptures attributed to St. *Athanaſius* mentions them, and after him the Chronicle of *Alexandria*, *Nicephorus Calliſtus* in the Third Book of his Hiſtory, *Chap.* 18. S. *John Damaſcen*, and ſome others (*q.*)

Perhaps this is the ſecond Part of the *Recognitions* cited by *Ruffinus*, for it is a Continuation of the Preachings and Acts of S. *Peter*. The *Greek* and *Latin* Collection, publiſhed by *Cotelerius* under this Name, contains divers Tracts full of Errors in Philoſophy, as alſo of the Hereſie of the *Ebionites*, and is ſuch another Book as the *Recognitions*. There muſt needs have happened ſome Alteration in theſe *Clementinæ*, as well becauſe they do not agree with that which is cited from them by *Maximus*, and by the Author of the Chronicle of *Alexandria*, as becauſe they are infected with the Errors of *Eunomius*; beſides, there is a Paſſage cited by an Author in the Library of the College of *Clermont*, which is not to be found there; and we are informed by *Nicephorus*, that the *Clementinæ* are an Orthodox Work, whereas this (as we have already ſhewn) abounds with Errors. It contains, firſt, two Apocryphal Letters, one of which is attributed to S. *Peter* as written to S. *James*, wherein he adviſeth him not to deliver the Book of his Preachings to the Gentiles, which is followed by a Proteſtation of S. *James*. The other is a Letter of S. *Clement* to S. *James*, which tho' it be Ancient, and Tranſlated by *Ruffinus*, yet is certainly counterfeit; as we ſhall hereafter ſhew when we give an account of the Forgeries of the Decretals of the Popes. To theſe two Epiſtles there are nineteen Homilies annexed relating to the Voyages, Preachings, and Diſputes of S. *Peter*. Moreover at the end of this Work is likewiſe inſerted an Epitome of the Actions of S. *Peter* extracted from the *Clementinæ*, the *Recognitions*, and the Epiſtle of S. *Clement*. *Cotelerius* found three of them in the King's Library, and hath publiſhed but one, which is the ſhorteſt, formerly publiſhed by *Turnebus*, and Printed at *Paris*, *Anno Dom.* 1555. All theſe Writings, which are of very little uſe becauſe they are full of Errors, are only a Contexture of Fables and idle Tales. Laſtly, *Cotelerius* hath added the Records of the Martyrdom of S. *Clement*, concerning the Antiquity whereof we have no aſſurance, and which appear on the contrary to have been compoſed by the modern *Greeks* (*r.*)

(*p*) *That they have been from time to time Corrected, &c. according to the various Cuſtoms of different Ages and Countries.*] It is on this account, that the *Ethiopians* have certain Conſtitutions different from Ours, which are cited by *Anaſtaſius Nicenus*, Cod. 189. in the King's Library, and in his *Queſtions*, Q. 160. where they are much commended.

(*q*) *S.* John Damaſcen *and ſome others.*] S. *Epiphanius* ſeems to quote *Hæreſ.* 26. *n.* 16. as alſo *Anaſtaſius*, Q. 20. *p.* 242. *Maximus in Homil.* 53. and 55. *Cedrenus in Compend. Hiſt. p.* 170, 171. Moreover, it is cited in a Collection of the Works of the Fathers, which is in the Library of the Jeſuits Colledge at *Clermont*, and by *Nicon* in his Pandect.

(*r*) *Which appear on the contrary, to have been Compoſed by the Modern* Greeks.] It is related in theſe Acts that S. *Clement* was ſent beyond Sea, (*ultra mare*) and afterwards into a Deſart near the City, (*in Deſertum urbi vicinum.*) That he found there 2000 Chriſtians condemned to hew Marble out of the Quarries, who intreated him, ſaying, *Ora pro nobis Pontifex, ut digni efficamur promiſſione Chriſti*; *Pray for us O Prieſt, that we may be made worthy of the Promiſe of Chriſt.* That S. *Clement* cauſed a Spring to riſe up in that place, becauſe

becauſe theſe Chriſtians were obliged to fetch water Six Miles off from thence, that they built there within one Year 75 Churches, that they demoliſhed the Temples, and cut down conſecrated Trees to the Number of 300000, that the Empeaor *Trajan* being aſtoniſhed at theſe Actions, ſent thither the Peeſident *Auſidianus*, who cauſed S. *Clement* to be drowned; that whilſt his Diſciples ſought after the Relicks of his Body, the Sea withdrew, and they found it laid in a Tomb of ſtone, and that it was revealed to his Diſciples, that his Body ſhould not be taken away, and that the Sea ſhould retire after the ſame manner every year during ſeven Days, which it continues to do (ſays the Author of theſe Acts) even unto this Day, and this was accompanied with divers Miracles. Here are many Fables that do not agoee with the time of S. *Clement*. Who can imagine that People condemned to hew Stones ſhould find means to Erect 75 Churches, and to pull down an infinite Numbea of Temples? S. *Ephrem*, or rather the Author of the Narrative, which is falſly ſaid to be his, gives an Account of the ſame Miracle, concerning the Sea that was dryed up, to diſcover the Body of S. *Clement*, and adds, that his Child being left in a Tomb, was found alive, and in good health at the end of the year following: But this pretended *Ephrem* is an Author no leſs addicted to Fables, who calls himſelf Archbiſhop of *Cherſona*, thô he never was in that place. S. *Clement Romanus*.

[There have been ſeveral Editions of S. *Clemen*'s Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*, beſides Mr. *Young*'s and *Cotelerius*'s: *Joachim Maderius* Printed it at *Helmſtadt* 1654. in Quarto; *Colmeſius* likewiſe ſet it out at *London* in Octavo, with ſome few Notes 1687; and it was Printed at *Oxon* in 1677 in Twelves. All theſe Editions are in Greek and Latin; Mr. *Burton* who writ Notes upon *Antonius*'s *Itinerary*, as far as it concerned *Britain*, Tranſlated it into Engliſh, and Printed it with Notes in Quarto 1947, at *London*.]

Now it will not be amiſs briefly to recollect all that hath been ſaid concerning the Works of Saint *Clement*, and to declare our Opinion in this matter. The firſt Epiſtle to the *Corinthians* was certainly written by him, and is a good and uſeful Treatiſe. The ſecond is very ancient, thô not of the ſame Authority. The Conſtitutions are an ancient and uſeful Book falſly imputed to S. *Clement*, in which many things have been added and altered in proceſs of time, for which Reaſon ſeveral Errors have crept in among them. The *Recognitions* are an Apocryphal Work, ancient indeed, but abounding with Errors and Fables. The ſame Judgment ought to be given concerning the *Clementinæ*, which are not perhaps ſo ancient, as alſo the Second Part of the *Recognitions*. The Book Entituled, *The Doctrine of the Apoſtles*, may be the ſame with the Original Conſtitutions, but it is more probable that they are a different Work. We can give no account of the Book that bears the Title of *The Precepts of St.* Clement, Διδασκαλία Κλήμεντος. The Voyages or Itinerary of St. *Peter* are the ſame as the *Recognitions* and the *Clementinæ*. The Epitome is an Abridgment of the Apocryphal Writings. The Acts of the Martyrdom of S. *Clement* were compoſed by the modern *Greeks*. The Diſcourſe of *Ephrem* is likewiſe of a later Date. There were alſo certain Sermons aſcribed to S. *Clement* concerning the Juſt Judgment of God and Divine Providence cited by *Anaſtaſius Antiochenus*, *Queſt.* 96. but there is no probability of their being his. The five Decretals are counterfeit; and the Revelations or Apocalypſe of S. *Peter*, heretofore thought to have been written by S. *Clement*, is likewiſe ſuppoſititious. Thus we have given in ſhort, the Judgment that (according to our Opinion) ought to be given of all the Books that are, or have been attributed to S. *Clemens Romanus*, and all that we judge neceſſary to be propounded or explained concerning them in this place.

S. DIONYSIUS *the Areopagite.*

DIONYSIUS the *Areopagite*; who is reputed to have been a Native of *Thrace* (*a*), after he had been converted by S. *Paul*, as it is recorded in the *Acts* (*b*) of the *Apoſtles*; was made Biſhop of *Athens* (*c*), and ſuffered Martyrdom (*d*) in that City. I ſhall not ſpend time in proving that he never came into *France*, and that that S. *Denys* who was the firſt Apoſtle of this Kingdom, is different from the *Areopagite*; this Queſtion has been ſo clearly diſcuſſed in our time (*e*), that there is ſcarcely any one, thô never ſo incredulous that can queſtion it. I could alſo very willingly forbear to give any Account of the Books that are attributed to him, or to ſhew how they have been forged, were it not that the Deſign of my Work obligeth me to this undertaking; therefore I ſhall do it with as much Brevity and Moderation as is poſſible. St. *Dionyſius*, the *Areopagite*.

(*a*) *A Native of* Thrace.] Cæſarius Dialog. 2. *interrogat.* 112. *in Thracia ex qua Dionyſius Areopagite ortus eſt.*

(*b*) *Acts* 17.

(*c*) *Was conſtituted Biſhop of* Athens.] *Dionyſius Corinthius* in *Euſeb. Hiſt.* lib. 3. cap. 4. and lib. 4. cap. 4.

(*d*) *And ſuffered Martyrdom.*] *Ariſtides* in *Uſuardus*, and the other ancient Writers of Martyrologies.

(*e*) *This queſtion hath been ſo clearly diſcuſſed in our time.*] *Sirmondus* publiſhed a Diſcourſe wherein he proves it beyond contradiction; after him *Launoy* wrote ſeveral Tracts to confirm his Opinion, and to ſhew the falſhood of the Records produced by *Hilduinus*, which are urged to authorize the vulgar Opinion; and in a word, to confute all the Arguments that are uſually brought. To which we may add what *Morinus* had ſaid concerning this Queſtion in the beginning of his Book of Ordinations; And though I inſerted nothing relating to this matter in the Text, yet I thought it convenient to ſet down the Opinions of the Learned Men above-mentioned, for the benefit of thoſe that have not read their Works. The firſt Proof is, That it is certain that the Goſpel was Preached later in *France*, than in the other Regions of the World, and that there was no Perſecution in that Country before that of *Valerian*, as it is expreſly atteſted by *Sulpicius Severus* an Author who lived in the Fourth Century. Now if St. *Dionyſius* the

S. Dionyſius *the Areopagite*

Areopagite had been in *France*, the Chriſtian Religion would have been introduced there very early, and there would have been many Martyrs in that Kingdom before the Perſecution of *Valerian*. Secondly, It is evident that *Pothinus* was the firſt that propagated Chriſtianity in *France*; that during his Life, and that of his Succeſſor *Irenæus*, the Faith was only eſtabliſhed in the Provinces of *Vienna* and *Lyons*, and that there were no Martyrs but in theſe two Churches in the time of the Perſecution of *Marcus Aurelius*: therefore there were no other Churches then planted among the *Gauls*. And indeed *Euſebius* mentions no other Churches, or any other Martyrs in *France*, no more than the Chriſtians of the Church of *Lyons* in the Epiſtle that they wrote concerning their Martyrs called by them *Proto-Martyrs*. Thirdly, it is related by *Gregory* of *Tours* in the firſt Book of his Hiſtory, *ch.* 28. on the credit of an ancient Author that compoſed a Treatiſe concerning the Paſſion of St. *Saturnius*, that S. *Denys* and his Companions the Apoſtles of *France*, came thither under the Reign of the Emperor *Decius*, about the year of our Lord 250, to re-eſtabliſh the Faith of Jeſus Chriſt in that Country, which was almoſt entirely extinct after the Death of S. *Irenæus*. Fourthly, there are great numbers of Martyrologies, in which the Feſtivals of S. *Dionyſius* the *Areopagite*, and of S. *Denys* the Apoſtle of *France*, are deſcribed as on two different days, and wherein the place and circumſtances of their Martyrdom are diſtinguiſhed. We may likewiſe draw the ſame Argument from the ancient *Breviaries*, *Miſſals*, *Kalendars* and *Laitanies* in which St. *Denys* the Apoſtle of *France* is reckoned after the Saints that ſuffered under *Marcus Aurelius*. Fifthly, the Author of the Life of S. *Fuſcianus*, *Fulbertus*, *Carnutenſis*, and *Letbaldus*, diſtinguiſh two *Denys*'s. Sixthly, the opinion of thoſe that affirm, that S. *Denys* the Apoſtle of *France* is the ſame with the *Areopagite*, was unknown before the Ninth Century, neither doth the Monk that wrote the Life of our S. *Denys* in the year 750, ſay one word concerning this matter. *Hilduinus*, who is the firſt that mentions it, is a very Fabulous Author, who tells abundance of Lies, and cites a Book written by one named *Viſbius*, which is plainly forged; on the credit of which wretched Author he builds up the Opinion of thoſe that confound the two S. *Denys*'s.

We muſt obſerve Firſt, that the manner of the firſt appearing of thoſe Books ought to be ſuſpected; for it is certain, that being unknown to all Antiquity, they were firſt quoted by the *Severian* Hereticks, in a Conference holden between them, and the Orthodox Biſhops at *Conſtantinople* in the Palace of the Emperor *Juſtinian* 532 Years after the Nativity of Jeſus Chriſt. The ſilence of all the ancient Eccleſiaſtical Writers, is without doubt a very great prejudice to them; for who can imagine that ſo conſiderable an Author as S. *Denys* (if theſe Books had been really Compoſed by him) ſhould have been unknown to *Euſebius* and S. *Jerom*. And who can believe, that if they had known them, they ſhould take no notice of them, when they Compoſed an exact Catalogue of all the Authors, of whom they had any knowledge; not omitting even thoſe, that had ſo little Reputation that they were ſcarcely heard of in the World? Is it poſſible that *Euſebius* in making mention of *Dionyſius* the *Areopagite* in two ſeveral places, ſhould not have obſerved according to his uſual Method, that he had written ſeveral Books. St. *Jerom* in his Epiſtle to *Magnus* doth not omit the Teſtimony of one ſingle Author, to prove that it is lawful to make uſe of profane Books, whereas the Writings of S. *Denys*, might have ſerved as a notable Proof; why then doth he not ſpeak ſo much as one word concerning them? He gives us an Account in his Catalogue, of *Quadratus* Biſhop of *Athens*, and of *Ariſtides* the *Athenian* Philoſopher; is it poſſible that S. *Denys* ſhould be more obſcure than theſe two Writers, or leſs eſteemed by S. *Jerom*? How could it happen, that all the ancient Writers that mention S. *Dionyſius* the *Areopagite*, as *Dionyſius Corinthius*, S. *Chryſoſtom*, S. *Ambroſe*, S. *Auguſtine*, and the Author of the *Dialogues* aſcribed to S. *Cæſarius* the *Brother* of S. *Gregory Nazianzen*, ſhould give us no Intimation of theſe Books? In ſhort, why were theſe Books which contain many things relating to the Doctrine and Diſcipline of the Chriſtian Church, and that would have been of great Authority, as proceeding from ſo ancient and conſiderable an Author as S. *Dionyſius* the *Areopagite*, never cited, either for or againſt any Heretick, or for the Illuſtration of any point of Diſcipline before the ſixth Age of the Church? Furthermore admitting, that they had appeared even at that time, as Books of whoſe Antiquity and Truth there could be no ſcruple; if they had been then produced by the Orthodox as ancient Records, if they had been rejected by none, would not this be a matter of great moment? But who are they that produce them? They are Hereticks who have been uſed to quote counterfeit Records. How do they cite them? As uncertain Books, *ſicut ſuſpicamini*, ſay the Catholicks. To what end do they produce them? To eſtabliſh their Errors. Againſt whom do they cite them? Againſt the Orthodox. And what do they reply? This ought to decide the Controverſie; let us then hearken to them, and let us give credit to their Teſtimony, rather than to that of the Hereticks: *How can you prove* (ſay the Orthodox Biſhops to the *Severian*) *that theſe Records which you affirm to belong to S.* Dionyſius *the* Areopagite, *are Genuine, as you may imagine; for if they were his, they could not have been unknown to S.* Cyril *of happy Memory; but why do we only mention S.* Cyril? *If S.* Athanaſius *had believed that they had been written by S.* Dionyſius, *would not he have made uſe of their Authority in the Council of* Nice, *to prove the Conſubſtantiality of the Trinity againſt the blaſphemies of* Arius? *If they have not been cited by any of the ancient Writers, how can you demonſtrate, that they were written by him?* Thus the Orthodox then argued; but having ſince peruſed theſe Books, and finding nothing therein, that is contrary to the Catholick Faith, they admitted them without much Examination; thô there have always been ſome Criticks, who have queſtioned them. *Photius* ſays in the beginning of his *Bibliotheca*, that one *Theodorus* wrote a Book by way of reply to the Objections that were generally urged againſt theſe Books, and he produceth the Objections that were propounded by this Author, but takes no notice of the Anſwers that he had annexed to them, which is an Argument that he thought them to be of no great ſtrength.

2. The ſtyle and method of theſe Books is very far from the manner of writing uſed in the Firſt and Second Centuries, as being ſwelling and two much affected; the Author purpoſely leaves ordi-

nary

hary and natural Expreſſions, to make uſe of thoſe that are lofty and Figurative; he Amplifies every thing, even that which ought to be recited after the moſt ſimple manner, he uſes a great deal of Artifice in the diſpoſing of his Periods, and obſerves an exact Method in the Order of his Arguments; which ſhews that it was written by a Philoſopher, who had leiſure to reviſe and poliſh it with much Care and Study, which doth not agree with the Character of S. *Dionyſius* the *Areopagite*, nor with the way of writing in his time. *St. Dionyſius*, the *Areopagite.*

3. Neither are the Contents of theſe Books conformable to the *Genius* of the Age, wherein S. *Dionyſius* the *Areopagite* lived. The Chriſtians were employed in theſe primitive Times, in Compoſing Three ſorts of Books, Apologies for their Religion, Epiſtles for the Inſtruction of the Faithful, and to exhort them to ſuffer Martyrdom; and Laſtly, Treatiſes againſt the Hereticks: Now theſe Writings attributed to S. *Denys* plainly relate to another Subject, and have a quite different Deſign; for his principal Intention is to treat of Myſteries after a curious and exquiſite manner, and to expound them according to the Principles of *Plato*'s Philoſophy, and even in *Platonick* Terms. He is not content to propound them with the ſimplicity of the ancient, but he applies himſelf nicely to enquire into all the Difficulties that might occur therein, and to raiſe divers Queſtions more curious than uſeful concerning the Nature of God, and the different Orders of Angels: He explains the Doctrine of the Trinity more diſtinctly, even than S. *Athanaſius* himſelf: He plainly rejects the Errors of the *Neſtorians*, *Eutychians*, *Anthropomerphites*. He ſpeaks of the Church as in a proſperous Condition, and enjoying Peace; neither doth he make any mention of Perſecutions or Martyrs: He diſtinguiſhes the ſeveral Orders of Angels, and obſerves their difference, things that were unknown to the ancient Writers, and concerning which they were not ſollicitous to be informed, as S. *Irenæus* aſſures us, in *Lib.2. chap.*55. and S. *Cyril Catech. Illum.* 11, Upon the whole matter, if we compare theſe Writings with thoſe of the other ancient Authors, we ſhall find that there can be nothing more different, either as to their Style and Method, or as to the Matters therein contained.

We ſhall now proceed to give particular Proofs whereby it will plainly appear, that theſe Books were not written by S. *Dionyſius* the *Areopagite*, and there are two ſorts of theſe, ſome proving that they cannot belong to S. *Denys*, others ſhewing that they were compoſed by an Author who lived after the Fourth Century. I ſhall begin with the Arguments which prove that thoſe Books do not belong to S. *Denys*. 1. The Author of the Book, *de Divinis Nominibus*, Dedicates it to *Timothy*, and then cites an Epiſtle of S. *Ignatius*. Now *Timothy* was dead when S. *Ignatius* wrote his Epiſtles, and *Oneſimus* ſucceeded him; and beſides, he calls *Timothy* his Son, and yet he muſt needs be older than S. *Denys*. He cites and explains the Goſpel according to S. *John*, and the Apocalypſe, which were ſcarcely written when *Dionyſius* the *Areopagite* was alive: And yet he declares in thoſe Books, that he was but a young Man. He cites the Revelation, as undoubtedly included in the Canon of Holy Scripture, and yet it was very much queſtioned in the Primitive Ages of the Church, whether it were Canonical or not. The ſame Reflection may be likewiſe made upon his Citations, taken from the Second Epiſtle of S. *John*, and that of S. *Jude*. 3. He rejects the Error of the Millenaries which could not have appeared in his time. 4. He expreſly produceth in *Lib. de Divinis Nomin. chap.* 4. certain Paſſages out of the Epiſtle of S. *Ignatius* to the *Romans*, written by this Biſhop a little before his Martyrdom; whereas S. *Ignatius* was put to Death under the Reign of the Emperor *Trajan*, and S. *Dionyſius* the *Areopagite*, under that of *Domitian*, and conſequently the later was dead, when the former wrote this Epiſtle. *Maximus* replies that this Citation is added, but there are Three or Four entire Lines that relate to this matter, which there is no reaſon to diſallow. 5. This Author affirms, that he was preſent at the Death of the Virgin *Mary*, but S. *Dionyſius* the *Areopagite* was not Converted at that time; for it is generally believed, that ſhe died Fifteen years after the Crucifixion of Jeſus Chriſt, and S. *Paul* who Converted S. *Denys* came not to *Athens* till Seventeen years after our Saviour's Paſſion.

Laſtly, There are many Reaſons, by which it may be proved, that this Author wrote after the Fourth Century; For, 1. He treats of the Myſteries of the Holy Trinity, and the Incarnation in ſuch Terms as were not known till after the Fourth Age of the Church; he uſed the word *Hypoſtaſis* to ſignifie *the Divine Perſons*, (c.7. *Cæleſt.Hier.* c.1. *de Divinis Nominibus*) whereas it is well known, that this word was not uſed in this Senſe, till after the end of the Fourth Century. 2. In *Lib. de Cæleſti Hierarchia cap. ult.* He confirms the Baptiſm of Infants by an ancient Tradition: *We declare that* (ſays he) *which our Biſhops have taught us according to an ancient Tradition.* Could this have been written by S. *Dionyſius* the *Areopagite*, or rather, doth not this ſhew, that he that diſcourſeth thus, is a much later Author than this Biſhop of *Athens*? 3. He deſcribes the ſolemn Adminiſtration of Baptiſm as it was, when the Church being delivered from Perſecution, began to practice the ancient Ceremonies with exterior Pomp and Splendor. 4. He ſpeaks of Churches built on purpoſe, wherein there was a Sanctuary ſeparated from the reſt of the Churches; as alſo of the perfuming of Altars with incenſe, and of divers Ceremonies relating to the *Energumens*, *Catechumens*, and *Penitents*, which were not obſerved in thoſe Primitive times. 5. It is certain, that the Inſtitution of Monks is not ſo ancient as St. *Denys*, and that they were not conſecrated till long after the Age wherein he lived. Yet the Author of the *Divine Hierarchy* in *chap.*6. mentions them, as being more ancient than himſelf, and adds that his Inſtructers called them *Therapeutæ* or *Monks*; and he gives an Account of the manner of their Conſecration, and diſtinguiſheth ſeveral ſorts of them. 6. He often cites the Eccleſiaſtical Authors that lived before him, who wrote concerning matters that were only debated in the 4th Century, ſuch were the diſtinctions between Love and Charity, the Opinions relating to the ſeveral Functions and Orders of Angels, as alſo the Lot by which S. *Matthias* was elected, the Prayers that

S. Dionyſius *the Areopagite*

were recited at Maſs, which he declares to have been received from their Anceſtors by Tradition; The Baptiſm of Infants, of which he affirms the ſame thing; The Funeral Rites and Solemnities, the Ceremonies of Baptiſm, and many other Cuſtoms. Laſtly, he cites St. *Clemens Alexandrinus* under the name of *Clement* the Philoſopher, and the paſſage of this Author produced by him, is taken from *Stromat. lib.* 8. which ſhews that he ſpeaks of St. *Clement*, who lived in the Third Age of the Church.

However many Arguments are alledged to prove the Verity and Antiquity of theſe Books, which nevertheleſs may be very eaſily confuted in a few words. It is objected firſt, That it is affirmed, by *Maximus*, *Anaſtaſius Sinaita*, and *Cypariſſiota*, that St. *Dionyſius Alexandrinus* compoſed *Scolia*, or Annotations on the Books of *Dionyſius* the *Areopagite de Nominibus Divinis*. 2. That St. *Athanaſius in Queſt.* 4. *ad Antiochum*, and *Origen*, in his firſt Homily on St. *John* quotes the Writings of *Dionyſius* the *Areopagite*, and that St. *Gregory* the Great calls him an ancient Father; St. *Gregory Nazianzen* ſeems likewiſe to cite him in *Hom.* 38. 42. where after having declared that the repetition of the word *Holy* thrice, relates to one and the ſame Lordſhip, and to one and the ſame Divinity, he adds, *as another hath very excellently and very clearly Philoſophized before us*, which may well be applied to the Author of the Hierarchy, who lived before the time of St. *Gregory Nazianzen*, and whoſe Philoſophy was very ſublime: Moreover, S. *Denys* is cited by S. *Chryſoſtom* in his Sermon of falſe Prophets; *Where is* (ſays he) *St.* Ignatius *the Tabernacle of God, where is* Dionyſius *the* Areopagite, *the Eagle of Heaven?* deſigning by this Expreſſion to ſet forth the magnificence of his ſtyle. There is a compariſon *in Lib. de Divinis Nominibus, chap.* 3. of an Anchor that attracts us to it more than we drew it to us, which St. *Clemens Alexandrinus* ſeems to have taken from S. *Denys*. Laſtly, *Nicephorus* affirms, that *Juvenalis* Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, who aſſiſted at the Council of *Chalcedon*, in replying to *Pulcheria* concerning the Sepulchre and Death of the Virgin *Mary*, made uſe of the words of S. *Dionyſius* the *Areopagite*. All theſe Arguments ſeem to prove, that the Books *de Hierarchia & de Nominibus Divinis*, were written by S. *Denys*, or at leaſt that they are more ancient than the Fourth Century.

But if we examine theſe Objections, they will appear all very weak: For 1. We ought not to believe on the Teſtimony of *Anaſtaſius* and *Maximus*, that *Dionyſius Alexandrinus*, the Diſciple of *Origen*, compoſed any Annotations upon the Writings of *Dionyſius* the *Areopagite*, ſince *Euſebius* and S. *Jerom*, who took a Catalogue of the Works of this Saint, did not mention it; whence we ought to infer, either that it was another *Dionyſius Alexandrinus*, or that ſome *Grecian* hath forged Commentaries on the Books attributed to S. *Dionyſius* the *Areopagite*, under that name. 2. The Book Entituled, *Queſtiones ad Antiochum*, cited under the name of St. *Athanaſius*, and the Homilies on ſeveral places of the New Teſtament aſcribed to *Origen* are alledged to no purpoſe, becauſe it is certain that theſe Books are falſly attributed to St. *Athanaſius* and *Origen*, as it is generally agreed. 3. St. *Gregory Nazianzen* doth not cite St. *Denys* by name; *Elias Cretenſis* is of opinion that Saint *Athanaſius* is here meant, and indeed the paſſage quoted by St. *Gregory Nazianzen* concerning the *Triſagion* is found word for word in one of the Homilies of St. *Athanaſius*, who living before St. *Gregory* might be cited by him. 4. The Sermon quoted under the name of S. *Chryſoſtome*, was without queſtion not written by this Father, but by *John the Faſter*, Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*; and though it really belonged to the former, yet he takes no notice of the Writings of St. *Denys*, but only extols him as a great Saint. Laſtly, it is more probable that the Author of the Treatiſe *De Divinis Nominibus*, hath borrowed the ſimilitudes from St. *Clemens Alexandrinus*, whom he cites in another place, than that St. *Clement* ſhould have taken them from him.

As for the Authority of *Nicephorus* and other modern Writers, it proves nothing elſe, but that theſe Books were attributed to St. *Dionyſius* the *Areopagite* when they wrote, and this is agreed on all ſides, for after they firſt appeared in the beginning of the Sixth Century, they ſoon got a great deal of Reputation and Authority; They are cited by St. *Ephrem* in a Treatiſe that he compoſed in vindication of the Synod of *Chalcedon*; The Monk *Jobius*, *Andreas Cæſarienſis*, *Leontius*, *Anaſtaſius Sinaita*, *Suidas*, *Nicephorus*, and many other modern *Greeks*, make honourable mention of them; and *Joannes Scythopolitanus*, *Maximus*, and *Pachymeres*, wrote Commentaries on this Author. Among the Latins, *Gregory* the Great cites them with great applauſe; *Joannes Scotus Erigena* tranſlated them into *Latin*, and *Anaſtaſius* the Library-Keeper ſent this Verſion to *Charles* the Bald, with a Preface and Annotations. But the Teſtimony of theſe modern Authors is of very little moment in this matter, and only proves, that theſe Books were then thought to belong to St. *Dionyſius* the *Areopagite*; On the contrary, the Reaſons that we have already alledged are ſufficient to convince all Perſons that are Ingenuous and of a clear Judgment, that they were forged about the end of the Fifth Century, or at the beginning of the Sixth, for the time when they firſt appeared cannot be preciſely determined; but it is certain, that they were written ſince the Fourth Century, and before the middle of the Sixth. Moreover it cannot be affirmed, that the Works of ſome other *Denys* might accidentally be imputed to St. *Dionyſius* the *Areopagite*, it being evident that the Author of theſe Books affects to ſeem to have lived in the time of the Apoſtles.

We ſhall here ſubjoin a Catalogue of the Works that have been publiſhed under the name of St. *Dionyſius* the *Areopagite*; A Book *concerning the Celeſtial Hierarchy*, another *of the Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchy*, a Treatiſe *of the Divine Attributes*, another *of Myſtical Divinity*, together with Ten Epiſtles, whereof the Four firſt are written to the Monk *Cajus*, the fifth to *Dorotheus*, the ſixth to the Prieſt *Soſipater*, the ſeventh to the Biſhop *Polycarp*, the eighth to the Monk *Demophilus*, the ninth to the Biſhop *Titus*, and the tenth to St. *John*. All theſe belong to the ſame Author, who hath

likewiſe

likewise composed some others which are cited by himself; A Book *concerning Symbolical Theology* (*f*) another treats *of the Soul* (*g*,) another *of Divine Hymns* (*h*,) another *of Theological Instructions*; a Treatise *concerning the just Judgment of God* (*i*,) and another *of those things that are understood by the Mind, and of those that may be perceived by the Senses* (*k*;) but these are lost. The others have been often Printed in *Greek* and in *Latin* separately (*l*,) and were published in *Greek* and *Latin* by *Lanselius* at *Paris*, *Anno Dom.* 1615. afterwards at *Antwerp* in 1634, and again at *Paris* 1644, by the Jesuit *Corderius*. together with the Commentaries of *Pachymeres* and *Maximus*.

S. Dionysius *the Areopagite.*

(*f*) Cited *cap.* 15. *lib. de Cæleſt. Hier. cap.* 1. and 13. de *div. nom. cap.* 3. de *Myſt. Theolog.* and *Ep.* 9.

(*g*) C. 4. *lib.* de *div. nom.*

(*h*) C. 1 and 2. *de divin. nomin.* and *cap.* 3. *lib.* de *Myſt. Theolog.*

(*i*) *Lib. de Cæleſt. Hier.* c. 7.

(*k*) C. 1, and 2. de *Cæleſt. Hier.*

(*l*) *Often Printed in* Greek *and in* Latin *ſeparately.*] In *Greek* by *Merellus* in the year 1562, with the *Scholia* of *Maximus* and *Pachymeres*; at *Baſil* in 1539, and at *Venice* in 1558, in *Latin*, of the Verſion of *Ambroſius Camaldulenſis*, at *Strasburg* in 1468, and in 1502, with the Notes of *Jacobus Faber Stapulenſis*; in 1504, at *Alcala* of the Tranſlation of *Ficinus*; at *Colen* by *Quentelius in* 1546. In this Edition they have put in the Verſion of *Scotus Erigena*, *Petrus Sarraſinus*, *Ambroſius Camaldulenſis*, and *Marſilius Ficinus*, together with a Paraphraſe by the Abbot *de Verceil*, and the Annotations of *Dionyſius Carthuſianus*. *Perionius* finding theſe Verſions too obſcure, made a new Tranſlation, which was Printed at *Colen*, at *Paris* in 1557, and 1567, and at *Lyons* in 1585. *Clauſerus* likewiſe made another Tranſlation that was Printed at *Strasburg* in 1546. The Book *de Myſtica Theologia* was Printed with the Notes of a Divine at *Paris*, in *Quarto*, in the year 1626.

St. *IGNATIUS.*

IGNATIUS Sirnamed *Theophorus* (*a*,) was the Succeſſor of *Evodius* (*b*) in the Epiſcopal See of *Antioch*, about the year of your Lord 70. He governed this Church for the ſpace of almoſt Forty years with admirable Prudence and Conſtancy, and at laſt ſuffered Martyrdom in the Tenth Year of the Reign of *Trajan*, when this Holy Prelate having profeſſed the Faith even in the preſence of the Emperor himſelf with great Courage, (if we may believe the Acts of his Martyrdom) was condemned to be expoſed to wild Beaſts in the *Amphitheatre* at *Rome*: And he is reputed to have wrote his Epiſtles to ſeveral Churches, in the way as he was carried a Priſoner in Chains to that City, for maintaining the truth of the Chriſtian Religion; but ſince there are very great difficulties concerning the number and different Editions of theſe Epiſtles, it will be neceſſary to draw up their Hiſtory, and to produce the Teſtimony of Authors that have mentioned them ſince his time.

S. *Ignatius.*

Immediately after the death of this Holy Martyr, *Polycarp* Biſhop of *Smyrna*, his Diſciple, collected theſe Epiſtles, and ſent them to the Chriſtians of *Philippi*, as appears from a Letter that he wrote to them, and which cannot be queſtioned without contradicting, not only *Euſebius*, S. *Jerom*, and *Photius*, the moſt renowned Criticks of Antiquity, but alſo S. *Irenæus* himſelf the Diſciple of S. *Polycarp*, who cites this Epiſtle, and commends it in theſe words: *There is an Epiſtle of* Polycarp *to the Chriſtians of* Philippi *which is extremely accurate, and very proper to ſhew the character of the Faith, and the Doctrine of the Truth, to thoſe that take any care of their Salvation.* Moreover we have not only an approbation of St. *Polycarp*'s Epiſtle by S. *Irenæus*, to prove the Authority of S. *Ignatius*'s, but it is likewiſe evident, that this Father had read theſe Epiſtles: *Irenæus* (ſays *Euſebius*) *was not ignorant of the Martyrdom of S.* Ignatius, *and mentions his Epiſtles in theſe words: Thus one of our* Brethren *being condemned for maintaining the Faith, to be expoſed to the wild Beaſts, ſaid,* (*c*) *I am the Wheat of God, and ſhall be ground by the Teeth of wild Beaſts, that I may become the Bread of* Jeſus Chriſt. The words recited by S. *Irenæus* in *Lib.* 5. *contra Hæreſ. cap.* 28. are alſo found at preſent in the Epiſtle of S. *Ignatius* to the *Romans*. *Origen* hath cited the Epiſtles of S. *Ignatius*, and that which he produceth in two ſeveral places, is read in thoſe that are now extant. *I have found it written* (ſays he in his 6th Homily on S. *Luke*) *in the Epiſtle of a certain Martyr, I mean* Ignatius *Biſhop of* Antioch, *who was expoſed to wild Beaſts at* Rome, *I have found it written* (I ſay) *very elegantly, that the Virginity of* Mary *was unknown to the Prince of this World.* This paſſage is word for word in

(*a*) *Sirnamed* Theophorus.] This is not an Epithet, but his Sirname. Some have believed, that he was that young Child, whom Jeſus Chriſt placed in the middle of his Apoſtles, and that from thence he took the Name of *Theophorus*, but this is a vain Imagination without any ground, not ſupported by the Teſtimony of any ancient Author; and beſides, it contradicts the Opinion of St. *Chryſoſtom*, who declares that S. *Ignatius* never ſaw our Saviour in the Fleſh.

(*b*) *The Succeſſor of* Evodius.] S. *Chryſoſtom*, *Theodoret*, and the Author of the Chronicle of *Alexandria* affirm, that he was ordained by S. *Peter*; but *Euſebius* S. *Jerom* and the other ancient Eccleſiaſtical Writers, place *Evodius* between S. *Peter* and S. *Ignatius*.

(*c*) *Wild Beaſts ſaid.*] In citing the Teſtimony of any Author, we ſay, *as he ſays*, or *as he writes*, without uſing any Choice; and it ought not to be concluded from thence, that S. *Irenæus* only produced a remarkable Expreſſion of S. *Ignatius*, without taking it from any of his Works, for it is much more probable, that he took it from his Epiſtle to the *Romans*, becauſe it is found there word for word.

the

St. Ignatius.

the Epiſtle of S. *Ignatius* to the *Epheſians*. The Second paſſage quoted by *Origen* is in his Commentary on the *Canticles*. *We remember* (ſays he) *the Expreſſion of a Saint named* Ignatius *in ſpeaking concerning* Jeſus Chriſt, *my Love is Crucified, and I do not believe that he ought to be reprehended on this Account.* Theſe are the Teſtimonies taken from Authors who wrote in the Second and Third Centuries; in the Fourth, *Euſebius* cites the Epiſtles of S. *Ignatius*, declares their number, and gives us a Catalogue of them. He ſays in the Third Book of his Hiſtory, *chap.* 36. that this Holy Martyr being carried from *Aſia* into *Italy*, confirmed the Churches of the ſeveral Cities, through which he paſſed, in the Faith, and admoniſhed them to avoid Hereſies by conſtantly adhering to the Tradition of the Apoſtles; and that being arrived at *Smyrna*, where (*l*) *Polycarp* was then Biſhop, he wrote four Letters; The firſt to the Church of *Epheſus*, wherein he mentions *Oneſimus* their Paſtor; The ſecond to the *Magneſians*, wherein he ſpeaks of *Damas* their Biſhop; The third to the *Trallians*, where he names Biſhop *Polybius*; and the laſt to the Church of *Rome*, wherein he intreats the *Romans* not to deprive him through the fervour of their Prayers of the Crown of Martyrdom. Afterwards he recites a large fragment of this Epiſtle, and adds, *that being departed from* Smyrna, *and arrived at* Troas, *he wrote to the* Philadelphians, *as alſo to the Church of* Smyrna, *and particularly to S.* Polycarp *their Biſhop, recommending to him the care of the Church of* Antioch, *as unto a good Paſtor worthy of thoſe Apoſtolical times.* he cites likewiſe a Fragment of the Epiſtle to the Inhabitants of *Smyrna*, and confirms what he had before alledged by the Atteſtations of S. *Irenæus*, and S. *Polycarp*. It is evident from this paſſage, that in the time of *Euſebius* there were Seven Letters, which were eſteemed undoubtedly to be S. *Ignatius*'s, and that they were the very ſame with thoſe that are ſtill extant, becauſe they were written from the ſame places, to the ſame Perſons, and on the ſame Subject, and contain all the Paſſages that are produced by *Euſebius* word for word, after whom theſe very Epiſtles were unanimouſly allowed by the whole Church, and cited by an infinite number of Eccleſiaſtical Authors. S. *Athanaſius* who could not be led by the Authority of *Euſebius*, whoſe Hiſtory perhaps he had never ſeen, ſets down in his Book of the Synods, a paſſage of this ancient Biſhop, which is in the Epiſtle to the *Epheſians*. S. *Chryſoſtom* in the Oration, that he made in the Commendation of S. *Ignatius*, recites this famous Sentence taken from his Epiſtle to the *Romans*: *Would to God that I might ere long fight with Beaſts*, and in another Oration, if that be really his, (*d*) he quotes a paſſage of the Epiſtle to S. *Polycarp*.

S. *Jerom* acknowledgeth the Seven Epiſtles of S. *Ignatius* mentioned by *Euſebius* to be Genuine: they are reckoned in his Catalogue of Authors, and cited by him in divers other places of his Works. The Learned *Theodoret* uſes the Authority of the Letters of this Father, as certainly written by him, againſt the Heretieks, and in his Dialogues produceth many large paſſages out of the Epiſtles to the *Smyrneans*, *Epheſians*, and *Trallians*, that are expreſſed after the very ſame manner, as they are Printed in the Editions of *Voſſius* and Biſhop *Uſher*. *Geſaſius* likewiſe cites a paſſage of the Epiſtle to the Chriſtians of *Smyrna* on the ſame Subject in his Treatiſe concerning the two Natures of Jeſus Chriſt? The Author of the Book of the *Divine Attributes*, aſcribed to *Dionyſius* the *Areopagite*, produceth a Sentence taken from that to the *Romans*. S. *Ephrem* in the ſixth Century (according to the report of *Photius*, Cod. 228.) hath cited the Writings of S. *Ignatius*: *Gildas de Excidio Britanniæ*, produceth a large paſſage of the Epiſtle to the *Romans*: The Monk *Jobius* (as it is related by *Photius*, Cod. 222.) quotes another of that to the *Smyrneans*: *Leontius* oppoſeth the Authority of S. *Ignatius* to the Heretieks in *Lib. de Sect. Act.* 3. *Anaſtaſius Sinaita* of the Seventh Century, in his Book Entituled ὁδηγὸς (*The Guide*) ſets down a paſſage taken from the Epiſtle to the *Romans*, and *Antiochus* a Monk of *Paleſtine*, in his 124th Homily to *Euſtathius* concerning *the Honour, that is due to the Biſhops*, recites many paſſages of thoſe to *Polycarp*, the *Philadelphians* and *Trallians*, S. *Maximus* acknowledgeth the Works of S. *Ignatius*, and *Theodorus* in the Eighth Century (whom *Photius* mentions *Cod.* 1.) produceth divers paſſages thereof, as alſo *Andreas Cretenſis* a Writer of the Ninth Century, in *Hom.* 2. *de Virgine*; and *Singelus* in his *Panegyrick* upon S. *Dionyſius* the *Areopagite*: To theſe may be added, *Simeon Metaphraſtes* in the Tenth Century, *Honorius* Biſhop of *Autun* in the Twelfth, *Nicetas Choniates* in the Thirteenth; and Laſtly, *Nicephorus Caliſtus* in the Fourteenth: This ſhews that the Epiſtles of S. *Ignatius* have been allowed by the Church in all Ages, as authentick Records; but the modern *Grecians* ſince the time of S. *Joannes Damaſcen* have uſed other Letters, that are not named by *Euſebius*, whereas before, the Seven Epiſtles mentioned by *Euſebius* and S. *Jerom* were only cited.

Having produced the ſeveral Teſtimonies of the Ancients, concerning the Epiſtles that are attributed to S. *Ignatius*, we ſhall now proceed to ſhew what Judgment hath been given by the Moderns concerning the ſame, and for the better underſtanding of this matter, it ſeems to be neceſſary in the beginning, to ſet down a Catalogue of the different Editions of theſe Epiſtles that have been made in our time.

The firſt Edition of the Epiſtles of S. *Ignatius*, was publiſhed at *Paris*, *Anno Dom.* 1494. which did not contain any of the Seven that are recited by *Euſebius*, but only the Three *Latin* Letters, one whereof

(*d*) *If that be really his*] We find this Oration in the ſixth Tome of his Works, it is *Entituled*, *Quod unus ſit Veteris & Novi Teſtamenti Legiſlator*. It hath been cited by Pope *Adrian*. 1. In his Epiſtle to *Charles* the Great. *Epiphanius* the Deacon hath likewiſe alledged it againſt *Gregorius Neocæſarienſis*; it is quoted alſo by *Theodoſius* in the Second Council of *Nice*. The Style doth not ſeem to be that of S. *Chryſoſtom*, as being full of Allegories; ſome ſay that it ſeems to have been written about the time of the declining of the *Roman* Empire, through the Incurſions of the Barbarous Nations, which are mentioned therein; nevertheleſs, it may be underſtood of the inroads of the *Arabians* that were made under the Reign of the Emperor *Valens*. Others think that this paſſage is put in ſince.

was written to the Virgin *Mary*, and the other two to S. *John*. In the Year 1498, Eleven were Printed in *Latin*, which being revised by *Clictoveus*, were Reprinted at *Strasburg* in 1502, 1515, and 1527, as also by *Henry Peter* at *Basil*, in 1520. Not long after *Champerius* added three others, and one written to *Maria Cassobolita*, which he caused to be Printed at *Colen*, by *Quentelius* in 1536. together with the Commentaries of *Dionysius Carthusianus* on the Works attributed to S. *Dionysius* the *Areopagite*; afterwards they were Printed at *Antwerp* in 1540. at *Alcala* in 1541. at *Basil* in 1530, and 1540. at *Zurick* in 1546, 1550, 1557, and 1560. at *Paris* in 1569, 1575, and 1610. at *Colen* in 1570. at *Basil* in 1569, and 1628. at *Louvain* in 1568. and at *Antwerp* in 1572. In the Year 1557, they were set forth at *Colen*, according to the Version of *Perionius*, *Pacæus* gave us the *Greek* Text. In 1557, 1558, and 1562 *Morellus* procured them to be Printed in *Greek*, at *Paris* in *Octavo*. Moreover, *Gesner* published them in *Greek*, in 1559, with the Translation of *Brunnerus*. In the Year 1566. they were published at *Antwerp*, being corrected from certain Manuscripts by *Vairlenius*, and Printed by *Plantin*, *Mestræus* set forth a new Edition of them in 1608. *Vedelius* a Protestant caused them to be Printed with large Annotations in *Quarto*, at *Geneva*, *Anno Dom.* 1623. Lastly *Usher* having observed, that three *English* Divines had formerly quoted a passage of S. *Ignatius*, in the very same words as it is expressed by *Theodoret*, which was not inserted in the *Greek* Text, nor in the Vulgar Translations, judged that it might not be difficult to find some Manuscripts of the Original Epistles of S. *Ignatius* in *England*; Whereupon having made Enquiry, he happened to meet with two, one in the University of *Cambridge*, (in *Caius* Colledge Library,) and another in a private Library of one *Richard Mountague*, which contained an ancient Version of those Epistles very different from the Vulgar; and afterwards having compared this Translation, with the passages recited by the Fathers, he perceived that it exactly agreed with them, quite through; for which reason, when he set out a new Edition, (*e*) of the Epistles of S. *Ignatius* he used them, and caused the places that were added by the Modern *Greeks*, to be distinguished, in the *Greek* Text by Red Characters. Not long after, the Learned *Isaac Vossius* found in the Library of *Florence* a *Greek* Manuscript of the same Epistles, which had been perused about an hundred years before by *Turrianus*, wherein the *Greek* Text perfectly answered to the Version published by *Usher*, and so he published the *Greek* Original of S. *Ignatius*. (*f*)

S. *Ignatius*.

We may Learn from the knowledge of these Editions, that the Epistles of S. *Ignatius* ought to be divided into three *Classes*. The first contains those Three that are only extant in *Latin*, written to the Virgin *Mary* and S. *John*. The Second comprehends those that are in *Greek*, whereof *Eusebius* and S. *Jerom* make no mention, which being five in number (*g*,) are cited by some Modern *Greeks*. In the Third Rank are comprized those Seven Epistles mentioned by *Eusebius* (*h*,) but these are either such as were published before the Editions of *Vossius* and *Usher*; or such as are conformable to their Copies, that is to say, more concise, and more simple.

We must likewise distinguish three several Opinions concerning these Epistles: The first is, of those that allow them all, even the Three which are written only in *Latin*, as *Faber*, *Roffensis*, *Driedo*, *Marianus*, *Victorius*, *Canisius* and *Halloixius*. The last of whom, tho' Living in a clearer Age than the former yet was not a better Critick than any of them that were before him. We may also reckon almost in the same Rank, those that admit all the *Greek* Letters, wherein they follow the Opinion

(*e*) *He made use thereof in preparing a new Edition.*] The first Edition of *Usher* was Printed at *Oxford*, *An. Dom.* 1644. It contains, 1. A preliminary Dissertation. 2. The Six Epistles of S. *Ignatius* in *Greek*, wherein all that is not in the ancient Version is distinguished by Red Characters. 3. The counterfeit Letters. 4. The ancient *Latin* Translation. 5. Several Notes in the Year 1647. He published another Edition which he calls *Appendix Ignatiana*, in which he inserted the *Greek* Text, published by M. *Vossius* in 1646. as also a new Translation. He added therein, 1. The Ancient Records of the Martyrdom of S. *Ignatius*, which bear the Name of *Philo*. 2. The Letters of *Tiberianus*; *Pliny*, and *Trajan* concerning the Constancy of the Martyrs. 3. The entire Epistle of the Church of *Smyrna*, concerning the Martyrdom of S. *Polycarp*. 4. Annotations on the Acts of the Epistles of S. *Ignatius*.

(*f*) *To publish the Greek Original of S.* Ignatius.] His Edition was Printed at *Amsterdam*, *Anno Dom.* 1646. It contains, 1. The seven Original Epistles, excepting that to the *Romans*, as they were written in his *Greek* and *Latin* Manuscripts. 2. The *Greek* Epistles falsly attributed to S. *Ignatius*, which are not cited by *Eusebius*. 3. The three *Latin* Letters to the Virgin *Mary* and S. *John*. 4. The seven *Greek* and *Latin* Epistles, as they were in the former Editions. 5. The Epistle of S. *Barnabas*, together with Notes on the whole Work. The Editions of *Cotelerius* and of *Madrus* at *Helmstadt* in *Octavo*, are not different from that of *Vossius*, which hath been lately Reprinted at *London*, in 1680.

(*g*) *Which being Five in Number.*] We find at the beginning, the Epistle of *Maria Cassobolita* ? afterward the first Epistle of S. *Ignatius* to this *Mary*; the Second to the Inhabitants of *Tarsus*; the Third to the *Antiochians*; the Fourth to *Hero* a Deacon of the Church of *Antioch*; and the last to the *Philippians*.

(*h*) *The seven Epistles mentioned by* Eusebius.] They are written according to the Order observed by M. *Vossius*, 1. To the Christians of *Smyrna*; The Second to S. *Polycarp*; The Third to the *Ephesians*; The Fourth to the *Magnesians*; The Fifth to the *Philadelphians*; The Sixth to the *Trallians*; and the Seventh to the *Romans*. Moreover, we may distinguish Four ancient Editions of the Epistles of S. *Ignatius*; the First contained only these seven that were known to *Eusebius*, and the other ancient Writers without any Additions; the Second comprehended only these seven Epistles, but with several Additions; *Pearson* had a Manuscript of them; which Copy had been used by *Gobarus*, *Anastatius Antiochenus*, and the Author of the *Alexandrian* Chronicle; in the Third there are the seven Authentick Epistles without Interpolations, together with the counterfeit; such are those of the Version of *Usher*, and the *Greek* Manuscript of M. *Vossius*, and these were perused by S. *Joannes Damascenus*, and *Antonius*; the Fourth is that of the seven Genuine Epistles, together with the Additions, and the others that were forged, which is the Vulgar.

of

St. Ignatius.

of Cardinal *Bellarmin*, *Baronius* and *Poſſevin*. The ſecond is of thoſe who reject all. *Calvin* was the chief promoter of this Opinion, being followed by the *Centuriators*, *Socinus*, and even, after the Editions of *Uſher* and *Voſſius*, by *Salmaſius*, *Blondel*, *Albertinus* and *Daille*, who have uſed their utmoſt endeavours to ruin the Credit of their Copies. The Third Opinion is that of thoſe who keeping the middle way, aſcribe to S. *Ignatius* only the Seven Epiſtles, that are recited by *Euſebius* and S. *Jerom*, diſallowing all the reſt as Suppoſitirious, and owning that there were ſome Additions in the others. This has been formerly obſerved by very Learned Men, even before the Editions of *Voſſius* and *Uſher* appeared, as by *Chemenitius*, *Perkins*, *Cook*, and *Vedelius*, who tho' ſeparated from the Communion of the Church of *Rome*, yet were very able Criticks. But ſince their Editions, the judicious of both perſuaſions as *Rivet*, *Grotius*, *Petavius*, *Labbæus*, and the Author of the *Offices of the Holy Sacrament*, have acknowledged that the Seven Epiſtles of S. *Ignatius*, which had been corrupted by many Additions, were reſtored to their Original purity in *Voſſius*'s *Greek* Edition, and in the Verſion publiſhed by *Uſher*. *Morinus* is the only Perſon among the Learned, that maintains the contrary Opinion, affirming that the Original Text of thoſe Letters is contained in the ancient *Greek* Edition, whereas it is retrenched and corrupted in the later of *Voſſius*. I had almoſt forgotten to obſerve, that *Uſher* and ſome others after him, have rejected the Epiſtle of S. *Ignatius* to S. *Polycarp*; and therefore reckon only ſix as Genuine. Thus we have repreſented the different Opinions concerning the Epiſtles of S. *Ignatius*; let us now conſider which ſide we ought to take.

Firſt, it is certain, that the Three *Latin* Epiſtles, whereof two are written to S. *John*, and the Third to the Virgin *Mary* are forged. S. *Bernard* is the firſt that quotes them in his 7th Sermon, on the Pſalm *Qui habitat*; they were unknown to the ancient and modern Grecian Writers; they were never extant in *Greek*, and the affected gingling of words that appears therein, ſhews that they were compoſed in *Latin*, and by one of that Nation. Beſides, they are written in a mean Style, and they are full of uſeleſs Notions unworthy of S. *Ignatius*.

Secondly, neither can it be doubted, but that the Five *Greek* Letters, which are not quoted by *Euſebius* and S. *Jerom* are in like manner counterfeit. For had they been extant when theſe Authors lived, it were impoſſible but they ſhould have ſeen or heard of them. And is it credible that having ſeen them, they ſhould take no notice of them, when they made a Catalogue of the Epiſtles of S. *Ignatius*? 2. They were not only unknown to *Euſebius* and S. *Jerom*, but likewiſe to all the Greek Fathers, whoſe Teſtimonies we have produced, and who have all cited only the Seven Epiſtles mentioned by *Euſebius*, the others being quoted only by the more modern Writers: They contain many things that do not agree with the time of S. *Ignatius*, for there are ſome Hereſies named which did not appear until a great while after his Death: We find an account of *Subdeacons*, *Lecturers*, *Chanters*, *Porters*, *Exorciſts*, and of thoſe that were called among the *Grecians* ἀναγνώσται or Readers. Now who knows not that theſe Orders were eſtabliſhed after the Deceaſe of S. *Ignatius*? They mention alſo Aſſemblies of *Virgins*, *Lent*, the *Sabbath*, *Feſtivals*, &c.

Thirdly, it muſt be confeſſed that the Epiſtles of S. *Ignatius* ſuch as they were before the Editions of *Uſher* and *Voſſius*, were corrupted, and different from thoſe that are cited by the ancient Writers. 1. Becauſe the paſſages cited by *Theodoret* and others, are not conformable to thoſe which we may find in the vulgar Edition. 2. Becauſe if we compare the ancient Edition with *Voſſius*'s, it will evidently appear, that the later is not an Epitome of the former, but that the other is a kind of a Paraphraſe of this laſt: for the greater part of the paſſages which are extant in the ancient Edition; and are not to be found in *Voſius*'s, are Explanations and Paraphraſes, or Thoughts added afterward, that have no manner of coherence with the reſt, and wherein one may find a plain difference in the Style and Doctrine. 3. There are divers things contained in the vulgar Edition, that cannot belong to the time of S. *Ignatius*, and which might give an occaſion juſtly to doubt of their Authority, before the Editions of *Uſher* and *Voſſius* were publiſhed. As for Example, in that to the *Trallians* we find the Names of *Theodotus* and *Cleobulus*; there are certain paſſages that confute the Opinion of *Saturninus* concerning Marriage, and the errors of *Praxeas*, mention is alſo made therein of the *Nicolaitans*, of the leſſer *Orders*, &c. things that by no means ſuit with thoſe Primitive Ages of the Church.

I have now only to enquire whether the ſeven Epiſtles, according to the Edition of *Voſſius* were written by S. *Ignatius*, and the firſt Queſtion that offers it ſelf to our Examination, is whether this Father wrote any Epiſtles at all: To which I reply, that it cannot be reaſonably doubted. For, 1. This matter of Fact is atteſted by all Antiquity. 2. It is proved by the above-cited Tradition that the Authors who ſaw S. *Ignatius*, as S. *Polycarp*, and thoſe that lived immediately after him, as *Irenæus* and *Origen*, knew and quoted theſe Epiſtles. Now to believe that they were falſly attributed to him even in their time, is in my Opinion great Nonſenſe; therefore it ought to be taken for granted, that S. *Ignatius* wrote Epiſtles; And who can imagine, that thoſe are not Genuine that were collected by S. *Polycarp*? Or what likelyhood is there that they were loſt between S. *Polycarp*'s death, and *Euſebius*'s time, and that others were ſubſtituted in their room? Wherefore *Euſebius* had the Original Epiſtles of S. *Ignatius*, and they that ſucceeded him, whoſe Teſtimonies we have already alledged, having without doubt preſerved the Seven that are mentioned by him, it cannot be affirmed with any probability that they have cited fictitious Epiſtles. From whence we ought to conclude, that ſince all the paſſages produced by them may be found word for word in the Editions of *Uſher* and *Voſſius*, it is very probable that they contain the Authentick Epiſtles of S. *Ignatius* in their Original Purity. And this Argument is of ſo much the more force, becauſe this is not only true in the reſemblance of one or two Paſſages, for it were not to be admitted that they ſhould agree, ſince they might have been inſerted by an Impoſtor; but in a very great number that are cited by different Authors,

Authors, which makes it much more certain. Besides, there is nothing in these Epistles that does not agree with the Person and Time of S. *Ignatius*; there are no Defects in the Chronology, nor any Anachronisms, which are usually found in Suppositious Works; there is no mention made of any Heretick that lived after S. *Ignatius*; the Errors that are refuted belong to his time, as that of the *Simonians* and *Ebionites* concerning the Passion and Divinity of *Jesus Christ*; the Tradition of the Church is confirmed according to *Eusebius*: He speaks of those Gifts of the Holy Spirit that were visible in the Church; he cites very few Passages out of the Holy Scriptures; he imitates the Style of S. *Paul*, and interminges nothing of Prophane Learning. Upon the whole matter, these Epistle are written with great simplicity, and bear an Apostolical Character; thus all the Arguments that evince the Falsification, or the Corruption of the other Epistles, invincibly prove the Truth and Purity of these. But this will appear yet further from the Answers to the Objections propounded by *Salmasius*, *Blondel* and *Daille*, which we shall set down and confute in a few Words, replying only to those that may be alledged against the seven Epistles, as they are Printed in the Edition of *Vossius*, and omitting the others which do not relate to our Opinion. S. *Ignatius*

Objection 1. Our Adversaries not being able to produce any considerable Testimonies, at least such as can be esteemed to be of sufficient Authority, and being unwilling to appear to be the first Authors of the Opinion which they maintain, have sought for the Author of the *Stichometria*, which is prefixed to the Works of *Syncellus* and *Theophanes*, and is commonly attributed to *Nicephorus*, Patriarch of *Constantinople*, tho' it is not certain whether it is his or not. This *Stichometria* is a Catalogue of the Sacred Books both Canonical and Apocryphal, together with the number of their Verses, at the end whereof are annexed, *The Apocryphal Books of the New Testament*, *the Voyages of S.* Peter, and *The Doctrin of the Apostles*, of S. *Clement*, *Ignatius*, *Polycarp* and *Hermas*; from whence M. *Daille* concludes, that this Author hath inserted the Epistles of S. *Ignatius* among the Apocryphal and Counterfeit Writings.

Answer. First, This Author calls all those Books Apocryphal that are not Canonical, and in this Sense the Epistles of S. *Ignatius* may be reckoned under this Denomination, as the Book of the *Pastor*, which is Styled Apocryphal by those that do not receive it as Canonical, tho' it is very ancient, and was certainly writ by him whose Name it bears.

Secondly, This Author doth not mention the Epistles of S. *Ignatius* or S. *Polycarp*; and there is no probability that he intended to do it, because his Design is to make a Catalogue of the Sacred Writings both Genuine and Apocryphal; now what Analogy is there between this and the Epistles of S. *Ignatius*, which being writ a long time after the Death of the Apostles, could not be comprized amongst the Books of the Holy Scripture? And indeed if the Epistles of S. *Ignatius*, and S. *Polycarp* ought to be rejected as fictitious, because this Author hath inserted their Names among the Apocryphal Books of the *New Testament*, we must likewise reject the Epistle of S *Clement*, whose Name is found immediately before; therefore it must necessarily be inferred, that he intended to reject some other Books that were ascribed to S. *Clement*, to S *Ignatius*, and to S. *Polycarp*, and that the Word διδαχὴ ought to be understood with relation to these three last; for after having said διδαχὴ ἀποστόλων, *The Doctrin of the Apostles*, he adds, without specifying any thing else, of *Clement*, *Ignatius* and *Polycarp*, that is to say, the Books in like manner Entituled, *The Doctrin of* Clement, *The Doctrin of* Ignatius, and *The Doctrin of* Polycarp; this is the plain Sense of that Passage.

Thirdly, Altho' it were granted, that this Author had rejected the Epistles of S. *Ignatius*, which is not true, Of what weight could his Testimony be, against the Tradition that we have even now alledged?

Object. 2. It is said, That these Epistles were unknown to S. *Justin*, to S. *Clement* of *Alexandria*, and to all the ancient Writers before *Eusebius*.

Answ. Tho' this were true, yet there are many Books whose Truth is not called in question, that are mentioned by *Eusebius* alone, and by no other ancient Author; but besides, we have already shewn, That these Epistles are cited by S. *Polycarp*, S. *Irenæus*, and *Origen*, and that the Passages which they produce, are found in those Letters that we have.

Object. 3. The Style (say they) of the Epistles attributed to S. *Ignatius*, is very different from that of this Father; it is full of lofty Expressions and affected Epithets, which is very far from the simplicity of the Apostolical Times. They say moreover, that the Inscriptions of these Letters are long and full of pompous Epithets.

Answ. The Objections taken from the Style are of little Moment; for who hath informed these modern Criticks how S. *Ignatius* writ? However it is not true, that the Style of these Epistles is far from the simplicity of the ancient Christians; on the contrary, it is very simple, and extremely natural: It must be confessed indeed, that there are some Epithets and compound Words, but this agrees with the *Asiatick* Style, which is generally more florid than that of other Nations. It might also be added, That we find the like Epithets in the Epistle of S. *Clement*, and in other ancient Authors. The Inscriptions are not longer than S. *Paul*'s Epistles, and in the Editions of *Usher* and *Vossius* they are not so large nor so magnificent as in the Vulgar, as well as in that of the Epistle to the *Romans*, recited by *Metaphrastes*.

Object. 4. This Objection is the first of those that are taken from the Contents of the Epistles themselves. It is said, That the Author writes against the Opinion of *Saturninus*, who believed, that *Jesus Christ* suffered only in Appearance; and of *Theodotus*, who imagined that our Saviour was a mere Man. Now these two Hereticks are later than S. *Ignatius*.

S. *Ignatius* asserted by *Cerinthus* and *Ebion*, Hereticks who lived in S. *Ignatius*'s time.

Anſw. The firſt of theſe Errors was maintained by *Simon Magus* and *Menander*; the other was

Object 5. This is the Principal, or the only Objection that hath any Difficulty, it is taken from an Expreſſion in the Epiſtle to the *Magneſians*, *That the Eternal Word proceeded not from Silence*, ἐκ σιγῆς προελθὼν, which ſeems to be ſaid purpoſely againſt the Errors of the *Valentinians*, who firſt uſed the Word *Silence* as a Term of Art.

Anſw. If there were no Anſwer to be given to this Objection, I ſhould rather chuſe to affirm, That this Paſſage is added, than merely on this accout to reject the Epiſtles that are acknowledged as Authentick by all the Ancients. There are many Books wherein ſome Editions have been made, which make them appear later than they really are; and we find ſome of this ſort in the Bible, in *Homer*, and in almoſt all the Eccleſiaſtical and Prophane Authors. But there is no neceſſity to make uſe of this Anſwer, ſince we have ſeveral others that are ſufficient to afford reaſonable Satisfaction to the Impartial and Judicious Reader.

For 1. It is not true that S. *Ignatius* here ſpeaks of the Silence of the *Valentinians*, or of any other Notion of the Hereticks that is like it; he only declares, That the Word of God is not like unto that of Men, which comes from, or follows after Silence. Theſe are his Words: *There is but one God, who hath made himſelf manifeſt by his Son* Jeſus Chriſt, *who is the Eternal Word of God, that doth not proceed from Silence, and that is in all things like unto him that ſent him.* The main Deſign of S. *Ignatius* in this Place, is to eſtabliſh our Saviour's Divinity againſt the *Ebionites*. He ſhews that he is God, becauſe he is the Word or the Speech of God, which being Eternal, is not preceded by Silence as that of Men. This Explication is Natural and liable to no Difficulty, though M. *Daille* hath thought fit to cenſure it as Impertinent; however, there is none that reads this Paſſage but will readily grant, that this Senſe is moſt proper and very conformable to the Intention of the ancient Writers, who endeavoured to demonſtrate the Difference that there is between the Word of God and that of Men. S. *Auſtin*, in his Homily concerning the Nativity of *Jeſus Chriſt*, makes uſe of the very ſame Compariſon, without having any regard to the *Valentinians*; *Quid eſt* (ſays he) *hoc Verbum? Quod dicturus antea non ſilebat, quo dicto, non ſiluit qui dicebat:* And S. *Fulgentius*, lib. 3. *ad Traſim.* cap. 28. *Idem Verbum nullo potuit coerceri ſilentio, quia ipſe Patris eſt ſempiterna locutio.* That which is affirmed by M. *Daille*, that the Word προελθὼν was uſed by the *Valentinians*, may be true, but they oftener uſed the Word προβολὴν, neither is the Word προελθὼν peculiar to the *Valentineans*, it is commonly applied in *Greek* to ſignifie *To go or come forth.* Beſides, S. *Ignatius* ſays not ἐκ σιγῆς, but ἀπὸ σιγῆς, which may ſignifie, that the Word of God came not forth after Silence as that of Men.

2. *Valentinus* and his Diſciples did not affirm, That the *Word* came from *Silence*. The *Word* according to their fantaſtical Imagination, came from *the Spirit* and *the Truth*, and not from *the Deep* and *from Silence*.

3. The Opinion of *Valentinus* concerning *Silence*, was deviſed and propagated before his Time, for all that ſpeak of his Hereſie obſerve, that he revived the ancient Errors of the *Gnoſticks*. *Euſebius* declares in *lib.* 2. *de Theolog. Eccleſ. cap.* 9. That *Simon Magus* often talked of Silence among his Followers: *Secundum impium* (ſays he *Hæreticorum principem, qui, impia dogmatizans, prænunciavit dicens, erat Deus, & Sige*; which comes nearer to the Error, that is ſuppoſed to be confuted by S. *Ignatius*. S. *Irenæus* attributes this Opinion to all the *Gnoſticks*, as alſo *Tertullian*, S. *Epiphanius*, and S. *Auguſtin*. S. *Gregory Nazianzen*, *orat.* 23. and after him *Ellas Cretenſis*, charge it upon the *Gnoſticks*. This ſhews, that tho' the Author of the Epiſtle to the *Magneſians* ſhould have oppoſed the Error of thoſe that maintain that the *Word* proceeded from *Silence*, yet this doth not hinder but that it might have been written by S. *Ignatius*.

4. It is not certainly known, whether *Valentinus* had not already began to divulge his Errors even before the Death of S. *Ignatius*, ſince it is evident that S. *Polycarp* ſurvived this Arch-Heretick, and tho' he was not declared to be the Ring-leader of this Party till afterwards, yet he might even then have taught ſome of his pernicious Doctrins, to which S. *Ignatius* might allude. Theſe four Anſwers are ſolid, and every one of them ſeparately might be ſufficient to convince any Man; but the firſt in my Opinion is moſt natural.

Object. 6. In the Epiſtle to the Chriſtians of *Smyrna*, mention is made of certain viſible Princes that ſhall be judged, if they do not believe in *Jeſus Chriſt*. Now what probability is there (ſay they) that S. *Ignatius* ſhould ſpeak this of the Emperors and Kings of his Time?

Anſw. Why may not this be affirmed of the Unbelieving Emperors and Kings that were Contemporary with S. *Ignatius*? Since *Tertullian* and S. *Juſtin* have declared as much of the Emperors of their time, and that too in the Preſence of the Emperors themſelves. Moreover, it is not neceſſary to underſtand the Word Ἄρχοντες only of Emperors and Kings, ſince it may ſignifie all that are inveſted with any Authority.

Object. 7. In the Epiſtle to the *Romans* we find this Expreſſion, *That he was led by the Leopards, which are Soldiers.* This Explication (ſay they) is needleſs, and the compariſon is childiſh.

Anſw. And, I ſay, that the Similitude is very natural, and that the Explication was neceſſary. *Bochart* indeed affirms, That the Word *Leopard* was not uſed until the Time of *Conſtantine*; but how does he know it? It is in the Acts of the Paſſion of S. *Perpetua* and S. *Felicitas*; *Ælius Spartianus*, in the Life of *Geta*, thinks, that it was an old Word at the time when he wrote his Hiſtory.

Object. 8. In the Epiſtle to the *Philadelphians*, he ſpeaks of Penitents that were publickly received by the Church, whereas, (ſay they) in the firſt Ages, they that had once fallen were not afterward readmit-

readmitted into the Communion of the Church; neither was there any Penance that ended in Reconciliation.

Answ. There is nothing in the Epistle to the *Philadelphians* concerning publick Penitence who had committed enormous Crimes; this is a meer Imagination. It is only declar'd, That they that had departed from the Church should obtain Pardon for their Fault, if they repented thereof by re-entring into it, that is to say, if they re-united themselves to the Church, from which they were separated. It is certain, that Hereticks and Schismaticks returning to the Church, were always readmitted. Beside, the Example of the Young Man who was reconciled by S. *John*, after he had been for a long time Captain of a Troop of Highway-men, and of many others, shew, that Penance was then in use; and *Morinus* evidently proves, That in the two first Centuries Absolution was granted more easily than in the third.

Object. 9. *Onesimus* Bishop of *Ephesus*, who died before S. *Ignatius*, is cited by Name in this Epistle.

Answ. This *Onesimus* is not he that was the Disciple of S. *Paul*, whom others affirm to have been Bishop of *Berœa*: And besides, even the *Onesimus*, mention'd by S. *Paul*, might be living when S. *Ignatius* wrote this Epistle, since that of S. *Paul* to *Philemon* was written from *Rome* about the Year of our Lord 64, therefore tho' *Onesimus* might be 26 Years old then, yet he could not have been above 70 Years of Age about the Year 107, or 108, when S. *Ignatius* compos'd these Works, which is no very extraordinary thing.

Object. 10. The Author of the Epistles attributed to S. *Ignatius* cites (as they say) several Apocryphal Books. He produceth in the Epistle to the *Smyrneans* a Sentence concerning *Jesus Christ*, taken from the Gospel according to the *Hebrews*. Who can believe this of S. *Ignatius*?

Answ. This is no unusual thing among the Ancients. S. *Jerom* gives us the same Passage of S. *Ignatius*, and *Papias* hath likewise quoted the Gospel according to the *Hebrews*. S. *Clement*, in his Epistle to the *Corinthians*, uses some Expressions as taken from the Holy Scriptures which are not there, as is observed by *Photius*, *Cod.* 126. S. *Jude* also cites the Book of *Enoch*. And besides, we cannot positively affirm, that the Gospel according to the *Hebrews* is cited by S. *Ignatius*, for he only produceth a Sentence, as knowing by Tradition that it was uttered by *Jesus Christ*. Thus S. *Clement* and S. *Barnabas* set down the Words of our Saviour, which they had either heard spoken by him, or had received from those by whom he was seen in the Flesh. Lastly, this Passage in S. *Ignatius*, is quoted by S. *Jerom*, as belonging to the Gospel according to the *Hebrews*; but *Origen* produces it out of the Book, entituled, *The Doctrin of S.* Peter, which shews that it was a very common Expression.

Object. 11. The ardent Desire of suffering Martyrdom, express'd by S. *Ignatius*, is (according to their Judgment) too excessive.

Answ. This hath been admired in the Epistle to the *Romans*, by the ancient Christians; the same Ardor appears likewise in S. *Cyprian*, in *Germanicus* a Martyr of *Smyrna*, and in many others. Certainly they must needs have but a very little Knowledge of Antiquity, who deny that the Primitive Christians were inflamed with a fervent Desire of suffering Martyrdom, and a Man shews that he is but meanly skill'd in Divinity, if he blames this Passion, when it neither does, nor says any thing that is Impudent or Indecent. And this is the Case of S. *Ignatius*, who, in testifying an earnest Desire of becoming a Martyr, uttered no Expressions but such as were very prudent, and very moderate: Let us read his Epistle to the *Romans* with the same Spirit as he wrote it, and we shall be so far from censuring it with the modern Criticks, that we shall admire it as much as the Ancients did.

Object. 12. S. *Paul* doth not mention the *Ephesians* in all his Epistles, as it is affirmed by the Author of the Epistle to the *Ephesians*: Therefore, *&c.*

Answ. He doth not say that S. *Paul* mention'd the *Ephesians* in all his Epistles, but throughout the whole Epistle that he wrote to them, (ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ) and compos'd altogether for their Use.

Object. 13. He declares that he saw *Jesus Christ*, which, S. *Chrysostom* says, is not true.

Answ. The Passage which is meant by them signifies only, that he knew and believed the real Incarnation of *Jesus Christ*. And after all, it was not impossible for S. *Ignatius* to have seen our Saviour.

Object 14. He gives an account of the Errors of certain Hereticks that abstain'd from the *Eucharist*; now there were not any such (says M. *Daille*) in the time of S. *Ignatius*, but afterwards when these Epistles were counterfeited.

Answ. Who hath informed him, that there were no such at the time when these Epistles were forged, and none before? These Hereticks are the *Docetæ*, who believed that *Jesus Christ* suffered only in Appearance, whose Heresie was very ancient.

Object. 15. He affirms, that the *Romans* might easily have deliver'd him from his Persecutor, why then did they not do it?

Answ. He doth not declare that they were absolutely able to deliver him, but only that he was ready to undergo Martyrdom, if they did not prevent it; that they might easily do whatever they thought fit, that is, use their Endeavours to rescue him from Death; but for his part, he could not find a better Opportunity of suffering for *Jesus Christ*.

Object. 16. He promiseth to send a Book to the *Ephesians*; but how could he do it when he was going to be put to Death?

Answ. His meaning is, That he would write a second Letter to them, Δεύτερον βιβλίον, *a second*

ſmall *Volume*, upon two Conditions: Firſt, if God ſhould permit; and, Secondly, in caſe the *Epheſians* S. *Ignatius* ſhould want it. He might well hope to write another, having had the liberty to write the former.

Object. 17. There appears (ſay they) too much Arrogance and Affectation in theſe Epiſtles; the Author boaſts, that he hath the knowledge of Celeſtial Things, *Se multa ſapere in Deo*, and that he knew the Orders, Offices, and Stations of the Angels.

Anſ. All this might be affirmed by an ancient Biſhop, that had acquired the Reputation of S. *Ignatius*; all the Chriſtians might likewiſe boaſt, that they were endued with the knowledge of Celeſtial Things, and more eſpecially Biſhops. S. *Ignatius* immediately adds, after the Words cited in the Objection, *Whatſoever Knowledge I have, I am not puffed up, but I meaſure my ſelf.* He ſays nothing of Angels, but what had been ſaid before by S. *Paul.*

Object. 18. What reaſon is there, that S. *Ignatius* ſhould be ſent to *Rome*, to be expoſed to wild Beaſts in the Amphitheatre of that City, as if Perſons condemned to this ſort of Puniſhment, were not executed in all the great Towns, where Shews were exhibited? Why muſt he be brought thither by Sea and Land, a Way ſo far about?

Anſ. If we may believe the Hiſtory of the Martyrdom of S. *Ignatius*, he was ſent to *Rome* by the expreſs Command of the Emperor. However, if this were not true, it is ordained by the Law, *Ad beſtias, tit. de Pœnis*: That Criminals, condemned to be torn in pieces by wild Beaſts, ſhould be conveyed to *Rome* with the Emperor's Permiſſion; (which ought to be underſtood of conſiderable Malefactors;) ſuch were the Ring-leaders of Factions, and the Biſhops among the Chriſtians, eſpecially ſo famous a Biſhop as that of *Antioch*. The way through which he was conducted thither was the ordinary Road; for to come to *Rome* out of *Syria*, it is neceſſary to go to *Smyrna* or to *Epheſus*, afterward to croſs the *Helleſpont*, and ſo to *Brunduſium*, and from thence to *Rome*.

Object. 19. The laſt Objection, which is the cauſe why all the others were made, is taken from the different Orders of Biſhops and Prieſts, who are often diſtinguiſhed in the Epiſtles that are attributed to S. *Ignatius*; it is ſuppoſed that this diſtinction was not made until the third Age of the Church, from whence it is concluded that theſe Epiſtles are none of his.

Anſ. This Suppoſition being falſe, the whole Objection muſt conſequently fall of it ſelf, and tho' we had no other Proofs of the diſtinction of Biſhops and Prieſts in the ſecond Century, than the Epiſtles of S. *Ignatius*, yet we ought not to doubt thereof, and inſtead of inferring from thence, that theſe Letters are Counterfeit, it may well be concluded on the contrary, that the different Orders of Biſhops and Prieſts, were eſtabliſhed in S. *Ignatius*'s time, ſince they are found in the Epiſtles that have been acknowledged by all the ancient Writers as certainly belonging to him: But there are many other Teſtimonies which make it appear, that there was a diſtinction between Biſhops and Prieſts even in the ſecond Age of the Church. *Hegeſippus*, for Example, gives us a Catalogue of the Biſhops of *Jeruſalem*; can this be ſaid to be a Liſt of the Prieſts of that City? *Polycrates* hath made another of the ancient Biſhops of *Aſia*, and *Euſebius* hath compiled that of the principal Cities throughout the whole World ſince the time of *Jeſus Chriſt*. Therefore there muſt of neceſſity have been always in the Church, Perſons called *Biſhops*, who preſided over Churches and Prieſts. The Martyrs of *Lyons* ſtyle *Photinus* Biſhop, and S. *Irenæus* Prieſt. The anonymous Author, cited by *Euſebius* againſt the *Cataphrygians*, diſtinguiſhes Prieſts from Biſhops. And there are infinite Numbers of Teſtimonies and Arguments, by which it may be proved, that there was ſome difference made between Prieſts and Biſhops even in the ſecond Century; but we ſhall inſiſt no longer on this Subject: And I am afraid that I have already tired the Reader's Patience in Refuting all the Objections that have been alledged againſt the Epiſtles of S. *Ignatius*, but I judged it neceſſary for the confirmation of their Authority.

It remains only, for the concluſion of our Critical Enquiries concerning theſe Epiſtles, to give ſome account of that to S. *Polycarp*. I know not what reaſon *Uſher* might have to reject it, ſince it plainly belongs to the number of the Seven that are mentioned by *Euſebius*, who clearly diſtinguiſheth it from that which was written to the Inhabitants of *Smyrna*. S. *Jerom* follows *Euſebius* in this particular, *Et proprie* (ſays he) *ad Polycarpum*. It is true, indeed, that here he cites a Paſſage of the Epiſtle to the *Smyrneans*, as appertaining to that of S. *Polycarp*, but this may only be an Error as to Matter of Fact, and it very frequently happens, that in Citations one Work is taken for another. A notable mark of the Truth of this Epiſtle is that in the Manuſcript of *Florence*, it is found to be different from the Vulgar Edition, as well as the ſix others that are eſteemed Authentick, whereas all the reſt which are forged do not vary in this Manuſcript from the ordinary Editions; this ſhews, that the Author of theſe Letters, is the ſame Perſon that made the Additions in the real Epiſtles of S. *Ignatius*, and that all thoſe that are purged from theſe Additions in the above-cited Manuſcript of *Florence*, and in the Edition of *Voſſius*, are undoubtedly genuine.

The Chronological Order of theſe ſeven Epiſtles is this: Firſt, it is certain that they were all written by S. *Ignatius* when he was in Bonds, and as he was conveyed from *Antioch* to *Rome* to be expoſed to wild Beaſts in that City. Secondly, it is likewiſe evident, that four of them were made at *Smyrna*, where he reſided, perhaps, for ſome conſiderable time; theſe four in the Edition of *Voſſius* and in S. *Jerom*, are put in this following Order; the Epiſtle to the *Epheſians*, to the *Magneſians*, to the *Trallians*, and the laſt to the *Romans*. It cannot be preciſely determined, whether this be the Order wherein they were written, or whether they were all compoſed at the ſame time. It is probable that the Epiſtle to the *Romans* is the laſt, becauſe he declares therein, that he wrote to the other Churches, and that he went chearfully to ſuffer Martyrdom: It ſeems to have been made when he was ready to depart, being wearied with the long ſtay of his Guards in that place; ſo great was his Paſſion to ſuffer Martyrdom.

He

He wrote the three others at his departure from *Smyrna* whil'ſt he ſtayed at *Troas*, from whence he was obliged to go to *Naples*. The Epiſtles to the *Smyrneans* and to S. *Polycarp*, ſeem to have been written together, and that to the *Philadelphians* laſt, becauſe it is expreſſed in the later, that the other Cities had ſent ſeveral Biſhops and Prieſts into *Syria*; and in the Epiſtle to S. *Polycarp*, he chargeth him to depute a fit Perſon for the Epiſcopal Function in that Country. However, there is a more probable conjecture to prove, that the two others were written after that to the *Philadelphians*, according to S. *Jerom*'s Opinion, becauſe S. *Ignatius* declares therein, that he was ready to embark for *Naples*, and that this was the reaſon why he could not write to the other Churches, which ſhews, that the time of his departure drew near when he Compoſed them. He there mentions his Martyrdom, as a thing certainly to be accompliſh'd. S. *Ignatius* in his Epiſtle to the Chriſtians of *Smyrna*, confutes the Error of thoſe that denied that Jeſus Chriſt took upon himſelf the Human Nature; that he aſſumed a real Body, and that he actually ſuffered: He affirms, that thoſe Hereticks neglected the Poor and the Widows, and ſeparated themſelves from the Publick Prayers of the Church, and from the Euchariſt, becauſe they did not believe that it was the Body of Jeſus Chriſt, which had been nailed to the Croſs for our ſakes, and afterwards roſe again from the dead: He admoniſheth the *Smyrneans* to avoid Diviſions, as the Original of all Evil, to obey their Biſhop, to honour the Prieſts and Deacons, and to do nothing contrary to the Precepts of their Biſhop, without whoſe Aſſiſtance (ſaith he) it is not lawful even to Baptize, or to celebrate the *Agapæ* or *Love-feaſts*. S. *Ignatius*

In the Epiſtle to S. *Polycarp*, he gives excellent Counſels to this Biſhop; he adviſes him to endeavour to preſerve Union in his Church, to watch continually over his Flock, and to apply convenient Remedies to their Diſtempers, to reprove thoſe that offend, with Charity and Gentleneſs, to pray to God inceſſantly and to ſue for his Grace. In ſhort, to labour without Intermiſſion as a faithful Servant and Soldier of Jeſus Chriſt, who being inviſible and impaſſible, made himſelf viſible and mortal for our ſakes. He admoniſheth him to take care of the Widows, not to deſpiſe the meaneſt People, not to ſuffer any thing to be done without his Concurrence, and to do nothing himſelf but what is conformable to the Will of God, to enjoyn Women to pleaſe their Husbands, and Husbands to love their Wives, as alſo to recommend to them Chaſtity, accompanied with Humility, and to inform the Chriſtians, that their Marriage, when performed, according to the Will of God, ought to be ſolemnized in the Preſence of the Biſhop. Afterward he exhorts all the faithful, to ſubmit to their Biſhop, Prieſts and Deacons, and to work out their own Salvation. Laſtly, directing his Diſcourſe to S. *Polycarp*, he adviſeth him to call a Synod, and to ordain a Biſhop to be ſent into *Syria*.

In the Epiſtle to the *Epheſians*, he teſtifies his Joy in ſeeing *Oneſimus* their Biſhop, who came to him with a Deacon, named *Burrus*, and two other Believers; he admoniſheth them to live Holily, in perfect Unity among themſelves, and in Obedience to their Biſhop and Prieſts; he declares, that they that do not joyn with the Biſhop and are not preſent at the Publick Service of the Chriſtians, over which the Biſhops preſide, are without the Pale of the Church, and deprived of the Celeſtial Food. Afterward he warns them to beware of Hereſies, to avoid the Company of Hereticks, and to believe that Jeſus Chriſt is God, who was incarnate, that he is impaſſible as he is God, and paſſible as he is Man. Laſtly, after having commended their Piety, he exhorts them to pray to God, for all ſorts and conditions of Men, frequently to aſſemble together, to make Publick Prayers and Supplications, and inviolably to preſerve Faith and Charity; he affirms, that the Prince of this World, that is to ſay, the Devil, was ignorant of the Virginity of *Mary*, of her Child-birth, and of the Death of our Lord: He promiſeth to ſend to them a little Book, that is to ſay, a Letter concerning the Incarnation of Jeſus Chriſt, and he intreats them to pray to God for him.

In the Epiſtle to the *Magneſians*, he exhorts the Chriſtians of that Church to be obedient to their Biſhop *Damas*, who came to ſee him, to do nothing without him, and to live in Unity one with another. He admoniſheth them not to ſuffer themſelves to be led away with vain Opinions, not to live like Jews but as Chriſtians, to believe in Jeſus Chriſt, who is the Word of God that doth not proceed from Silence, but was ſent by God the Father, and is our only hope. At laſt he deſires them to remember him in their Prayers.

In the Epiſtle to the *Philadelphians*, he Congratulates their Union, he exhorts them to avoid Corrupt Doctrins, and adviſes them not to follow thoſe that are the Abetters of Schiſms and Diviſions amongſt them, and to concur in every thing with their Biſhop. Laſtly, he refutes the Arguments of thoſe that refuſed to believe any thing, but what was written in the Old Teſtament, and declares that the Goſpel is the perfection of that which was prefigured in the Old Law.

In the Epiſtle to the *Trallians*, he commends their Union, and the Submiſſion and Reſpect that they ſhewed towards their Biſhop, Prieſts and Deacons, and exhorts them to perſevere in this Union, and to beware of Hereticks. He expounds the Orthodox Doctrins of the Catholick Church, that Jeſus Chriſt was born of the Virgin *Mary*, that he was really Man, that he actually ſuffered and died, and not in appearance, as ſome Hereticks ſaid.

Laſtly, In the Epiſtle to the *Romans*, he expreſſeth his Zeal, and ardent deſire of ſuffering Martyrdom, and entreats them not to take this glorious Crown from him, by preventing his being expoſed to wild Beaſts in the Amphitheatre of *Rome*.

Upon the whole matter, all theſe Epiſtles are full of very wholſom Precepts, and uſeful Exhortations; they are extremely worthy of a Chriſtian, of a Biſhop, and of a Martyr, and are all full of Warmth and Piety. One cannot read them, without perceiving every-where, that this Holy Man was animated with a Zeal truly Divine for the Salvation of Souls, for the fulfilling of the Law of Jeſus Chriſt, and for the preſervation of his Doctrin. In every thing that he ſays, he appears to be full of Love to

our

S. *Ignatius*

our Saviour, of Affection towards his Brethren, of Care for the Diſcipline of the Church, and of Ardor for the Bleſſing of Peace. In ſhort, let Criticks that are of a contrary Opinion ſay what they pleaſe, I dare maintain that theſe Epiſtles deſerve to be well eſteemed, and to be admired by all thoſe who profeſs to have any Reſpect for Books of Piety.

S. POLYCARP.

S. *Polycarp.*

S. *Polycarp* (*a*) the Diſciple of S. *John* the Evangeliſt (*b*), and by him ordained Biſhop of *Smyrna*, was after the Deceaſe of this Apoſtle, eſteemed as the Head of the Churches of *Aſia*; (*c*) when he went to *Rome*, under the Pontificate of *Anicetus* about the Year 160 (*d*) he converted ſeveral *Marcionites*, and obliged them to return to the Boſom of the Church. He had ſeveral Conferences with Pope *Anicetus*, probably about ſeveral particular Cuſtoms of the Church of *Rome*; They debated the Queſtion of the Day when they ſhould keep *Eaſter*, which was afterwards diſputed under the Pontificate of Pope *Victor*, but each of them having judged it to be moſt convenient to obſerve his own Cuſtom, they amicably communicated one with another; and *Anicetus* to do the greater Honour to S. *Polycarp*, cauſed him to officiate in his own Church (*e*), and in his own Place.

This Holy Biſhop always abhorred Hereticks; and he uſed to tell a Story, That S. *John* having ſeen *Cerinthus* entring into a Bath, ſpeedily fled from thence without bathing himſelf therein, fearing leſt the Building ſhould fall becauſe *Cerinthus* the Enemy of the Truth was there; and he himſelf having once accidentally met with *Marcion*, who deſired that he would vouchſafe to take notice of him, he replied, *I know that* thou *art the eldeſt Son of the Devil.* He had a very particular Reſpect for the Memory of S. *John*; he took much delight in telling over the Diſcourſes that he formerly had with him, and with others that had ſeen *Jeſus Chriſt* in the Fleſh; he related every thing whereof he had been informed by them concerning his Doctrin and Miracles, and if he had heard any one maintaining any Principles contrary to the Apoſtolical Faith, he was wont to cry out, *O God to what Times haſt thou reſerved me!* and would immediately depart from the Place where he was. All this is recorded by S. *Irenæus*, and cited by *Euſebius* in the 14th Chapter of the fourth Book of his Hiſtory, and in Book 5. Chap. 20.

The illuſtrious Martyrdon of this Saint, which happened in the Year 167. after the Nativity of Jeſus Chriſt on the 23d Day of *February*, is deſcribed after a moſt elegant manner in the Excellent Epiſtle of the Church of *Smyrna* to thoſe of *Pontus*, produced in part by *Euſebius*, in the Fifteenth Chapter of the fourth Book of his Hiſtory, and publiſhed entirely firſt by Archbiſhop *Uſher*, and afterward by *Valeſius*. They there give an account that S. *Polycarp* did not voluntarily ſurrender himſelf to his Executioners, but that he waited after the Example of our Saviour, 'till he was deliver'd into their Hands; that many Chriſtians ſuffered before him with admirable Conſtancy, all the Torments imaginable; that there was only one *Quintus*, who had perſuaded the others to preſent themſelves before the Tribunal of the Judge, that was overcome in the great Tryal, *which ſhews* (as it is obſerved in the ſame Epiſtle) *that although we cannot but admire the Conſtancy of thoſe that have generouſly ſuffered, after they had preſented themſelves, yet their Conduct ought not to*

(*a*) S. *Polycarp*] *Halloixius* ſays that S. *Polycarp* was originally of *Smyrna*; that he was born in the Eaſt, and that he was a Slave in his Youth, that he was bought by a certain Lady named *Caliſtione*, who gave him his Liberty, and cauſed him to be inſtructed in the Chriſtian Religion; that ſhe afterward made him her Steward, and at laſt her Heir. He enlarged on the liberal Donations of this Lady; he affirms that *Bucolas* Biſhop of *Smyrna* was at firſt Tutor to S. *Polycarp*, and afterwards S. *John*; he writes much in the commendation of this Fictitious *Bucolas*, and declares, that he ordained S. *Polycarp*, who is the Angel of *Smyrna*. Theſe Tales and many others are extracted from the falſe Acts of the Life of S. *Polycarp* forged under the name of *Pionius* from the *Menologium Græcorum* by the modern Greeks.

(*b*) *The Diſciple of S.* John *the Evangeliſt.*] S. *Irenæus* tells us, *lib.* 3. *cap.* 3. That he was conſtituted Biſhop of *Smyrna* by the Apoſtles; and this could be done by no other than S. *John.*

(*c*) *The head of the Churches of* Aſia.] S. *Jerome* ſays that he was *Princeps Eccleſiarum Aſiæ*, that is to ſay, that he was the moſt conſiderable Biſhop, and (as I may ſay) ſucceeded in the Authority of S. *John.*

(*d*) *About the year* 160.] He died in the ſeventh Year of the Emperor *Marcus Aurelius* in the Year 167. he had then ſerved Jeſus Chriſt 86 Years, as he declares himſelf in the Acts of his Martyrdom; Thus he might have begun to ſerve God in the Year 81. after the Nativity of our Saviour, and then he might be Ten Years old. He converſed with all the Apoſtles, if we may believe the Teſtimony of S. *Irenæus*. S. *John* died in the Year of our Lord 101, and in the ſecond of *Trajan*; he was baniſhed in the fourteenth of *Domitian*, *Anno Dom.* 95. and returned into *Aſia* after the Death of this Emperor. Theſe Obſervations may ſerve to fix the Chronology of the Life of S. *Polycarp*. He was born about the Year of our Lord 70. he began to conſecrate himſelf to the ſervice of God in the year 81. At that Time he converſed with the Apoſtles, and became the Diſciple of S. *John*; after the return of this Apoſtle he was ordained Biſhop of *Smyrna*, however it is not preciſely known in what year, but this muſt of neceſſity have happened before the Year 101, ſince S. *John* died that Year: He undertook his Journey to *Rome* in the beginning of the Pontificate of *Anicetus*, who preſided in the from that See Year 158 to the Year 169.

(*e*) *In his own Church*] All theſe Circumſtances are related by S. *Irenæus*. There are ſome who affirm, That the Expreſſion of S. *Irenæus* ſignifies only, that *Anicetus* adminiſtred the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper to S. *Polycarp*, but he would not thereby have done him much Honour, it may be better underſtood according to our Explication.

be approved, since it is condemned in the Gospel. That S. *Polycarp* being informed of what had happened, determined to remain in the City; but being constrained to retire into a little House in the Country, he there continually prayed to God Night and Day for all the Churches, and for all Men; that three Days before he was apprehended, being fervent in Prayer, he saw a Vision, wherein he perceived that his Bedstead was all on Fire, which caused him immediately to foretel that he should ere long be burnt alive; that although he was removed from the Place of his Abode, yet he was seized by the Soldiers of the Provost-Marshal, led into the City, and brought before the Pro-Consul, who endeavoured to perswade him to swear by the *Genius* of *Cæsar*, and to curse Jesus Christ, whereupon *Polycarp* being encouraged by a Voice from Heaven, openly declares that he was a Christian; That the Pro-Consul having caused his Profession to be proclaimed with a loud Voice, all the People who were in the *Amphitheatre*, cryed out, That he should be burnt alive: That being tied to a Stake, he prayed to God, and concluded with Blessing the most Holy Trinity; that when the Fire was kindled it made a kind of a Circle round about the Body of this holy Martyr, who remained in the midst thereof without receiving the least Hurt; And lastly, that the Pagans perceiving that the Fire could not burn or consume him, sent an Officer to run him through with a Sword; and would not suffer the Christians to carry off his Body, which continued whole and intire, lest (as these deluded Heathens affirm'd) they should adore it in stead of Jesus Christ. *Fools as they were* (these are the Words of the Epistle of the Church of *Smyrna*) *they did not know that the Christians worship none but* Jesus Christ *because he is the Son of God, and only honour the Martyrs who are his Disciples and Followers, because of the Love which they testifie to have for their King and Master. The Centurion having caused the Body of this Martyr to be burnt, the Christians carried away his Bones being more valuable than the most precious Stones, and more pure than Gold, which they buried in a place where they assembled together, to celebrate with joy and chearfulness the Day of his Martyrdom, thus honouring the Memory of those that have fought gloriously for the defence of their Religion, and to confirm and instruct others by such Examples.* These were the Notions of the Primitive Church concerning the Respect due to Martyrs and their Relicks, explained after a clear and exact manner, which are as far removed from the Aspersions that are cast on them by the Protestants of our Time, as from the Superstition of some *Roman Catholicks.*

S. *Irenæus* assures us, in his Letter to *Florinus*, that S. *Polycarp* wrote several Epistles to the neighbouring Churches to confirm them in the Christian Faith, and others to some of his Brethren to encourage and exhort them to persevere in the Truth. We have at present but one single Epistle written by him to the *Philippians*, and particularly cited by S. *Irenæus*, *Eusebius*, S. *Jerom* and *Photius*, (*f*) who have all commended and approved it as really belonging to this Primitive Bishop. And it cannot be doubted that it is the same with that which was extant in the time of these ancient Writers; wherefore I shall make no difficulty to affirm, That it would be great Rashness to reject it, as M. *Blondel* and M. *Daille* have done; for by whom have these Modern Authors been informed that this Letter was not composed by S. *Polycarp?* What Reasons can they alledge? Do they know S. *Polycarp*'s style better than S. *Irenæus* his Disciple? Have they a greater insight into this matter than *Eusebius*, S. *Jerom*, or *Photius?* Besides, if the Arguments produced by them had any Weight, one might set them in the Balance with the Authority of these ancient Writers, but they are so weak that they scarcely deserve to be mentioned. This Epistle (says M. *Daille*) is disallowed by *Nicephorus* in his *Stichometria*: This is indeed an Authority of great Moment fit to be set against the Testimony of *Eusebius*, S. *Jerom* and *Photius!* It is not certainly known by whom this *Stichometria* was composed, and altho' we should allow that it was written by *Nicephorus*, yet he is a late Author, and of very little Authority in comparison of those that we have now cited. After all, he doth not reject the Epistle of S. *Polycarp*, but only a certain Work that was attributed to him, and the Book of the Doctrin of S. *Polycarp* (as we have elsewhere observed) ought to be thereby understood, after the same manner as the Book of the Doctrin of S. *Ignatius*, and the Book of the Doctrin of S. *Clement*. Otherwise we must likewise disallow the Epistle of S. *Clement* to the *Corinthians*, whose Name is found among the Apocryphal Writings immediately before that of S. *Polycarp*. It is certain also, that there was extant a Book, entituled, The Doctrin of S. *Polycarp*, as well as one called, The Doctrin of S. *Clement*, since it is cited by *Maximus*, *Bede*, *Ado*, *Usuardus*, *Metaphrastes*, *Pachymeres*, *Honorius* and *Nicephorus Calistus*.

S. *Polycarp.*

[*There is nothing in this Declaration of the Church of* Smyrna *which the Protestants ever disallowed: They are far from thinking that those are not worthy of extraordinary Honours here below, who are so peculiarly graced by God himself. But yet if they are jealous of the Honour which is only due to* Jesus Christ, *and afraid of doing any thing which may derogate from it, they think this to be a thing which needs no excuse; since we have a positive command for the one, whereas the other is wholly discretionary: And we can never Err in assigning the Bounds of that Respect which is due to Saints and Martyrs, if we consider that their great Honour arises from their inviolable fidelity to our common Master; and that the chiefest reason why the Church at first commanded the anniversaries of Saints and Martyrs to be observed with so much splendor, was to encourage the rest of the Faithful to imitate them as they imitated* Jesus Christ.]

(*f*) *By S.* Irenæus, Eusebius, *S.* Jerom *and* Photius] S. *Irenæus* in *lib.* 3. *contr. Hæres.* says thus, *There is extant an Epistle of* Polycarp *to the Christians of* Philippi, *which is extremely accurate, and very proper to shew the Character of the Faith, and the Doctrin of the Truth, to those that take any Care of their Salvation. Eusebius* adds, in *lib.* 4. *cap.* 14. That S. *Polycarp*, in this Epistle, makes use of some Testimonies taken from the First Epistle of S. *Peter*; These References are found in that which we now have under his Name. S. *Jerom* affirms, that this Epistle was read in the Assembly of the Faithful of *Asia*. See *Photius*, *Cod.* 126.

M. *Daille*

S. *Polycarp.*

M. *Daille* perceiving the weakneſs of his Objection againſt the Epiſtle of S. *Polycarp*, is obliged to aſſert, that tho' the firſt Part is genuine, yet the ſecond, wherein he mentions thoſe of S. *Ignatius*, is ſuppoſititious: And to prove this he ſhews, that the Epiſtle was concluded with the Invocation of Jeſus Chriſt, and that which follows ought to be eſteemed as an addition made afterwards, being of no Authority. But M. *Daille* cannot maintain this *Hypotheſis* without rejecting the Teſtimony of *Euſebius* and *Photius*, who cite this ſecond Part, and more eſpecially that which relates to the Letters of S. *Ignatius*; neither doth it ſignifie any thing to urge that the Epiſtle was concluded before, becauſe it is evident, that the Invocation of Jeſus Chriſt is frequently inſerted in the middle of an Epiſtle, which is nevertheleſs continued after this ſort of Concluſion; this is very often to be found in S. *Paul*'s Epiſtles, particularly in the fifteenth Chapter of his Epiſtle to the *Romans*. The only Objection alledged by M. *Daille* that hath any manner of Probability is this; it is manifeſt (ſays he) that the Author who wrote that part wherein S. *Ignatius* is mentioned, ſuppoſeth him to be yet living, ſince he requires the *Philippians* to inform him concerning the tranſactions of S. *Ignatius*, and of thoſe that were with him; *De ipſo* Ignatio *& de iis qui cum eo ſunt* (g) *quæ certius agnoveritis ſignificate*. But if we obſerve theſe Words, it will appear, that they might as well be written after the Death of S. *Ignatius* as when he was alive, and that S. *Polycarp* only deſired an account of the particular Circumſtances of the Life and Martyrdom of that eminent Biſhop, which were not unknown to the Chriſtians of *Philippi*, through which City he had paſſed in his Journey to *Rome*.

This Epiſtle being full of admirable Counſels, Precepts and Exhortations taken from the Holy Scriptures, is written with a great deal of Elegancy and Simplicity, as *Photius* has obſerved already. It was Printed in *Latin* together with the Epiſtles of S. *Clement* and S. *Ignatius* in the years 1498, 1502, 1520, 1536, and 1550. at *Baſil* in 1579. at *Colen* in 1530. at *Paris* in 1569. with the Works of S. *Irenæus*, at *Ingolſtadt* in 1546. at *Paris* in 1562, and at ſeveral other times: It is likewiſe inſerted in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* ſet forth by *La Bigne*. Beſides, it was Printed at *Colen* in 1557. of the Tranſlation of *Perionius*, with the Works of *Dionyſius* the *Areopagite*, and in 1585, with them and the Epiſtles of S. *Ignatius*. *Halloixius* firſt publiſhed part thereof in *Greek* from a Manuſcript which *Sirmondus* had tranſcribed from a Copy written by *Turrianus*. *Uſher* hath printed it in *Greek* and *Latin* afterwards with the Epiſtles of S. *Ignatius* in the year 1644. *Cotelerius* put it into his Collection of the ancient Records of the Fathers. *Moderus* hath likewiſe procured it to be reprinted at *Helmſtadt*; and laſtly it was Printed in *Holland* in 1687. with a Diſſertation concerning the Life and Writings of S. *Polycarp*, in a Collection of Treatiſes, entituled, *Varia Sacra*, ſet forth by M. *Le Moine*.

There are ſeveral other Works attributed to this ancient Biſhop, as an Epiſtle to S. *Dionyſius* the *Areopagite*, quoted by *Suidas*, and a Treatiſe concerning the Union of S. *John*, which is pretended to be kept in the Abby of *Fleury*; ſome Paſſages or Notes on the Goſpels are likewiſe produced for his, which are taken from the *Catena* of *Feuardentius* under the Name of *Victor Capuenſis*. But it is very probable that theſe Tracts are fictitious. S. *Jerome* in his 28th Epiſtle to *Bæticus* declares, that it was commonly reported in his Time, that the Authentick Works of *Joſephus*, *Polycarp* and *Papias*, were brought to him, but that it was a falſe Rumor.

(g) *Qui cum eo ſunt*] It is expreſſed in the *Greek*, Τῶν μετ' αὐτοῦ, that is to ſay, they that had been with him, and who followed him when he paſſed through *Philippi*.

PAPIAS.

Papias.

Papias, Biſhop of *Hierapolis* (a) a City of *Aſia*, was a Diſciple either of S. *John* the Evangeliſt (b), or of ſome other Perſon who bore the ſame Name: He wrote five Books, entituled, *The Explications of our Lords Diſcourſes*, which were extant even in the Time of *Trithemius*; but at preſent we have only ſome few Fragments in the Writings of the ancient and modern

(a) *Hierapolis.*] There are ſeveral Cities of that Name, but this lies betwen *Phrygia* and *Lydia* near *Laodicea*, being famous for Springs of hot Water.

(b) *A Diſciple of S.* John *the Evangeliſt*] S. *Irenæus*, lib. 5. cap. 33. *Hæc Papias Joannis auditor Polycarpi contubernalis.* S. *Jerom*, Ep. 29. ad Theodorum: *Refert Irenæus vir Apoſtolicorum temporum & Papiæ auditoris Evangeliſtæ Joannis Diſcipulus.* In the Martyrologies of *Beda*, *Uſuardus*, and *Ado*, as alſo in the *Roman*, in the Works of *Trithemius* and *Andreas Cæſarienſis*, in *Anaſtaſ. Sinait.* lib. 7. in *Hexamer. Oecumen.* in *Act. cap.* 2. he is called, *The Diſciple of S.* John *the Evangeliſt*. *Euſebius* on the contrary reciting a Paſſage of *Papias* in *Hiſt lib.* 3. *cap. ult.* wherein he ſpeaks of two *Johns*, obſerves that the Maſter of *Papias* was not *John* the Evangeliſt, but the other *John* called the Elder. His Reaſon, or rather Conjecture, is, That this Author in the beginning of his Books doth not aſſure us, That he was the Diſciple of the Apoſtles, or that he had learn'd any thing from them, but only that he had received that which he declares from thoſe that were familiar with the Apoſtles, and who knew them. However, in the Paſſage alledged by *Euſebius* to prove his Aſſertion, *Papias* only affirms, That he interrogated the ancient Men who had ſeen the Apoſtles, demanding of them, What ſays *Andrew*? What ſays *Philip*? What ſays S. *John*? What ſays *John* the Elder? Therefore if it may be inferred from thence, that he was not the Diſciple of S. *John* the Evangeliſt, becauſe he informs us, that he enquired of thoſe who had ſeen him what were the Opinions of this Apoſtle; it may as well be inferred that he was not the Diſciple of *John* the Elder. However, the Words of *Papias* may be inter-

Authors

Authors. He was the first that promoted the famous Opinion, or rather Dotage of Antiquity (*c*), concerning the Temporal Reign of Jesus Christ, which they fansied should happen on Earth a thousand Years before the Day of Judgment, when the Elect should be gathered together after the Resurrection in the City of *Jerusalem*, and should enjoy there all the Delights imaginable during these thousand Years, *Papias.*

S. *Irenæus* produceth a Fragment taken from the fourth Book of *Papias*, wherein he endeavours to prove this Opinion by a Passage of the Prophet *Isaiah*: And *Eusebius* having cited a Paragraph of his Preface to these Books, in which he shews the great Care that he took to be informed of the Doctrin of the Apostles, by interrogating their Disciples, adds; *That this Author hath set down many things, which he pretended to have learnt by an unwritten Tradition, of which sort there are several new Parables and Instructions of our Saviour* Jesus Christ, *that are not contained in the Gospels, together with other fabulous Histories, among which we may reckon the Reign of* Jesus Christ *on Earth during the space of a thousand Years after the Resurrection of the Body; that which led him into this Error* (continueth *Eusebius*) *is that he understood the Discourses and Instructions of the Apostles too literally, not understanding that a mystical Sense ought to be given to this sort of Expressions, and that the Apostles only made use of them as illustrations; for he was a Man of a very mean Capacity, as appears from his Books, who nevertheless gave occasion to many of the ancient Fathers, and among others to* Irenæus, *to follow this Error, which they maintained by the Authority of* Papias. *Eusebius* in the same Place relates two Miracles, the account whereof *Papias* declares that he had received from the Daughter of *Philip* the Deacon, who resided at *Hierapolis*; That a dead Man was raised at that Time, and that *Barsabas* sirnamed *Justus*, Elected to be an Apostle, together with S. *Matthias*, having swallowed deadly Poison, was not hurt by it: Moreover he assures us, That *Papias* had collected in his Books divers Explications on some Words of Jesus Christ composed by *Aristion* a Disciple of the Apostles, and the Traditions likewise of the venerable Elder S. *John*; but omitting these things, he is content only to recite a Passage wherein this ancient Writer affirms, That S. *Mark* compiled his Gospel from what he had heard S. *Peter* tell of the Actions and Discourses of Jesus Christ, and this is the reason that he hath not observ'd an Historical Method; That S. *Matthew* wrote his Gospel in *Hebrew*, and that it was afterward Translated into *Greek*. Lastly, *Eusebius* affirms, that he cited the first Epistles of S. *Peter* and of S. *John*, and that he explained the History of a Woman that was accused before our Saviour of several Crimes, which was found in the Gospel according to the *Hebrews*. Thus we have given an account of all that is recorded by *Eusebius* concerning *Papias*. *Andreas Cæsariensis* and *Oecumenius* have likewise produced some Passages (*d*) of his Works in their Commentaries on the Holy Scripture, but it is not certain whether they were *Papias*'s or no.

The Judgment that ought to be given concerning him, is that which hath been already given by *Eusebius*, that is to say; That he was a good Man, but very credulous, and of very mean Parts, who delighted much in hearing and telling Stories and Miracles. And since he was exceedingly inquisitive, and inclined to believe every thing that was told him, it is not to be admired that he hath divulged divers Errors and extravagant Notions, as the Judgments of the Apostles, and hath given us fabulous Narratives for real Histories, which shews, that nothing is so dangerous in Matters of Religion, as lightly to believe, and too greedily to embrace, all that hath the Appearance of Piety, without considering in the first place how true it is (*e*).

preted after such a manner, as to signifie nothing else, but that he was careful whensoever he happened to meet with any one that had familiarly conversed with the Apostles, to desire of them a particular account of their Doctrin or Judgment; Which makes me believe, that he was the Disciple of the Evangelist, and this is confirmed by the Authority of S. *Irenæus*, who certainly means S *John* the Evangelist; for S. *Polycarp* was his Disciple, and he asserts that *Papias* was the Companion of *Polycarp*, *Polycarpi contubernalis*.

(*c*) *The famous Opinion, or rather Dotage of Antiquity.*] This was the Opinion of S. *Justin*, *Athenagoras*, S. *Irenæus*, S. *Clement*, *Tertullian*, *Lactantius*, and many other ancient Writers.

(*d*) Andræas Cæsariensis *and* Oecumenius *have likewise produced some Passages.*] *Andræas Cæsariensis*, in *Serm.* 12. in *Apocalyps.* cites a Passage of *Papias* wherein he says, that the disposing of sublunary Things was committed to the Care of the Angels that are round the Earth, but that they did not perform their Duty as they ought to do; *Oecumenius* upon the *Acts* observes, That *Papias* believed that *Judas* did not end his Life by hanging, but that he was run over with a Chariot, which is the Opinion of *Theophylact*, *Euthymius* and *Oecumenius*.

(*e*) *Without considering in the first place how true it is.*] This is conformable to an excellent Passage of S. *Augustin*: *Non sit Religio nostra in Phantasmatibus nostris; melius est enim quælecunque verum quam omne quicquid pro arbitrio fingi potest, melior est vera stipula, quam lex inani cogitatione pro suspicantis voluntate formata*: *De ver. Rel. c.* 55.

QUADRATUS *and* ARISTIDES.

Quadratus and *Ariſtides.*

THeſe two Defenders of the Faith preſented Apologies for Chriſtians to the Emperor *Adrian*: The firſt was a Diſciple of the Apoſtles (*a*), and it is ſaid, that he had the Gift of Prophecy (*b*). *Euſebius* aſſures us, That the Apology of this Author was extant in his Time, and that it ſhewed the Genius of this Man, and the true Doctrin of the Apoſtles. But we have only a ſmall Fragment produced by *Euſebius* in the fourth Book of his Hiſtory, *chap.* 3. wherein the Author declares, That none could doubt of the Truth of the Miracles of *Jeſus Chriſt*, becauſe the Perſons that were healed or raiſed from the Dead by him, had been ſeen, not only when he wrote his Miracles, or whilſt he was upon Earth, but even a very great while after his Death: *So that there are many* (ſays he) *who were yet living in our Time* (*c*).

We have alſo loſt the Apology of *Ariſtides*, which was preſerved till S. *Jerom*'s Time. *This* Ariſtides *was a very Eloquent* Athenian *Philoſopher*, (ſays the ſame S. *Jerom*) *who when he changed his Religion, did not alter his Profeſſion, and preſented unto the Emperor* Adrian, *at the ſame Time as* Quadratus, *a Volume in form of an Apology, wherein he produced the Proofs of our Religion, and being ſtill extant, ſhews the Learned how excellent a Writer this Author was.* The ſame S. *Jerom* obſerves in another Place, that this Work was full of Philoſophical Notions, and that it was afterward imitated by S. *Juſtin.*

(*a*) *A Diſciple of the Apoſtles.*] *Hieron. Ep.* 84. *ad Magnum.* This appears from the Fragment that is ſet down afterward. We muſt not confound this *Quadratus* with another of this Name who was Biſhop of *Athens*, and the Succeſſor of *Publius* mentioned by *Euſebius*, *Lib.* 4. *cap.* 23. S. *Jerom* makes no diſtinction between them in his Catalogue, nor in his Epiſtle to *Magnus*; and they are likewiſe confounded in the *Menologium Græcorum*: But *Valeſius* clearly proves that they are different; for the firſt was not a Biſhop, as appears from the Teſtimony of *Euſebius*, *Lib.* 3. *c.* 37. and *Lib.* 4. *c.* 3. Beſides, the former *Quadratus* was a Diſciple of the Apoſtles, and lived in the time of the Emperor *Adrian*, whereas the other never ſaw the Apoſtles, as being Contemporary with *Dionyſius Corinthius* under the Reign of *Antoninus*. And it cannot be doubted, but that it was the Elder who preſented the Apology to *Adrian*.

(*b*) *It is ſaid, that he had the Gift of Prophecy*] *Euſebius, Lib.* 3. *cap.* 37. aſſures us, That he was endued with the Gift of Prophecy, as were the Daughters of *Philip* the Deacon; and *Miltiades* in *Euſeb. Lib.* 5. *cap.* 17. reckons him in the Number of the Prophets of the New Teſtament.

(*c*) *In our Time.*] *Euſebius Theſſalonicenſis* cites this Author againſt *Andreas Cretenſis*, *apud Phot. Cod.* 335. *Bede*, who hath confounded him with the Biſhop of *Athens*, declares, that he determined that there was no Meat from which a Chriſtian ought to abſtain, which is likewiſe Recorded in the *Menologium Græcorum* upon the 21*ſt* day of *September*.

AGRIPPA.

Agrippa.

AT the ſame Time, and under the Reign of the ſame Emperor, lived *Agrippa*, Sirnamed *Caſtor*, a Learned Man, who wrote a very convincing Book againſt the Hereſie of *Baſilides*, in which he confuted the Errors of this Heretick, after he had diſcovered them, and detected all his Devices and Frauds. He obſerves, (ſays *Euſebius*) that *Baſilides*, had written twenty four Books on the Goſpels, and that he forged ſeveral Prophets that never were in the World, to whom he attributed extraordinary Names, ſuch as *Barſabas* and *Barcoph*, on purpoſe to amuſe the Minds of his Auditors. He affirmed alſo, That this Heretick taught his Followers, That it was a thing indifferent to eat Sacrifices that were offered unto Idols; That it was lawful to renounce the Faith in the Time of Perſecution; and that, in imitation of *Pythagoras*, he impoſed Silence on his Diſciples for the ſpace of five Years. We have no further Knowledge of this Author, ſince his Book is loſt, and I know not whether we have any conſiderable Fragment of it left.

HEGESIPPUS.

Hegeſippus.

HEgeſippus appeared in the World a little after the Death of the Apoſtles, about the beginning of the Second Age of the Church (*a*). He left the *Jewiſh* Religion, in which he was born (*b*), to Embrace that of the Chriſtians; he took a Journey to *Rome* under the Pontificate of Pope *Anicetus*,

(*a*) About the beginning of the Second Age of the Church.] *Euſeb.* Lib. 2. cap. 23. Ὁ Ἡγήσιππος ὅτι τῶν ἀποστόλων χρόνοις διαδόχοις. S. *Hieron.* Hegeſippus *vicinus Apoſtolicorum temporum omnes a Paſſione Domini uſque ad ſuam ætatem Eccleſiaſticorum Actuum texens Hiſtorias, multaque alia ad utilitatem legentium pertinentia hinc inde congregans, quinque libros ſcripſit Sermone ſimpliciori, ut quorum vitam ſectabatur, dicendi quoque exprimeret caracterem.*

(*b*) He left the *Jewiſh* Religion, in which he was born.] *Euſeb.* Lib. 4. c. 22. *Nonnulla item in Hebræorum Evangelio, & ex Hebraica Lingua profert in medium, ſatis per hæc aperte ſignificans ſe ex Hebræis ad Chriſti fidem tranſiſſe.*

and

and remained there until that of *Eleutherus* (*c*), that is to ſay, from the Year 165, until the Year 180, or thereabouts; he is the firſt Author that hath Compoſed an entire Body of the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, which he divided into five Books (*d*), wherein he relates the principal Occurrences which happened in the Church from *Jeſus Chriſt*'s Paſſion to his own Time. This Book was written in a ſimple Style (*e*), becauſe he reſolved (ſays S. *Jerom*) to imitate the Phraſes and Dialect of thoſe, whoſe Lives he wrote. We have only ſome few Fragments left, which are inſerted by *Euſebius* in his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory. *Hegeſippus.*

The firſt Fragment extracted from the Writings of *Hegeſippus*, and produced by *Euſebius* in the ſecond Book of his Hiſtory, Chap. 23. contains a Relation of the Martyrdom of S. *James* Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, but his way of telling it looks more like a fabulous Narrative than a true Hiſtory (*f*).

The ſecond Fragment of *Hegeſippus* is likewiſe to be found in the Hiſtory of *Euſebius*, Book 3. Chap. 20. He therein informs us, That the Emperor *Domitian* cauſed a ſtrict Search to be made after the Poſterity of *David*, who were the Children of S. *Jude* the Brother of our Lord, but that perceiving them to be extremely poor, and very far from being able to make any Attempt againſt the Empire, he ſoon diſmiſſed them without any Moleſtation (*g*).

The third is alſo found in the ſame Book, *Ch.* 32. where he gives an account of the Martyrdom of *Simeon* the Son of *Cleophas* Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, who was crucified under the Reign of *Trajan*, and adds, That hitherto the Church had remained a Virgin (*h*), but that after the Death of thoſe that had heard and ſeen *Jeſus Chriſt* in the Fleſh, the firſt *Hereſiarchs* began openly to divulge their deteſtable Errors.

The fourth Fragment concerning *Antinous*, whom *Adrian* cauſed to be regiſtred among the Gods is cited, *Book* 4. *Chap.* 8. only to ſhew that *Hegeſippus* lived after the Time of that Emperor.

The fifth is in *Book* 4. *Chap.* 22. where *Hegeſippus* ſpeaks of his Journey to *Rome* in paſſing through *Corinth*, where he ſaw *Primus* the Biſhop of that City; he deſcribes the Election of *Simeon* in the room of S. *James*, and makes mention of a certain Perſon named *Thebutis*, whom he affirms to have been the firſt that rent the Church by his Errors, being incenſed becauſe he was not made a Biſhop; he obſerves, that this *Thebutis* had collected his Doctrins from the ſeven Sects that were among the *Jews*, as well as the other Hereticks.

Euſebius adds, That *Hegeſippus* produced divers Paſſages out of the *Hebrew* and *Syriack* Goſpels, and that he ſpeaks of ſeveral Traditions of the *Jews*; it is likewiſe obſerved by him, That he cites the Proverbs of *Solomon*, as well as S. *Irenæus*, under the Name of *The Book of Wiſdom*, and that he mentions certain Apocryphal Writings compoſed by the Hereticks of his Time. This is all that is extant of the Five Books of the Hiſtory of *Hegeſippus*, the Order of which is alſo unknown to us; but, as far as we can judge by the remaining Fragments of this Work, it was not very exact, and was rather filled with feigned and fabulous Relations, than with ſolid and real Hiſtories.

We have beſides, under the Name of *Hegeſippus* an Hiſtory of the Wars of the *Jews*, and of the taking of the City of *Jeruſalem*, divided into five Books, which hath been often publiſhed, and particularly at *Colen* with the Notes of *Galterius*, in the Year 1559. It was likewiſe printed in a Collection of the Works of the Fathers, ſet forth by *Laurentius de la Barre*, *A. D.* 1583. as alſo in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* of *La Bigne*, *&c.* But it is certain that this Work does not belong to *Hegeſippus*, it being evident that it was written by an Author who lived after the Reign of *Conſtantine* the Great. For firſt, the Hiſtory of *Hegeſippus* was merely Eccleſiaſtical, whereas this is an Hiſtory of the *Jews* copied out in Part from *Joſephus*. Secondly, We do not find therein any of the Paſ-

(*c*) *And remained there until that of* Eleutherus.] So S. *Jerom* ſays; but *Hegeſippus* only declares, That he came to *Rome*, and reſided there during the Pontificate of *Anicetus*, whoſe Deacon *Eleutherus* was at that time; that *Soter* ſucceeded *Anicetus*, and *Eleutherus Soter*. This ſhews, that he lived in the Time of the *Antonines*, and wrote his Hiſtory at leaſt under the Pontificate of *Eleutherus*. In the Chronicle of *Alexandria* it is obſerved, that he died under the Reign of the Emperor *Commodus*.

(*d*) *Which he divided into five Books.*] According to the Teſtimony of *Euſebius* and S. *Jerom*; this Work was entituled, ὑπομνήματα ἐν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν πραξεων, *Apud Euſeb. & Gobarum apud Phot. c.* 232.

(*e*) *This Work was written in a ſimple Style.*] This *Euſebius*, *Lib.* 4. *c.* 8. and S. *Jerom de Script. Eccleſ.* both bear witneſs.

(*f*) *But his way of telling it, looks more like a fabulous Narrative than a true Hiſtory.*] *Scaliger* proves by many Arguments that this Relation is fabulous, ſome whereof are not very ſolid, but others are ſo convincing, that the Anſwers of *Halloixius* and *Petavius* are not ſufficient to give Satisfaction to any Man of a ſound Judgment; for to omit the particular Circumſtances of the Life of S. *James* recited by *Hegeſippus*, which cannot be true; as that he alone was permitted to enter into the Sanctuary, becauſe he was not cloathed in Woollen but in Linnen, and other Things of the like nature; the account of his Martyrdom being contrary to that of *Joſephus*, the verity of whoſe Hiſtory was never ſuſpected by any, furniſhes us with Arguments againſt which it is almoſt impoſſible to diſpute. See *Valeſius* his Notes on *Euſebius*.

(*g*) *He ſoon diſmiſſed them without any moleſtation.*] This Narrative is likewiſe accuſed of Falſhood by *Scaliger*, but his Arguments are not ſo conſiderable as thoſe which he urges againſt the former: The Anſwers of *Halloixius* and *Valeſius* are indeed of ſome Weight; yet I can ſcarcely perſwade my ſelf of the Truth of this Relation.

(*h*) *Hitherto the Church had remained a Virgin.*] Not but that the Church always remains in this ſtate. Therefore the meaning of *Hegeſippus* is this; That until that time ſhe was not torn in pieces by Hereſies and Schiſms, and that all thoſe who were called by the Name of *Chriſtians*, had one and the ſame Faith, whereas afterward the Arch-Hereticks divided the Profeſſors of Chriſtianity, rent the Church, and propagated their pernicious Errors. It were a manifeſt Abuſe of this Paſſage to interpret it otherwiſe.

Hegeſippus. ſages of the true *Hegeſippus* that are produced by *Euſebius*. Thirdly it is Recorded by this Author, in *Book* 3. *C.* 5. that the City of *Antioch*, which was reckoned as the third in Order and Dignity among thoſe of the *Roman* Empire, became the ſecond ever ſince the City of *Byzantium* was called by the Name of *Conſtantinople*. It is plain therefore, that the Author of this Book lived after *Conſtantine*. Some with *Gronovius* attribute it to S. *Ambroſe*, by reaſon of the Conformity of its Style to that of the Writings of this Father; others, as *Labbee*, are of Opinion, that it is a *Greek* Verſion; and laſtly, others, as *Voſſius* and *Miræus*, affirm, That this Book was Compiled ſince the Time of *Nicephorus Phocas*, that is to ſay, after the tenth Century, becauſe the Author diſcourſing concerning the City of *Antioch*, declares, that it formerly belonged to the *Perſians*, and that at preſent it was a Bulwark againſt them, which may be underſtood of the taking of this City by the Emperor *Phocas*. However it be, this Author is only a Tranſcriber, or an Interpreter of *Joſephus*, who hath made a kind of an imperfect Epitome of his Hiſtory. The *Latin* Interpreter, who hath Tranſlated it from *Joſephus*, gave it the Title of *Joſeppi* or *Joſippi*, and the Tranſcribers not underſtanding this Word, have ſubſtituted *Igiſippi* or *Egeſippi* in its Room, as it appears from ſome ancient Manuſcripts.

Father *Mabillon* obſerves in his Voyage into *Italy*, that he found in the *Ambroſian* Library at *Milan* an ancient Manuſcript of this Book, wherein it is ſaid, that it was Tranſlated by S. *Ambroſe*, in the Titles whereof it is ſometimes written *Joſippi*; he ſaw another likewiſe at *Turin* that appear'd to be about 700 years old, and that was entituled *Egeſippi*. If theſe Manuſcripts are as ancient as *Mabillon* would have them to be, this Book muſt of neceſſity be of greater Antiquity than *Voſſius* and *Miræus* have imagined. It was Printed by it ſelf at *Paris* in the Years 1511, 1589, 1610; and afterwards inſerted in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*.

S. JUSTIN.

S. Juſtin. S. *Juſtin* was a Native of the City of *Sichem*, otherwiſe called *Naples* of *Paleſtine* (*a*), which even at this Day bears the Name of *Napolous*; his Father was called *Priſcus Bacchius*; he was a *Græcian* by Birth and Religion (*b*), but having in vain ſought for the Knowledge of the true God among all the Sects of the *Pagan* Philoſophers, (tho' he chiefly adhered to the *Platonick*) was converted to the Chriſtian Faith in a private Conference that happened between him and a certain ancient Man unknown to him, as himſelf tells the Story in his Dialogue with *Tryphon*; however being turned Chriſtian he did not lay aſide his Habit nor his Profeſſion, but added to his Skill in the Heathen Philoſophy, a profound Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures. He was at *Rome* when the Perſecution, that was raiſed under the Reign of *Antoninus Pius* the Succeſſor of *Adrian*, began to break forth, where he compoſed an excellent Apology in behalf of the Chriſtians, and Dedicated it to the Emperor, and to the *Cæſars* his Sons (*c*), about the Year 150 after the Nativity of *Jeſus Chriſt* (*d*).

(*a*) *Of the City of* Sichem, *otherwiſe called* Naples *of* Paleſtine.] In *Dialog.* 2. *a p.* 212. *ad p.* 223. *Juſt. Apol.* 2. *p.* 53. Ιυστινος Πειθων τῳ Βακχειῳ τῳ ἀπὸ Φλαυιας νεας πολεως ἡ Συριας, Juſtin *the Son of* Priſcus Bacchius *of* Flavia, *the new City, or* Naples *of* Syria. This was one of the principal Cities of the *Samaritans*, and it hath had four Names. The firſt and moſt ancient is that of *Sichem*; thus it is uſually called in the Holy Scripture, and in the Works of *Joſephus*. The Second is *Maboortha*, or *Mamortha*, in *Joſeph.* Lib. 5. *de bello Judaico*, c. 4. and in *Plin.* Lib. 5. *Nat. Hiſt.* c. 13. The Third is *Naples*, and the Fourth is *Flavia*, which Name it has had ever ſince one of the Emperors (it is not certainly known, whether it were *Veſpaſian* or *Domitian*) cauſed a Colony of the Greeks to be Tranſported thither. Moreover this Name is to be found, not only in the Paſſage of S. *Juſtin*, that we have even now cited, but alſo in ancient Medals and particularly in one of *Domitian*'s Φ ΒΙ-ΟΠΟΛΕΙΤΩΝ ΣΑΜΑΡΕΙΤΩΝ.

(*b*) *He was a Greek by Birth and Religion.*] S. *Epiphanius* ſeems to believe, that S. *Juſtin* was of the Extraction and Religion of the *Samaritans*, when he ſays, that he paſſed from the *Samaritan* to the Chriſtian Religion, ἀπὸ Σαμαρίτων εἰς Χριστὸν πεπιστευκέναι. But when S. *Juſtin* himſelf mentions his Converſion, he declares, that he had been Educated in the Greek Religion, and that having diſcovered the Falſhood thereof he readily embrac'd the Chriſtian. It is true indeed that he calls the *Samaritans* in his Dialogue, and in his firſt Apology, *his Stock, his Nation*, and the like: But it was becauſe he was born among them, in a City the Original whereof was *Samaritan*, as S. *Paul* is ſaid to be a Citizen of *Rome*, and of the City of *Tarſus*, tho' he was a Jew, and of the Tribe of *Benjamin*; and perhaps *Epiphanius* meant nothing elſe in this Place.

(*c*) *To the Emperor, and to the* Cæſars *his Sons.*] The Inſcription of this Apology is, *To the Emperor* Ælius Hadrianus, Antoninus Pius, Auguſtus Cæſar, *and to his Son* Veriſſimus, *and to* Lucius *the Philoſopher, the natural Son of* Cæſar, *and the adoptive of* Antoninus Pius. To underſtand this Inſcription it is requiſite to know, that the Emperor *Antoninus Pius*, the Adoptive Son of *Adrian*, adopted *Marcus Antoninus* the Philoſopher; and *Lucius Verus*, the Son of *Ælius Verus*, whom ſome affirm to have been adopted by *Marcus* the Philoſopher; therefore the firſt, who is named in this Inſcription, is the Emperor *Antoninus Pius*; the Second called *Veriſſimus*, is *Marcus Antoninus* the Philoſopher, the adoptive Son of *Antonius*; the Third is *Lucius Verus*, the Son of *Ælius Verus*, who had been *Cæſar*, and was the adoptive Son of *Antoninus Pius*; he affects to call them Philoſophers, and Pious, that ſo he might inſinuate himſelf into their Favor, and that he might oblige them patiently to hearken to the Reaſons of the Chriſtians.

[This Reaſon is by no means true: S. *Juſtin* deſigned only to give theſe Emperors thoſe Titles, by which they themſelves deſired to be called: This Family of the *Antonines* from *Adrian* to *Commodus* affected the Title of *Philoſophers*, as much as of *Fathers of their Country*, or any other Title by which the flattering *Romans* endeavoured to get the Favour of their Maſters whom they Courted.]

(*d*) *About the Year after the Nativity of Jeſus Chriſt.*] It could not be written before this Time, becauſe he mentions in two ſeveral places, the

This

This Apology is commonly called the second, but is really the first, whereas the other, commonly so called, is actually the second (*e*), nay, (if we may give Credit to the Testimony of *Eusebius*) it was not Presented unto the Emperor and the Senate (*f*) until the Time of *Marcus Antoninus* the Philosopher and Successor of *Antoninus Pius*. The Subject of these two Apologies is almost the same. S. *Justin* in the former, to shew the Injustice of their Proceedings in Punishing and Persecuting the Christians, and that they were Innocent of the Crimes laid to their Charge, gives an exact account to the Emperor and his Sons, of their Doctrin, Manners, and Ceremonies, which Qualifications render this Apology one of the most considerable Records of Antiquity, and one of those wherein many things are contained relating to our Religion: We there find the Doctrin of the Church concerning the Trinity, the Incarnation of our Saviour, and Eternal Life, as also the Proofs of the Christian Faith, the Holiness of the Conversation of its Professors, together with a Description of their Assemblies, and the Ceremonies used by them in the Administration of the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. S. *Justin*.

The second Apology, whereof some few Sentences are lost, doth not comprehend such variety of Matter, as being properly a Complaint or Remonstrance directed to the Emperor, the Senate, and all the People of *Rome*, concerning the Injuries that were unjustly offered to the Christians. In this last Apology he describes the Snares that were laid for him by a certain *Cynick* Philosopher named *Crescens*, whom he had convinced of Ignorance and Debauchery. *I expect* (says he) *that those that falsly call themselves Philosophers, should lie in wait for me, and should cause me to be bound with Chains; perhaps through the Instigation of this ignorant* Crescens, *who delights more in vain Glory than in the Truth.* This really happened just as he foretold; for not long after, *Tatian* (*g*) the Disciple of *Justin* observes, this *Crescens* caused him to be Condemned to Death in the Sixth Year of the Reign of *Marcus Antoninus* the Philosopher (*h*), in the Year 166. It is not certainly known what kind of Punishment was inflicted on him, unless we stand by the Accounts which are given us in the *Menologium* (*i*) of the Greeks, or the Acts of his Martyrdom (*k*) related by *Metaphrastes*, which seem to be very ancient; wherein it is declared, that he was beheaded by the command of *Rusticus* the *Prefect* or Gover-

Followers of *Marcion*, who came not to *Rome*, till the Death of Pope *Hyginus* in the Fourth Year of *Antoninus*, and did not begin to propagate his Heresie, until about the end of the Reign of the same Emperor. S. *Justin* himself says, that it was 150 Years after the Birth of Christ, when he wrote it, *Dici a nobis Christum ante centum quinquaginta annos natum sub Cyrenio.* It is observed by *Eusebius* in his History, That it was Composed under the Pontificate of *Anicetus*, wherefore S. *Jerom* is deceived when he asserts, that it was presented in the Fourth Year of *Antoninus*, and *Scaliger* is yet more mistaken, when he maintains that it was written in the beginning of his Reign; and the Argument alledged by him, that S. *Justin* mentions the War raised against the Jews under *Adrian*, as a thing that lately happened, τὸν νεωστὶ γεγενημένον πόλεμον, is not considerable, since this might very well be affirmed of a War that was made ten or twelve Years before.

(*e*) *Is actually the second.*] It is not to be doubted but that the Apology which is commonly called the first, is really the second, for besides the Authority of *Eusebius*, and *Anastasius* the Library Keeper, it is evident that it was written a little before the Martyrdom of S. *Justin*, since he therein describes the snares that were laid for him by the Philosopher *Crescens*. But there is only the Testimony of *Eusebius* to induce us to believe that it was Composed in the time of *Marcus Antoninus*. *Valesius* affirms, That *Eusebius* is mistaken in this Point; 1. because he affirms in this Apology, That a certain Woman that was desirous to live separately from her Husband, presented a Petition to the Emperor, ἐπὶ τῷ αὐτοκράτορι, and not to the Emperors which she ought to have done, if this had happened in the beginning of the Reign of *Marcus Antoninus*, who had *Lucius Verus* for his Associate in the Empire. 2. Because he there says, That a certain Person named *Lucius* reproved a Judge in these Words: *This is not worthy of a pious Emperor, nor of him who is the Son of a* Cæsar *and a Philosopher*; or, as it is expressed by *Eusebius*, *Of a Philosopher the Son of a* Cæsar, ἐ φρέπουσα εὐσεβεῖ αὐτοκράτορι, οὐδὲ φιλοσόφῳ Καίσαρος παιδὶ, *Eusebius*, οὐδὲ φιλοσόφῳ. This Pious Emperor (says *Valesius*) is *Antoninus Pius*. And the Philosopher the Son of *Cæsar* can be no other than *Marcus Antoninus* surnamed the Philosopher. The third Objection is, that *Urbicus* who is mentioned in this Apology, as *Præfectus* or Governour of the City of *Rome*, exercised this Office under *Antoninus*, as appears from the third Oration of *Apuleius*, and from the Inscriptions of *Gruser*, *p.* 38. These are the Reasons or rather Conjectures of *Valesius*, which nevertheless seem not to deserve to be preferred before the Attestation of *Eusebius*, and in my Opinion they may be easily answered; for, 1. Mention is only made of one Emperor in this Apology, because *Lucius* was absent, and might be engaged in his Expedition against the *Persians*. 2. The Epithet of *Pious* might likewise be attributed to *Marcus Antoninus* the Philosopher, and his Son *Commodus* might well be called the Son of the Philosopher. Lastly, *Urbicus* might be Governour of *Rome* in the beginning of the Reign of *Marcus Antoninus* the Philosopher, as well as at the end of that of *Antoninus Pius*.

(*f*) *And the Senate.*] *Valesius* affirms, That it was directed to the Emperor alone, and not to the Senate; however it is not only addressed to the Senate, but the Author likewise in the sequel of his Discourse makes application to the *Romans* in the plural Number.

(*g*) *As is observed by* Tatian.] In *Lib. contr.* Gr. ὡς καὶ Ἰουστῖνον καθάπερ μεγάλω κακῷ τῷ θανάτῳ περιβαλεῖν περισπουδάσαι. *He procured that* Justin *should be condemned to Death, as if to dye were the greatest of all Evils.*

(*h*) *In the sixth Year of the Reign of* Marcus Antoninus *the Philosopher.*] The Author of the *Alexandrian* Chronicle sets the Death of S. *Justin* down in this Year, and we have not any certainer Proof.

(*i*) *To the* Menologium.] *In Menolog. Kalend. Junii.*

(*k*) *Or to the Acts of his Martyrdom.*] These Acts are very plain, and contain the Replies of S. *Justin* and of six other Companions of his Martyrdom, which are very generous and pathetical; which makes me think that they are ancient.

nour

nour of the City of *Rome*, under whom *Epiphanius* (*l*) likewiſe affirms, That S. *Juſtin* ſuffer'd Mar-
S. *Juſtin.* tyrdom.

Beſides theſe two Apologies, there are ſeveral other Books of this ancient Father, as, his excellent Dialogue againſt *Tryphon* the Jew, which was Compoſed by him after his firſt Apology, ſince he expreſly aſſures us therein, That he had informed the Emperor, in a particular Writing, that ſome *Samaritans* were led away by the Impoſtures of *Simon Magus*; (*m*) which Paſſage is in his Apology, dedicated to the Emperor *Antoninus*, from whence it follows that it was written before this Dialogue. *Euſebius* ſays, That this Conference was holden at *Epheſus*, but whether S. *Juſtin* ever had any Diſcourſe with *Tryphon*, or whether he only feign'd it, as *Plato*, *Cicero* and many others have done, this Book is very conſiderable. This Author proves againſt the Jews by an infinite number of Paſſages taken from the Old Teſtament, That Jeſus Chriſt is the *Meſſiah* and the *Word*; who firſt appeared unto the Patriarchs, and afterward condeſcended ſo far as to be made Man, and to be born of the Virgin *Mary*, for our Salvation. Of all the Writings of this ancient Martyr, cited by *Euſebius*, theſe only that we have now mentioned remain entire; to which may be added, a Fragment of his Treatiſe of Monarchy, wherein (ſays *Euſebius*) he demonſtrated the Unity of one God, not only by the Authority of the Holy Scriptures, but alſo by the Teſtimony of profane Authors. The firſt part of this Work is loſt, but I am perſuaded, that there is no reaſon to doubt, but that the Tract which is at preſent Entituled, *Of Monarchy*, is the Second Part thereof, and ſo much the rather, becauſe it begins after this manner; (*n*) *Having already produced Divine Authority; I ſhall alſo make uſe of human Allegations*, from whence it evidently appears, That this Book which we now have, is the Second part of that mentioned by *Euſebius*.

We might likewiſe attribute to S. *Juſtin*, two Orations which are prefixed at the beginning of his Works, wherein he exhorts the Gentiles to embrace the Chriſtian Religion, in ſhewing the abſurdity and Novelty of that of the Pagans, and the Truth and Antiquity of ours. Theſe two Diſcourſes are undoubtedly ancient, and tho' they are not quoted by *Euſebius*, and the Style of them ſeems to be a little different from that of S. *Juſtin*, yet we may affirm them to have been written by him, without any Injury to his Reputation. The ſame Judgment may likewiſe be given of the Epiſtle to *Diognetus*, (*o*) which was alſo Compoſed by an ancient Author, who lived in a Time when the Chriſtians were under Perſecution: But the other Epiſtle written to *Zena* and *Serenus*, does not agree in the leaſt with the Style of S. *Juſtin*, and contains many Precepts, which rather concern Monks than ſimple Chriſtians (*p*).

As for the other Works that bear the Name of this Father; Beſides that they are not cited by *Euſebius*, nor any of the ancient Writers, we have poſitive Proofs that they are counterfeit. The firſt of theſe is a Treatiſe purely Philoſophical, the Compiler whereof produceth divers Paſſages of *Ariſtotle's Phyſick*; which he confutes very dryly, and in a Style altogether different, not only from that of S. *Juſtin*, but even from that of the Age wherein he lived. At the End of this Tract there is another written, after the ſame manner, and probably Compoſed by the ſame Author, wherein are comprehended five Queſtions, which he calls Chriſtian, tho they have a much greater Tincture of the ſubtilty of a Philoſopher, than of the ſimplicity of a Chriſtian. Beſides, the Author of this Book reſolves theſe Queſtions, after the Method of the Pagan Philoſophers; and afterwards diſallows of the firſt Anſwer, by accommodating Chriſtianity to Philoſophy; to this are annexed ſeveral Philoſophical Axioms together with divers Queſtions and Anſwers concerning Incorporeal Things, and the Reſurrection. All theſe Books are written in the ſame Style and by the ſame Author after the Hereſie of the *Manichees* was ſprung up, which is often mentioned therein; now ſince this Hereſie was not known till above an Hundred Years after the Death of S. *Juſtin*, it muſt neceſſarily be affirmed that they were not written by him.

The Book of Anſwers to the Queſtions of the Orthodox, containing 146 that are very curious, is much more uſeful, and more worthy of a Divine than the preceeding; but neither can this belong to S. *Juſtin*, tho' it is aſcribed to him by *Photius*; for beſides that this ſort of Queſtions and Anſwers were not uſual in his time, in which no regard was had to matters of Curioſity, ſuch as the moſt part of thoſe that are compriſed in this Work, *Origen* is cited in *Queſt.* 82. and 88. S. *Irenæus* in the 115

(*l*) *S. Epiphanius.*] It ought to be obſerved, That S. *Epiphanius* is deceived in referring the Martyrdom of S. *Juſtin* to the Reign of the Emperor *Adrian*; but he is not miſtaken as to the Name of *Ruſticus*, who lived in the Time of *Marcus Antoninus*, and was much eſteemed by him.

(*m*) *Pag.* 342.

(*n*) *It begins after this manner.*] Page 103. Φιλοδόξῳ τῇ γνώμῃ χαίρουσες φιλαληθεῖ χρήσασθαι τῇ φωνῇ.

(*o*) *The Epiſtle to* Diognetus.] This Letter is written very much after S. *Juſtin's* way. There is mention made of a certain Perſon named *Diognetus* an able Painter in the Writings of the Emperor *Marcus Aurelius*, and in thoſe of *Julius Capitolinus*.

(*p*) *Rather concern Monks than ſimple Chriſtians.*] ſuch are theſe following Inſtructions; That they ought not to give occaſion to Diſcord; That they ought not to withdraw themſelves from the Publick Prayers on the account of any Difference; That they ought not to ſeek after the chiefeſt and the moſt honourable Employments; That they ought to keep Silence and to preſerve Modeſty; That they ought not to diſcourſe of the Affairs of the World, but that they ought to look upon them as out of their way, and not to retain them in their Minds; and many other Admonitions of this Nature, which although exceeding uſeful, yet ſuit more with another Age different from that wherein S. *Juſtin* lived, and ſeem to have been given to Monks rather than ordinary Chriſtians. The Author gives an account there of a Letter which he had written to a certain Pope, and to his Superiors, which further confirms our Conjecture.

and

and the *Manichees* in the 127. The Author Diſcourſeth there of the Myſteries of the Trinity, and of the Incarnation, in ſuch Expreſſions, and with ſuch Precautions as were not in uſe, until thoſe Hereſies were ſtarted in which theſe Truths were called in Queſtion. We find the Words *Hypoſtaſis, Perſon, Conſubſtantial*, in *Queſt.* 16, 17, 139, 144. according to the Senſe that was attributed to them by the Church, in the Fifth and Sixth Century. In *Queſt.* 126, he ſays, That at the Time when this Book was written, Chriſtianity was no longer under the Dominion of Paganiſm, which evidently ſhews that the Author of theſe Queſtions is much later than S. *Juſtin*, not to mention that there are ſome things in this Work, which are not conformable to the Doctrin of this Father; as for Example, in *Queſt.* 52. he denies that the Witch of *Endor* cauſed the Soul of *Samuel* to return, which is aſſerted by S. *Juſtin*, in his Dialogue againſt *Tryphon*; in *Queſt.* 112. he ſays, that it was a created Angel that communed with *Moſes* and *Jacob*, which is expreſly contrary to the Doctrin of this Father, and of the reſt of the Writers of that Age, who believed it to be the Word himſelf. Some attribute theſe Queſtions to *Theodoret*, as well becauſe they come near his way of writing, as becauſe there are ſeveral Phraſes uſed by the Writer, which are alſo frequently found in *Theodoret*. However it be, this Book was written by an Author, who lived about the Fifth or Sixth Age of the Church. Laſtly, the Expoſition of Faith, attributed to S. *Juſtin*, and cited by *Leontius*, and *Euthymius Zagabenus*, too plainly refutes the Errors of the *Arians*, *Neſtorians* and *Eutychians* to be written near the Age, in which this Father lived. S. *Juſtin.*

It were to be wiſhed, that inſtead of theſe Books which are falſly aſcribed to S. *Juſtin*, we had thoſe that were really Compoſed by him, whereof the Titles only remain at preſent. He wrote as he himſelf declares (*q*), a Treatiſe againſt Hereſies; and it is difficult to determine, whether the Book againſt *Marcion*, cited by S. *Irenæus* in two ſeveral Places, was part of that Tract; or whether it were a diſtinct Work, according to the Opinion of S. *Jerom*; however (*r*), there is nothing now extant, except two Paſſages quoted by S. *Irenæus*. We have alſo entirely loſt two Books that were Compoſed by S. *Juſtin*, againſt the Gentiles, in the firſt of which, after having Diſcourſed of divers Queſtions that are uſually debated, as well by the Chriſtians, as among the Pagan Philoſophers, he treated of the Nature of Demons; the other was Ἔλεγχος called and contained a Confutation of the Errors of the Heathens. It may perhaps be ſuſpected by ſome, that thoſe two Treatiſes are the Orations prefixed at the beginning of the Works of S. *Juſtin*, immediately before his two Apologies; but beſides that they have different Titles, there is not any Deſcription in either of the two, of the Nature of Demons. Moreover there was another Work called Ψαλτης, that is to ſay, the Pſalmiſt, and a Book of Collections concerning the Soul, wherein he produced the Opinions of the Pagan Philoſophers, promiſing to give his own in another Diſcourſe on this Subject. Theſe are all the Writings of S. *Juſtin* mentioned by *Euſebius*, S. *Jerom* and *Photius*; beſides which (ſays *Euſebius*) *There are many other Works written by him, in the hands of the Chriſtians*; Perhaps the Epiſtle to *Diognetus*, and the two Books againſt the Gentiles belong to this Number. *Anaſtaſius Sinaita* and *Glycas*, cite a Commentary of this Father upon the *Hexameron*. *Methodius*, *Leontius* and S. *John Damaſcen*, quote a Book of his concerning the Reſurrection of the Body, but it is very probable, that theſe Writings are none of his.

This Author (ſays the Learned *Photius*, ſpeaking of S. *Juſtin*) *was perfectly ſkilled in the Chriſtian Philoſophy, and yet more in the Profane; he had acquired an univerſal Learning, and a perfect Knowledg of Hiſtory; but he hath taken no care to adorn the Natural Beauty of Philoſophy, with the Artificial Ornaments of Eloquence; Therefore his Diſcourſes, tho' very Learned, have not the Elegancy and Grace of Eloquent Diſcourſes.* This Character appears throughout all his Works, which are extreamly full of Citations, and of Paſſages taken from the Holy Scriptures and Profane Authors, with little Order, and without any Ornament. He had joyned to his exquiſite Skill in the Pagan Philoſophy, an admirable Knowledge of the Sacred and Prophetical Writings, as alſo of the Principles of the Chriſtian Religion; that there is ſcarce any one of the ancient Fathers who ever Diſcourſed more accurately, than he hath done of all its Myſteries. It is true indeed, that as to the Doctrin of the Trinity (*r*),

(q) *As he himſelf declares.*] Apol. 2. Pag. 70. ὅτι δὲ ἡμῖν καὶ σύνταγμα κατὰ πασῶν τῶν γενομένων αἱρέσεων ὁ τοιοῦτος ἔστι βέλεσι ἐντυχεῖν δώσομεν. *We have alſo Compoſed a Book againſt all the Hereſies that have appeared, which we ſhall preſent unto you if you deſire it.* S. *Irenæus* Lib. 4. Cap. 14. *Præclare Juſtinus in eo libro, quem ſcripſit contra Marcionem ait, quoniam ipſe quoque Domino non credidiſſet alterum Deum annunciauti*; and Lib. 5. *Bene Juſtinus in ſuo libro ait, quoniam ante adventum Domini nunquam auſus eſt Satanas blaſphemare Deum, quippe nondum ſciens ſuam damnationem.*

(r) *As to the Doctrin of the Trinity.*] The moſt difficult Paſſage concerning the Trinity is that which we read in his Dialogue, page 356, and 357. wherein he declares, That the Father is inviſible and the Son viſible, and that the Majeſty of the Father is greater than that of the Son. But if we reflect a little on this matter, it will appear, that S. *Juſtin* and the other Fathers who ſaid the ſame thing, yet do not affirm that the Father is of a different Nature or Subſtance from the Son; but only, that it is the Son who manifeſted himſelf unto Men, or rather, that the Father hath not diſcovered himſelf unto Men but by his Son. Their Principle is this, That the Father performs no exterior Action but through his Word, which is his Son; that it was the Son who created the World, who revealed himſelf under ſeveral Figures to the Patriarchs and Prophets, and who at laſt was made Man. It is on this account that they aſſert, That the Son is viſible and the Father inviſible, becauſe the Father is not viſible but through the Son; but this doth not hinder them from being of the ſame Nature. We find the like Expreſſions in S. *Athanaſius*, *Orat.* 4. *contra Arian.* who cannot be ſuſpected of maintaining any Heterodox Opinions concerning the Divinity of the *Word.*

he

S. *Juſtin.* he ſeems to differ from us in following the Platonick Maxims; but it will appear to thoſe who ſhall thoroughly examine his Opinions, and thoſe of the ancient Fathers, that in the main they agree with ours (*s*), and that they are only different in the manner of Expreſſion. He aſſerts with many of the ancient Writers, That the Souls of Men after their Separation from the Body, ſhall wait for the Day of Judgment, to be either entirely happy or miſerable (*t*); but at the ſame time he acknowledgeth, that during this Interval they ſhall receive Puniſhments or Rewards, according to their Deſerts. Moreover he believes (according to the Opinion of the moſt part of the Primitive Chriſtians) That the Juſt after the Reſurrection ſhall remain for the ſpace of a Thouſand Years in the City of *Jeruſalem* where they ſhall enjoy all lawful Pleaſures (*u*). He ſeems to have thought that the Souls of the Wicked ſhould at laſt become capable of dying (*x*); tho' in other Places (*y*) he affirms that their Torments ſhall be eternal. He has a peculiar Opinion concerning the Souls of the righteous; which he affirms to have been before the coming of Jeſus Chriſt, under the Power of the Devil, who could cauſe them to appear whenſoever he ſhould think fit (*z*). He hath aſſerted, as S. *Irenæus* aſſures us, (*aa*) that the Devils were ignorant of their Damnation until the coming of our Saviour; nay, he goes further in his Apology to the Emperor, affirming that they are not as yet thruſt down into Eternal Flames (*bb*), &c. Laſtly, he ſeems not to deſpair of the Salvation of thoſe who have lived Vertuouſly among the Gentiles, having only the Knowledge of God without that of Jeſus Chriſt. (*cc*) Theſe are almoſt all the particular Points wherein he hath departed from the preſent Opinions of the Catholick Church.

The Works of S. *Juſtin* were firſt Printed all together in Greek (*dd*), by *Robert Stephen* in the Years 1551 and 1571; except the Second Treatiſe againſt the Gentiles, and the Epiſtle to *Diognetus* which were printed by themſelves, by *Henry Stephen* in the Years 1592, and 1595. This Edition was ſoon followed by that of *Commelinus* in Greek and Latin, publiſhed by *Fridericus Silburgius*, Anno Dom. 1593. It comprehends the entire Works of S *Juſtin*, divided into Three Parts, the firſt whereof contains the Books againſt the Gentiles, the Second, the Dialogue againſt *Tryphon*, and the Third, the Tracts that were Compoſed for the Inſtruction of the Chriſtians: They are tranſlated by *Langus*; except the ſecond Oration againſt the Gentiles, and the Epiſtle to *Diognetus*, which are of *Henry Stephen's* Tranſlation: At the End are ſubjoyned ſome Notes of *Silburgius*, *Stephens*, and other Learned Men. *Morellus* followed this Edition in the Impreſſion of the Works of S. *Juſtin*, which he cauſed to be made at *Paris* in the Years 1615, and 1656. only he added the ſmall Tracts of *Athenagoras*, *Theophilus*, *Hermias* and *Tatian*. This laſt Edition is thought to be the beſt, and yet it is very imperfect, and it were to be wiſhed that another might ere long be publiſhed; to this end a

(*s*) *In the main they agree with ours.*] We need only examine his Diſcourſe concerning the Three Perſons of the Holy Trinity in his Apology to the Emperour, *p.* 36, 93, 94. as alſo concerning the Divinity of the Word, *p.* 67, 96. and in the firſt Apology, *p.* 44, 45. and more eſpecially his Declaration concerning the Word in his Dialogue, *p.* 267. where he not only confutes the Opinion of thoſe that imagined that Jeſus Chriſt was a mere Man, but he likewiſe proves that he is really God: and in *p.* 358. where he plainly aſſerts, that the Word was begotten of the Father without dividing his Subſtance.

(*t*) *To be either entirely happy or miſerable.*] In his Dialogue, *p.* 223. he declares, that the Souls of the Juſt and of the Wicked wait for the Day of Judgment in a Place where they ſuffer more or leſs, proportionably to the Good or Evil that they have done in the World.

(*u*) *Where they ſhall enjoy all lawful Pleaſures.*] See *p.* 306. of his Dialogue; This Opinion is common to him and almoſt all the ancient Fathers, and it was a Fancy ſet on Foot by *Papias*, and from him ſpread among the Primitive Chriſtians, of the Vanity where of we are at preſent convinced.

(*x*) *That the Souls of the Wicked ſhould at laſt become capable of dying.*] We find this Notion in the beginning of his Dialogue, *p.* 222, 223, and 224. where the old Man that inſtructs him, refutes the Opinion of *Plato*, that Souls are incorruptible of their own Nature, and maintaining that they are ſo only through grace; from whence he concludes, That the Souls of the Wicked are only tormented as long as it ſhall ſeem good to the Will of God; inſomuch that after many Ages they ſhall ceaſe to be.

(*y*) *Although in other Places*, &c.] In his Apology to the Emperor, *p.* 57. he affirms, That the Torments of the Damned ſhall not only laſt for a thouſand years, as theſe mentioned by *Plato*, but that they ſhall be everlaſting. Obſerve likewiſe what he ſays concerning theſe torments in *p.* 64, 65, 66. and in other places, wherein he always calls them Eternal, oppoſing this word Eternal to the Pains that ſhall one day have an end.

(*z*) *Who could cauſe them to appear*, &c.] He aſſerts this in ſpeaking of *Samuel*, whoſe Soul the Witch really cauſed to return, according to his Opinion in Dialog. *p.* 332, and 333.

(*aa*) *According to the Teſtimony of S.* Irenæus.] This Paſſage is ſet down above.

(*bb*) *That the Devils are not as yet thruſt down into Eternal Flames.*] We find this in his Apology to the Emperor, *p.* 71.

(*cc*) *Having only the Knowledge of God without that of* Jeſus Chriſt.] In his ſecond Apology, *pag.* 83. he declares, That they that lived according to the Principles of Natural Reaſon, as *Socrates*, *Heraclitus*, *Azarias*, *Miſael*, &c. might be called Chriſtians, and he ſeems to ſuppoſe that they were ſaved by living up to the Law of Nature.

(*dd*) *The Works of S.* Juſtin *were firſt printed all together in* Greek. I do not ſpeak of the ſeveral Editions of the Verſions which are common, and whereof there are three beſides that of *Langus*. The firſt was Compoſed by *Picus Mirandula*, and printed at *Baſil* by *Henry Peter* in the Years 1528, and 1551. The ſecond by *Perionius*, and printed by *Nivelle* at *Paris* in 1554. The third by *Gelenius* was printed at *Baſil* in 1555. Laſtly, a Tranſlation of all the Works of *Juſtin* was ſet forth by *Langus*, and printed at *Baſil* in 1565, and at *Paris* in the ſame Year, and in 1578, together with large Commentaries. The Book of the Confutation of the Opinions of the *Ariſtotelians* was tranſlated by *Poſtellus*, and printed by it ſelf by *Nivelle* in 1552. A *Greek* Edition of his Apologies and ſeveral other little Tracts of the *Greek* Fathers were printed at *Rome* by *Zinnerus*. The Exhortation to the Greeks in *Greek* is printed by it ſelf by *Guillard* at *Paris*.

new

new Version ought to be made of all S. *Justin*'s Works, because *Langus*'s hath many defects, the ancient Manuscripts ought to be consulted (if any such can be found) and exactly compared with the Greek Text, which was not corrected by *Silburgius* from any Manuscript: Lastly, some Annotations ought to be added, and many of those that are already Printed should be cut off. S. *Justin.*

As for the disposing of these Works, the following Order may be observed; They should be divided into Three Classes. 1. Those that were really Composed by S. *Justin.* 2. Those that may be his, tho' we cannnot certainly affirm it. And, 3. Those that are manifestly Supposititious. His Apology to the Emperor *Antoninus*, that which ought to be called the first Apology, that so for the Future it may always be cited under that Name, ought to be placed in the Front: the other Apology, that immediatly follows, should be Entituled the Second; after this might be inserted the Fragment of the Books concerning Monarchy; the excellent Dialogue against *Typhon*, should be the last Treatise of this Class at least, till some of those that are lost, happen to be found. The Second Class should contain the two Orations to the Greek, and the Epistle to *Diognetus*. The Third may take in all the Books that are undoubtedly forged, which also might be distinguished into two Parts; in the first whereof should be placed those Writings, that may be in some manner useful, such are the 146 Questions, the Exposition of the Faith, and the Epistles to *Zena* and *Serenus*; and then in the Second one may add the Philosophical Tracts above cited, if it should not be thought more convenient to omit them altogether.

MELITO.

MELITO Bishop of *Sardis* in *Asia*, is one of those Fathers, who wrote the most concerning the Doctrin and Discipline of the Church; but there remains nothing of them at present but the Titles, and a few small Fragments produced by *Eusebius* in the Fourth Book of his History, *chap.* 26. The Titles are these; *Two Books of the Feast of* Easter, *one of the Lives of the Prophets (a) one of the Church, one of the Lords-Day, one concerning the Nature of Man, another of his Creation, one of the Submission of the Senses unto Faith (b), a Book concerning the Soul, the Body, and the Spirit, one of Baptism, another of Truth, another concerning the Generation of Jesus Christ, one of Prophecy, one of Hospitality, another entituled the Key, one of the Devil, another of the Apocalypse, one of God incarnate (c), and a Collection taken out of the Holy Scriptures.* Lastly, an Apology presented to *Marcus Antoninus*, whereof we have a Fragment in *Eusebius*, wherein *Melito* intreats the Emperor, that he would vouchsafe to examine the Accusations that were alledged against the Christians, and to cause the Persecution to cease by revoking the Edict that he had published against them: He represents to him, that the Christian Religion was so far from being destructive to the *Roman* Empire, that it was very much augmented since the propagation thereof; that this Religion was persecuted only by wicked Emperors, such as *Nero* and *Domitian*; that the Emperors *Adrian* and *Antoninus* had written several Letters in its behalf, and therefore he hoped to obtain of his Clemency and Generosity, the favour which he so earnestly requested. *Eusebius* also gives us another little Fragment out of the Book concerning *Easter*, to shew the time when this Author wrote, in which he mentions *Sagaris* Bishop of *Laodicea*, whom he affirms to have suffered Martyrdom, under *Servilius Paulus* the Proconsul of *Asia*. As also another Fragment more considerable, which is the Preface to his Collections, wherein he gives us a Catalogue of the Canonical Books of the Old Testament, omitting those that are not included in the Canon of the Jews; these are the Books of *Ecclesiasticus*, *Wisdom* (for he calls the Book of the *Proverbs* by the name of *Wisdom*) *Judith*, *Esther*, and the two Books of the *Maccabees*. *Melito.*

There is also another Fragment of *Melito*'s preserv'd by the Author of the Chronicle commonly called the *Alexandrian* in *Olympiad* 236. wherein he says, that the Christians do not adore insensible Stones, but that they worship one God alone; who is before all things, and in all things, and Jesus Christ who is God and the World before all Ages. It is not known from what Book this Fragment was taken; but it is probable, that it is in his Apology to the Emperor. Some other Passages are likewise attributed to him, which are taken out of a *Catena* of the Greek Fathers upon *Genesis*, but they seem to me to be unworthy of this Author (*d*); we find also in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, another Book under his Name, Entituled, *Of the Passage or Death of the Virgin* Mary, which is inserted

(*a*) *A Book of the Lives of the Prophets.*] Some reckon two Books on this Subject, but it is plain from the Greek Text of *Eusebius*, and the Authority of S. *Jerom*, that there was but one.

(*b*) *One of the Submission of the Senses unto Faith.*] S. *Jerom*, and *Ruffinus* distinguish the Book of *Faith*, from that of the *Senses*, but it is more probable, that it was but one Book bearing the above mentioned Title, as being Composed against some Hereticks, who asserted that we ought to believe only according to our Senses.

(*c*) *Of God incarnate.*] It is expressed in Greek Περὶ ἐνσωμάτου Θεοῦ, *of God incarnate, or invested with a Body.* Others expound this passage after another manner, imagining that he maintained that God was Corporeal; but this last is not the proper signification of the Greek word. However, *Origen*, cited by *Theodoret* in *Quest* 20. in *Exodum*, says that *Melito* wrote a Book περὶ τοῦ ἐνσωμάτου εἶναι Θεόν, That God was Corporeal, which answers to the other Interpretation.

(*d*) *Unworthy of this Author.*] One of these passages is produced by *Halloixius*, being a Comparison between *Isaac* and Jesus Christ, full of childish Notions and Expressions, that are more agreeable to the Modern, than the ancient Writers.

Melito. by Pope *Gelaſius* amongſt the Apocryphal Writings, and rejected by *Bede*; but it is at preſent generally agreed, that this Book as not being cited by any of the ancient Writers, and containing many untruths and abſurdities, is a counterfeit Work. *Melito* lived under the Reign of *Marcus Antoninus*; he preſented his Apology in the Second year of this Emperor, that is to ſay, in the Year of our Lord 182. and died before the Pontificate of *Victor*, as appears from the Epiſtle of *Polycrates* to this Pope, wherein he mentions him, as already dead, in theſe Words: *Why ſhould I not ſpeak of* Melito, *whoſe Actions were regulated by the Motions of the Holy Ghoſt, who lyes interr'd at* Sardes, *where he expects the Judgment and Reſurrection?* This ſhews that *Melito* was eſteemed as a Prophet, that is to ſay, as a Man inſpir'd by God, according to the Teſtimony of *Tertullian* produced by S. *Jerom*. If the ſame *Tertullian* had not aſſured us, that this Author wrote Elegantly and was a good Orator, it would be very difficult to give any Judgment concerning his Style, by that little of his Writings which is yet extant.

TATIAN.

Tatian. TATIAN Sirnamed the *Aſſyrian*, (*a*) from the Name of his Country, was an able Orator, and S. *Juſtin*'s Scholar. He remained in the Communion of the Church during the Life of his Maſter, but after his Martyrdom being puffed up with Pride, which often attends the Opinion of Knowledge, he became Head and Author of a new Sect (*b*), which was called the Hereſie of the *Encratites*, or of the *Continent*, becauſe theſe Sectaries condemned Marriage, as alſo the uſe of divers ſorts of Meats and Wine, leading a ſober and auſtere Life in appearance; beſides this, they maintained ſome of the Errors of the *Valentinians*, and affirmed that our Fore-Fathers were Damn'd: This Sect was afterwards augmented by *Severus* (*c*), from whom they took the Name of *Severians*: theſe latter rejected the Epiſtles of S. *Paul*, and the Acts of the Apoſtles. But to return to *Tatian*; he having got a great facility in writing, Compoſed a great number of Books, and among others an excellent Treatiſe againſt the Gentiles, which is moſt eſteemed of all his Works, as alſo a Goſpel Collected from the Four Evangeliſts.

There is yet extant the Treatiſe of *Tatian* againſt the Gentiles, which was firſt Printed at *Zurick*, in the Year 1646. together with the Verſion of *Conradus Geſner*, afterwards inſerted in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*; and Laſtly, annexed to the Works of S. *Juſtin*; the Title thereof is as follows: *The Diſcourſe of* Tatian *againſt the Gentiles, proving that the Greeks are not the Inventors of any of the Sciences, as they boaſt themſelves to be, but that they were all invented by thoſe whom they call Barbarians.* This is indeed the Subject of the beginning of his Diſcourſe, but then he adds, that the Greeks corrupted the Sciences, which they received from the Barbarians, and more eſpecially Philoſophy. Afterwards he proceeds to the Explication and defence of the Chriſtian Religion; he Treats of the Nature of God, of the Word, of the Reſurrection of the Body, and Freedom of the Soul: He confutes the Opinion of Fate, he diſcourſeth of the Nature of the Soul, and of Devils, diſcovering the Snares that they lay for Men. He intermixeth all theſe things with Satyrical Reflections on the ridiculous Theology of the Pagans, and the corrupt Manners of their Gods and Philoſophers, ſhewing at the ſame time, that the Writings of *Moſes*, are more ancient than all other Hiſtories, and giving an admirable Deſcription of the Holy Converſation of the Chriſtians. This work is extreamly full of profane Learning, and the Style thereof is Elegant enough, but exuberant, and not very elaborate; and the Matters therein contained are not digeſted into any Order. It was certainly Compoſed by *Tatian*, before he fell into Hereſie, tho' after S. *Juſtin*'s Death, ſince he doth not condemn the State of Matrimony in that Book (*d*). He argues concerning the Generation of the Wrod in ſuch Expreſſions as do not agree with our manner of explaining it, but they may be interpreted in a Senſe which is not Heretical (*e*). He maintains that the Angels, and Devils conſiſt of Bodies and Souls: He denies the Immortality of the later, affirming that they die, and that they ſhall hereafter riſe again with their reſpective Bodies, which is a conſiderable Error.

As for the Goſpel that was Compiled by *Tatian*, S. *Epiphanius* in his Deſcription of the Hereſie of the *Nazarenes*, hath confounded it with that which was Entituled: *The Goſpel according to the* He-

(*a*) *Sirnamed the* Aſſyrian.] At the end of his Treatiſe againſt the Gentiles, he declares that he was born in *Aſſyria*, and that he had been inſtructed in the Theology of the Grecians.

(*b*) *Of a new Sect.*] S. *Irenæus* Lib. 1. Euſeb. Lib. 4. c. 29. S. *Jerom*, in *Catalogo*.

(*c*) *This Sect was afterwards augmented by* Severus.] S. *Ephiphanius* affirms, that *Severus* lived before *Tatian* but he is miſtaken.

(*d*) *He doth not condemn the the State of Matrimony in that Book.*] On the other hand, *Pag.* 168. he ſeems to approve it.

(*e*) *A Senſe which is not Heretical.*] He aſſerts that the Word was begotten in the time of the Creation of the World; altho' he was from all Eternity, calling the Generation of the Word his Application, (if we may ſo term it) to the exteriour Work: He adds, that the Word was not begotten by way of Separation, but after the ſame manner, as one Fire is lighted or kindled by another; ſo that God did not remain without the Word, but that the Word proceeded from him, and remained in him altogether, or at the ſame time; this he explains by the inſtance of human Speech. Theſe are the Principles of ſome of the ancient Chriſtians. The Verſion of this Treatiſe was Printed together with the Greek Text at *Baſil*, in the Years 1564, 1569, 1575, 1593. and at *Geneva* in 1592.

brews

brews; and indeed they had this in common, that the Genealogy of Jeſus Chriſt was not in either of them: But the Goſpel according to the *Hebrews* was older than *Tatian*'s; beſides the latter was only a kind of a *Catena* or Concordance, wherein this Author had gathered together, what he judged proper to be Collected out of the Four Evangeliſts. S. *Ambroſe* ſeems to mention it in the Preface to his Commentaries on S. *Luke*; when he declares, that ſome Writers had made one ſingle Goſpel out of the Four, by Collecting thoſe paſſages, which they believed to be moſt favourable to their Opinions, and omitting the reſt. The Goſpel of *Tatian*, was Compoſed after this manner; in which he retrenched the Genealogy of Jeſus Chriſt, together with all that which relates to his human Nature, and his Extraction from the Stock of *David*. *Baronius* thought that that was the Work of *Tatian*, which is in the Seventh Tome of the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, under the Name of *Ammonius*; but this is a diſtinct Book: for as *Valeſius* obſerves, it is an Hiſtorical Epitome of the Goſpels, written by an Ancient Orthodox Author, containing many Paſſages, wherein Jeſus Chriſt is called the Son of *David*; whereas *Tatian*'s Goſpel was a Rhapſody of the Paſſages taken out of the four Evangeliſts, on purpoſe to induce us to believe that our Saviour was not deſcended from the Lineage of *David*. *Tatian* lived after the Death of S. *Juſtin*, and died about the time when S. *Irenæus* wrote his Book concerning the Hereſies. S. *Clement* in the third Book of his *Stromata*, cites a Treatiſe of this Author, Entituled, *Of Perfection according to the Saviour*, written by him after his Fall into Hereſie; he produceth a paſſage out of it againſt Marriage, which he confutes in *Pag.* 460.

Tatian.

ATHENAGORAS *and* HERMIAS.

Athenagoras & Hermias.

ATHENAGORAS an *Athenian* Philoſopher, lived in the time of the Emperor *Marcus Antoninus*, to whom he preſented an Apology for the Chriſtians (*a*). This Work and its Author, were unknown to *Euſebius*, S. *Jerom*, and *Photius*; but 'tis cited by S. *Epiphanius* in the Hereſie of *Origen*. In this Apology he refutes the three principal Calumnies that were alledged againſt the Chriſtians, as 1. That they were Atheiſts. 2. That they eat humane Fleſh. 3. That they committed horrible Crimes in their Aſſemblies. To the firſt Accuſation he makes Anſwer, that the Chriſtians were not Atheiſts, ſince they acknowledged and adored one God in Three Perſons, and lived Conformably to his Laws and Commadments, believing that he ſees and knows all things; that they refuſed to worſhip Idols, and to offer Sacrifice to them, as being perſuaded that they were not Deities. He replys to the two laſt Objections, in ſhewing that the Life, Laws and Manners of the Chriſtians were very far from Murther and thoſe infamous Crimes whereof thew were accuſed. He plainly Eſtabliſheth the Unity of the Eſſence of God, and the Trinity of the three Divine Perſons: He affirms that the Word, that remained in God from all Eternity departed from him, (if we may uſe ſuch an Expreſſion) to create and govern all things: He maintains the Worſhip of Angels, and declares that they were created to take care of Affairs here below. He aſſerts that the Devils were ruined through the Love that they bore unto Women; he admits Free-will in the utmoſt Latitude; he makes divers Deſcriptions of the Holineſs of the Converſation of the Chriſtians; he commends Virginity; he condemneth ſecond Marriages, calling them an honeſt Adultery. Laſtly, he Treats of the Reſurrection, of the laſt Judgment.

There is another Treatiſe of this Father extant, concerning the Reſurrection of the Dead, wherein he endeavours to prove, that it is not only not impoſſible, but even extreamly credible: Theſe two Books are written in a Dogmatical ſtyle; they were Printed ſeparatly in Greek and Latin (*b*), Tranſlated by *Geſner*, *Nannius*, *Marſilius Ficinus* and *Suffridus*, and are inſerted in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, as alſo in Greek, in the Supplement to the *Bibliotheca*; and Laſtly, after the Works of S. *Juſtin*, with the Annotations of *Geſner*, and *Henry Stephen*; there is another imperfect Tract annexed to them, which is a continual Series of Satyrical Reflections, on the Opinions and Philoſophical Notions of the Gentiles, Compoſed by *Hermias*, a Chriſtian Philoſopher. But this Author is not known, nor the perciſe time when he wrote, however it is not to be doubted but that he is ancient, and that he lived before the Pagan Religion was extirpated. This little Book was Printed by it ſelf in Greek and Latin, at *Baſil*, *Anno. Dom.* 1553.

(*a*) *In the time of the Emperor* Marcus Antoninus, *&c.*] He joyns *Lucius Aurelius Commodus* and *Marcus*. *Labbe* affirms that it was *Lucius Verus*; but it is more probable, that it was *Commodus* the Son of *Antoninus*, and that this Apology was preſented after his being taken into the Government, about the Year 178.

(*b*) *In Greek and Latin.*] At *Paris* in *Quarto*, by *Veke*, *Ann. Dom.* 1541, and in *Octavo*, by *Stephen* with *Nannius*'s Tranſlation in 1557. Alſo by *Plantin*, at *Antwerp* in 1560, 1583, and 1588. The Tranſlation of *Suffridus* was Printed at *Colen*, with Commentaries in 1567, and 1573. *Nannius*'s Verſion of the Treatiſe concerning the Reſurrection, was publiſhed at the end of the Works of *Philo* at *Baſil* 1561, and in 1558 by *Epiſcopius*, as alſo at *Colen* in 1599. There is a verſion of the Treatiſe of the Reſurrection by *Ficinus*, and Printed at *Baſil* in 1516, and another of *Valetus* in *Italian*, Printed at *Venice* in 1556. The Apology was Printed in Latin at *Paris* in 1498, in Greek and Latin in 1577. In Latin at *Baſil* 1565. Tranſlated by *Geſner*, and there again in 1558, in Octavo at *Zurick* in 1599. The Book concerning the Reſurrection of the Dead, was Printed in Latin at *Paris* in 1498, at *Baſil* in 1561. In Greek and Latin in *Venice* in 1498, and 1550. At *Baſil* in 1593, and 1653. At *Paris* in 1615, 1618, and 1636. The Tranſlations which are at the end of S. *Juſtin*, are *Nannius*'s of the Treatiſe of the Reſurrection, and *Geſner*'s of the Apology.

[*Athenagoras* has alſo been Printed at *Oxon* Gr. Lat. in 12°. 1682; and at *Leipzick* 1684 in Oct. *cum Notis Var.*]

THEOPHILUS *Biſhop of* ANTIOCH.

Theophilus Biſhop of Antioch.

THEY that imagine *(a)*, that this *Theophilus*, whom we ſpeak of, is the ſame with him, to whom S. *Luke* dedicates the Acts of the Apoſtles, are groſly miſtaken; for this Man was ſo far from being Contemporary with S. *Luke* and the Apoſtles, that he was not Ordained Biſhop of *Antioch (b)*, until the Year 170. after the Nativity of Jeſus Chriſt, and he governed this Church Twelve or Thirteen Years, until the beginning of the Reign of *Commodus (c)*; that is to ſay, until the Years of our Lord 181, or 182. This Biſhop was one of the moſt vigorous Oppoſers of the Hereticks of his time; he wrote a conſiderable Book againſt *Marcion*, and a Treatiſe againſt the Hereſie of *Hermogenes (d)*, wherein he cited the Apocalypſe. He likewiſe Compoſed other ſmall Tracts, for the Inſtruction and Edification of the Faithful: All theſe Works are entirely loſt; but we have Three Books ſtill written by him to *Autolycus*, a learned Heathen of his Acquaintance, who had undertaken to vindicate his Religion againſt that of the Chriſtians.

In the firſt of theſe Books he anſwers the Requeſt, that had been made to him by that Heathen, to teach him how to know the true God, and after, having declared, that to attain to the knowledge of him, we muſt be purified in Mind and Heart, he proceeds to Treat of the Nature of God, and of thoſe things which the Divines call his Attributes, as his Eternity, Immenſity, Power, Inviſibility; afterward he enlargeth on the Bleſſedneſs of the other Life, and on the Reſurrection of the Body; he obſerves, by the way, that Princes ought to be honoured as having received their Authority from God, and derives the Etymology of the word Chriſtian from Unction. This firſt Book is properly a Diſcourſe between him and *Autolycus*, in Anſwer to what this Heathen had ſaid againſt the Religion of Jeſus Chriſt. The ſecond Book was written to convince him of the Falſhood of his own Religion, and of the Truth of the Chriſtians. He begins with a Confutation of the Opinions that were maintained by the Pagans, concerning their Gods, and ſhews the Contradictions of the Philoſophers and Poets on this Subject; he explains at large the Creation of the World, and that which happened in the ſucceeding Ages; he demonſtrates, that the Hiſtory of *Moſes* is the oldeſt and trueſt Hiſtory that ever was, and that the Poets have extracted many things from the Holy Scriptures, particularly their Relations concerning the Torments of the Damned. In the third Book, after having proved that the Writings of the Heathens are full of an infinite number of Notions, contrary to right Reaſon and good Manners, he ſhews, that the Doctrin and Lives of the Chriſtians, are very far from thoſe Crimes that are laid to their Charge. Laſtly, At the end of his Work he adds an Hiſtorical Chronology, from the beginning of the World unto his Time, to prove, that the Hiſtory of *Moſes* is the ancienteſt and the trueſt. It is apparent, from this little Epitome, how well this Author was acquainted with profane Hiſtory. Theſe three Books are filled with a great Variety of curious Diſquiſitions concerning the Opinions of the Poets and Philoſophers: Tho' there are but few things that relate immediately to the Doctrins of the Chriſtian Religion; not that *Theophilus* was ignorant of them, for it appears from ſeveral Paſſages that he was very skilful in theſe Matters, but in regard that he compoſed this Book chiefly to convince a Pagan, he inſiſts rather in proving our Religion, by Arguments from without, than by expounding its Doctrins. He is the firſt Author that hath applied the word *Trinity (e)*, to the Three Perſons of the Godhead, but he calls the Third by the Name of *Wiſdom*: He aſſerts two things concerning the *Word*, which ſeem to ſavour of the *Arian* Hereſie; the firſt is, that the *Word*

(*a*) *They that imagine*, &c.] This was the Opinion of *Gulielmus Tyrius*, who in S. *Bernard*'s time wrote the Hiſtory of the *Cruſade*, See *lib.* 4. *c.* 9. It is a groſs error, for according to this account *Theophilus* muſt have lived above 150 years.

(*b*) *Ordained Biſhop of* Antioch,] He was the ſixth; The firſt (according to the teſtimony of *Euſebius*) was *Evodius*, the ſecond S. *Ignatius*, the third *Hero*, the fourth *Cornelius*, the fifth *Heros*, and *Theophilus* the ſixth; S. *Jerome* indeed declares in one place that he was the ſeventh, but he is miſtaken; *Euſebius* in his Chronicle, and in his Hiſtory, refers his Ordination to the eighth year of the Reign of the Emperor *Marcus*, that is the 170 after Chriſt, according to the common computation.

(*c*) *Until the beginning of the Reign of* Commodus.] *Euſebius* affirms that *Maximinus* was his Succeſſor in the ſeventeenth year of *Marcus Antoninus*, but in the Chronology of the Emperors compoſed by *Theophilus* at the end of his third Book to *Autolycus* he reckons nineteen years and ten days of the Reign of *Verus*, that is to ſay, of the ſame Emperor *Antoninus*, and it cannot be affirmed that 16 years ought to be put inſtead of 19, as it is in the Tranſlation, for by computing the total Sum of the years of the Emperors which amount to 237 years and one day, it is apparent, that there muſt of neceſſity be 19. From whence it follows, that either he was miſtaken in reckoning up a greater number of years of the Reign of this Emperor under whom he lived, than were really paſſed, which is not credible, or that he did not write theſe Books until after this time, under the beginning of the Reign of *Commodus*; and then, he could not have had *Maximinus* for his Succeſſor until the year 182 of the Vulgar Account, unleſs he was taken in his Life-time to be his Coadjutor. There is more probability that *Euſebius* was deceived a year or two. *Nicephorus* in his Chronography of the Patriarchs of *Antioch* allows 13 years to *Theophilus*, which agrees with our Opinion.

(*d*) *And a Treatiſe againſt the Hereſie of* Hermogenes.] *Euſeb. lib.* 4. *cap.* 24. Ἀπό τινος ἐκ ἀγγραφῶν αὐτῷ κατὰ Μαρκίωνος συντεθείσης λύσις. St. *Jerom*, *Sub Imperatore M. Antonino Vero librum contra Marcionem compoſuit, qui uſque hodie extat.* And *Euſebius*, Καὶ ἄλλο πρὸς τὴν αἵρεσιν Ἑρμογένους τὴν ἐπιγραφὴν ἔχον, S. *Jerom*, *Et contra Hæreſim Hermogenes liber unus*, Καὶ ἕτερά τινα καταλιπὼν ἀνθρώπινα. S. *Jerom*, *Et alii breves, elegantiſque tractatus ad ædificationem Eccleſiæ pertinentes.*

(*e*) *The word Trinity.*] Lib. 2. p. 94. and 100.

may

Theophilus Bishop of *Antioch.*

may be in a *Place*, and the Second, that he was begotten in *Time*; but these Expressions, which are common to him, and many of the ancient Fathers, had a different Signification (*f*) from that which was afterwards given them by the *Arians*.

Moreover these Books are full of Moral and Allegorical Expressions, the Style is elegant, and the Turn of the thoughts very agreeable, that whoever reads them, cannot doubt but that the Author was a very Eloquent Man. They are intituled in the *Greek* Manuscripts, *The Books of* Theophilus *to* Autolycus *concerning the Faith of the Christians against the malicious Detracters of their Religion.* They have been published in *Greek* and *Latin*, as also in *Latin* by *Conradus Gesner*, and Printed at *Zurich* in the Year 1546; afterwards they were inserted in the *Orthodoxographa*, Printed at *Basil* in 1555. *Fronto Ducæus* annexed them to the first Volume of the Supplement of the *Bibliotheca Patrum*; set forth in 1624; and they were afterwards Printed at the end of the Works of S. *Justin* in the Edition of *Morellus*.

Besides these three Books, we have another Book in *Latin* attributed to *Theophilus*, consisting of Allegorical Commentaries on the four Gospels, which is in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*; there was a Commentary on the Gospels under his name in S. *Jerom's* time, divers passages whereof are produced by him in his Annotations on S. *Matthew*; there were also Commentaries on the Proverbs of *Solomon*; but this Father observes in his Treatise of Ecclesiastical Writers, that they did not come up to the elegancy or to the style of the Writings of *Theophilus*.

(*f*) *But these Expressions which are common to him with many of the ancient Fathers had a different signification.*] They meant nothing else by the first Expression, as hath been already observed, but that God made himself manifest unto men by the Word; therefore when *Theophilus* affirms that the Word is in a *place*, and that the Father cannot be there, he intended only to declare that the Word appears unto Men in a *place*, as he heretofore appeared unto *Adam* in the Terrestrial Paradise, and that the Father doth not appear in that manner: This is a System of the ancient Christians: It would be more difficult to resolve the second Expression, were it not that they themselves have explained it, since they acknowledge that the Word is Eternal, and that he remained in God from all Eternity, as his Counsel, Wisdom, and Word. But they say that the same Word who was in God, in some manner went out from him when he undertook to Create the World, because he began to make use of this Word in Exterior Operations, and this is what they call the Procession, Prolation, and Co-generation of the Word, which does not hinder but that the Word might be from all Eternity, and eternally begotten of the Father after the same manner as we apprehend it, but this is not that which they call Generation. These Expressions are not only used by *Theophilus*, but likewise by *Athenagoras*, *Tatian*, *Tertullian*, the Author of the Book concerning the Trinity, amongst the Works of this Father, *Lactantius*, the Compiler of the Homilies attributed to *Zeno Veronensis*, and afterwards by *Rupertus* in his Commentaries on *Genesis*.

APOLLINARIUS, *or*, APOLLINARIS *of* HIERAPOLIS.

Apollinarius.

A *Pollinarius*, or, *Apollinaris* Bishop of *Hierapolis*, a City of *Phrygia*, wrote several Books under the Reign of *Marcus Antoninus*, the Titles whereof only remain at present; The first was an Oration dedicated to the Emperor in defence of the Christian Religion; The second a Treatise against the Gentiles divided into five Books; The third, two Books concerning Truth; The fourth, two Tracts against the *Jews*; The fifth was one or more Treatises against the Sect of the *Montanists*, which then began to appear. These are all the Works of this Author that are cited by *Eusebius* and S. *Jerom* (*a*), they were extant in *Photius's* time, who having read his Books against the Gentiles, as also those concerning Piety and Truth (*b*), declares that he was much to be esteemed both for his Doctrin and his Style; wherefore I shall prefer the Judgment of this Learned Man before that of *Trithemius*, who without perusing the Works of *Apollinarius*, peremtorily asserts, that there seems to be more Zeal than Learning in what he has writ.

We find in *Eusebius*, *Book* 5. *Chap.* 16. a large fragment of a certain Author, whom he doth not name, against the Heresie of the *Montanists*, from whence *Ruffinus* and *Nicephorus* have asserted, that this Fragment was taken from the Discourses of *Apollinarius* against them, but they must of necessity be deceived; for *Apollinarius* composed his Books to confute their Opinions, when they first began to be divulged, whereas the Anonymous Author of this Fragment, wrote after the death of *Montanus*, *Maximilla*, and *Theodotus*, who were the Ringleaders of that Party; besides, he makes mention of this Heresie as maintained in a Country far distant from his, and established a great while ago, which plainly shews, that this Fragment belongs not to *Apollinarius*, and consequently, that there is not any part of his Works now extant.

(*a*) *By* Eusebius *and S.* Jerom.] *Lib.* 4. *Cap.* 27. S. *Jerom in Catalogo* omits the Books against the *Jews*, neither are they found in the Version of *Ruffinus*, nor even in some *Greek* Manuscripts of *Eusebius*.

(*b*) *As also those concerning Piety and Truth.*] *Photius Cod.* 14. It is probable that the Book of Piety is the first of those two that are cited by *Eusebius*, under the Title of Truth. Besides, he affirms, that there were other Works of this Author, which he had never seen.

DIONYSIUS of CORINTH.

Dionysius of Corinth.

Dionysius Bishop of *Corinth* lived under the Reign of the Emperor *Marcus Antoninus*, and in the beginning of *Commodus*'s. 'He not only took care of his own Flock, (*says* Eusebius, *Book* 4. *Chap.* 23.) but he also made the Christians of other Countries partakers of his Divine Labours, causing them to fructifie every where by his Catholick Epistles, which he sent to many Churches. The 'first is written to the *Lacedæmonians*, containing an Instruction of the Catholick Faith, and an 'Exhortation to Peace and Unity. The second is directed to the *Athenians*, to excite their Faith, 'and to induce them to lead a Life Conformable to the Rules of the Gospel: He likewise reproves 'their negligence, whereby they had almost abandoned the Christian Religion ever since their Bishop '*Publius* suffered Martyrdom in the Persecutions that were raised in his time: Moreover he mentions '*Quadratus*, who was elected Bishop of *Athens* after the Martyrdom of *Publius*, and testifies, that 'the Christians of this City owed the renovation of the ardour of their Faith to his Care. Besides 'this, he informs us, that *Dionysius* the *Areopagite* being converted by St. *Paul*, (as it is recorded 'in the *Acts of the Apostles*) was constituted the first Bishop of *Athens*. There is also another Epistle 'written by him to the *Nicodemians*, wherein he confutes the Heresie of *Marcion*, and keeps close 'to the Rule of Faith. He likewise composed a Letter directed to the Church of *Gortyna*; as also 'to all those of *Crete*, in which he extreamly commends *Philip* their Bishop, to whom his whole 'Church had given authentick Testimonies of his singular Abilities and Generosity, and he admonish-'eth them to avoid Heresies. In his Epistle to the *Amastrians*, and to the other Churches of *Pontus*, 'addressing his Discourse to their Bishop *Palma*, he explains divers passages of the Holy Scriptures; 'He therein lays down several Precepts concerning Marriage and Chastity, determining at the same 'time, that all Penitents should be received that returned from any Crimes whatsoever, and even 'from Heresie. In the same Volume is contained another Epistle to the *Gnossians*, wherein he ad-'viseth *Pinytus* their Bishop not to impose on the Christians the heavy burden of the Obligation to 'preserve their Virginity, but to have respect unto the weakness which is incident to most of them. '*Pinytus* in replying to this Epistle, extols and admires *Dionysius* of *Corinth*, and exhorts him at last 'to afford them more solid nourishment, and to send frequent Letters to him which might fill and 'satiate the People that were committed to his charge, lest being always nourished only with Milk, 'they should grow old, and yet remain in a kind of Infancy. This answer represents as it were a 'lively Portraiture of the Faith of *Pinytus*, his diligence in watching over the Flock, with which he 'was entrusted by God, his profound knowledge in Divinity, and his extraordinary Eloquence. We 'have also in our hand another Letter of *Dionysius* written to the *Romans*, and particularly directed 'to *Soter*, who was then their Bishop; a passage whereof it will be expedient here to produce, in 'which he recommends to them the continuation of a certain Custom, that had been always ob-'served by them from their first plantation unto the persecution which happened in our time. *This is* (says he) *a custom which hath been established among you, O ye* Romans, *ever since the beginning of your Church, to be charitable unto your Brethren, and to send to divers Churches throughout the World things necessary for their subsistence; you comfort the poor in their indigence, and relieve the urgent necessities of those that are condemned to the Mines; This custom you have received from your Ancestors, which the blessed Bishop* Soter *hath not only retained, but even augmented, by abundantly distributing the Donatives appointed for the relief of the Faithful, and cherishing as a Father would do his Children all the Brethren who came to* Rome. 'He mentions St. *Clement*'s Epistle to the *Corinthians*, which had 'been for a long time constantly read in the Church of *Corinth*, as he testifies in these Words: *We have even now passed the Lords Day, when we perused your Epistle, which we shall hereafter read continually, as we do that of St.* Clement, *that we may be replenished with Precepts and wholsom Instructions*: Afterward he observes, that his Letters were corrupted by Falsifiers in these Words: *I wrote several Epistles at the Entreaty of the Brethren, but the Ministers of the Devil have filled them with Tares, by retrenching and adding many things; they may well expect this terrible Sentence*; Cursed be he that adds or diminisheth any thing from my Words. *Wherefore it is not to be admir'd that some have presumed even to corrupt the Sacred Writings, since they have done it in Books of much less Authority.* 'Besides 'these Epistles, there is another Extant, written to *Chrysophora* his faithful Sister, to whom he gave 'Instructions suitable, carefully nourishing her with spiritual Food. These are the Contents of this passage of *Eusebius*, concerning the Epistles of St. *Dionysius*, which I have set down entire, because he hath made use of the same Method as we should have done, in case those Epistles had been still Extant.

Moreover *Eusebius* in his 2*d. Book Chap.* 25. recites another Fragment of his Epistle to the *Romans*, wherein it mention'd the Death of S. *Peter*, in the City of *Rome* in these Words. 'Thus (says he) as I 'may so say, by your Exhortations you have mixed the Grain that sprung from the Seed of St. *Peter* 'and S. *Paul*, that is to say, the *Romans* and the *Corinthians*: for these two glorious Apostles entring into 'our City of *Corinth*, instructed us in dispersing the spiritual Seed of the Gospel, afterwards they passed 'together into *Italy*, and having given you also like Instructions, they suffered Matyrdom with 'you at the same time. This is all that we certainly know concerning the Life and Writings of *Dionysius* Bishop of *Corinth*. In the *Menologium* of the Greeks, he is reckoned among the Martyrs, (*a*) but

(*a*) *He is reckoned among the Martyrs.*] On the 29th of *November*, τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ Διονύσιος ἐπίσκοπος Κορίνθου ξίφει πληγὶς πλειῶνι, *on this day* Dionysius *Bishop of* Corinth *died by the Sword. Glycas* affirms that he suffered Martyrdom under the Reign of *Antoninus Pius*; and yet it is certain, that he lived under *Marcus Aurelius*.

since

since neither *Eusebius*, nor S. *Jerom* take any Notice of the matter, I am apt to believe that the Latin Church hath done more prudently in placing him in their Martyrology in the Rank of the Confessors

Pinytus, Philippus, Modestus, Musanus, and *Bardesanes.*

Pinytus, &c.

AT the same time lived *Pinytus* Bishop of *Gnossus* in the Island of *Crete*, who replyed (as we have even now observ'd) to S. *Denys* of *Corinth*, in an Eloquent and Learned Epistle. *Philippus* Bishop of *Gortyna*, mentioned likewise by the later, wrote a Treatise against *Marcion* as well as *Modestus* (*a*), but less accurate.

Among these may be reckoned *Musanus*, who wrote a Work against the *Encratites*, and *Bardesanes* (*b*) the *Syrian*, who Composed two Tracts translated into Greek by his Disciples, the First against *Marcion*, and other Hereticks, and the Second concerning Fate; this last was dedicated to the Emperor *Antoninus* (*c*). Besides he wrote other Treatises upon the Persecution, that was then raised against the Christians of *Syria*. *Eusebius* observes, that this Author having been engaged in the Sect of the *Valentinians*, though he had acknowledged and retracted the most part of his Errors, yet he retained some of them; wherefore he is accused by S. *Jerom*, of being the Deviser of a new Heresie: Tho' he owns that *Bardesanes* was endued with a very quick Apprehension, and was extremely vehement in his Disputes. S. *Epiphanius* likewise makes him to be the Ring-leader of an Heresie. 'Bar-'*desanes* (says he in *Hæres.* 56.) is the Author of the Heresie of the *Bardesianites*; he was a Native of '*Mesopotamia*, and an Inhabitant of the City of *Edessa*; moreover he was a very good Christian (*d*), 'and wrote many useful Books, being well skill'd in the Greek and Syriack Tongues (*e*). He was in-'timately acquainted with *Abgarus* Prince of *Edessa*, and assisted him in his Studies; he lived until 'the time of *Antoninus Verus*, and Collected many things concerning Fate against the Astronomer *Abi-'das*: There are also other Works written by him agreeable to the Faith: He Courageously withstood '*Apollonius* the Friend of *Antoninus* (*f*), who advised him to deny that he was a Christian, and un-'dauntedly replyed, that he did not fear Death, which he could not avoid, tho' he should do that 'which the Emperor required: But at last this Man adorned with so many Vertues fell into Heresie, 'suffering himself to be infected with the Errors of the *Valentinians*; inventing divers *Æones*, and de-'nying the Resurrection of the Dead: He acknowledged indeed the Law and the Prophets, toge-'ther with the whole New Testament, but then he admitted several Apocryphal Books along with 'them. *Eusebius* in *Lib.* 6. *Præparat. Evangel.* produceth an excellent Fragment of the Writings of this Author against Fate, whereby it is evident that it was written in the Form of a Dialogue. He proves in this Fragment, that Men are not Conducted by Nature and Necessity as brute Beasts, but by Reason and with Liberty; because, altho' the Nature of all Men be the same, yet there are infinite numbers of Manners, Customs, Laws and Religions among them, that are different even in the same Country, and under the very same Climate, which cannot proceed but from the different Choice that is made by them. Afterwards having alledged many Examples to evince this Truth, he adds: 'What 'shall we say, of the Society of Christians, who are dispersed throughout all the Cities of the World, 'and who cannot be induced by any Consideration, nor by any Arguments whatsoever, to follow the 'Manners and Customs of those among whom they reside; but on the contrary, wheresoever they are, 'they still adhere to peculiar Laws, and have Manners different from those of the People among whom 'they live, without being perswaded by any means to commit those things, which their Master hath 'declared to them to be Criminal, chusing rather to suffer Poverty, Dangers, Ignominy, Torments, 'and even Death it self? This passage set down by *Eusebius*, not only shews that *Bardesanes* was a Person of a quick Apprehension, and of a vehement Temper, (as hath been observed by S. *Jerom*) but it likewise informs us, that he had acquired much Learning (*g*), and that his Style wanted neither Elegancy nor Ornament.

(*a*) *As well as* Modestus.] S. *Jerom* affirms, that in his time there were other Tracts extant under the Name of *Modestus*; but that they were rejected by the learned as Suppositious.

(*b*) Bardesanes] *Porphyrius*, *Lib. de Abst.* cites one *Bardesanes* a *Babylonian*, who he says lived in the time of his Fore-fathers, and writ concerning the *Brachman* and *Indian* Philosophers: But he must needs have been another Person.

(*c*) *Was Dedicated to the Emperor* Antoninus.] It is asserted by S. *Jerom*, that he presented it to him; but it is more probable, that being Translated, it was afterwards delivered by others; for since he wrote in Syriack, it is not credible, that he presented, or even Dedicated his Book to the Emperor; on the contrary, he Composed it at the Entreaty of his Friends; and in the form of a Dialoge.

(*d*) *A very good Christian.*] S. *Epiphanius* is deceived; for it is otherwise affirmed by *Eusebius*, that he was at first a *Valentinian*, and that his Errors were the remainders of this Heresie.

(*e*) *Being well skilled in the Greek and Syriack Tongues.*] He did not understand Greek, since, as *Eusebius* assures us, his Disciples Translated his Works.

(*f*) *The Friend of* Antoninus.] Neither is there much certainty in this Relation.

(*g*) *That he had acquired much Learning.*] This Fragment contains an Enumeration of the Manners, Customs and different Laws of a very great number of People, which plainly shews his Learning, and it is written as agreeably as the Subject was capable of allowing it.

S. IRENÆUS.

S. *Irenæus.* WE know nothing of the Country of S. *Irenæus* (*a*), but only in general, that he was a Greek. It is probable, that he was at firſt Educated in the Chriſtian Religion (*b*), or at leaſt that he made profeſſion thereof even from his Youth, during which he was a Diſciple of S. *Polycarp* Biſhop of *Smyrna* in *Aſia*, who was then very Old. This induceth me to believe, that this Father could not be born till about the end of the Reign of the Emperor *Adrian*, or the beginning of that of *Antoninus Pius*, ſome time before the Year 140, after the Nativity of Jeſus Chriſt (*c*). He was alſo a Diſciple of *Papias*, if we may believe S. *Jerom* (*d*), and perhaps it is he whom he frequently cites in his Work againſt the Hereſies, under the Name of an Elder, that had ſeen the Succeſſors of the Apoſtles (*e*). After he had thus ſpent the time of his Youth in the School of the moſt Learned of the Apoſtles, (*f*) he went into *France*; where he was ordained Prieſt of the Church.

(*a*) *That he was a Greek.*] *Galeſinius* and ſome other Authors tell us, that he was of *Smyrna*, but this is barely a Conjecture: 'Tis certain, he was a Greek, and in all probability of *Aſia*.

(*b*) *He was at firſt Educated in the Chriſtian Religion.*] He always ſpeaks of the Chriſtian Religion, as if he had never been of any other, and he no where takes notice, that he had ever been a Heathen. Beſides it is certain that he was a Chriſtian, and a Diſciple of S. *Polycarp* from his tender years, as he himſelf teſtifies in his Letter to *Florinus*, as it is cited by *Euſebius*, Lib. 5. c. 20. *I have ſeen you*, ſays he, *when I was as yet but a Child in* Aſia *with S.* Polycarp, *I remember it very well, becauſe we beſt retain what we have ſeen in our Youth, ſo that I can tell, what kind of a place it was where S.* Polycarp *lived, what Diſcourſes he held, and after what manner he lived.* And in the Third Book againſt Hereſies, Ch. 3. *Polycarpus autem conſtitutus ab Apoſtolis Smyrnis in Aſia Epiſcopus, quem & noſtra prima ætate vidimus, multum enim perſeveraverat, & valdu ſenex, Glorioſiſſime, ac Nobiliſſime Martyrium faciens exivit e vita.* Which clearly Demonſtrates that S. *Irenæus* was very young, when he uſed to go to S. *Polycarp*, and that on the other hand, S. *Polycarp* was extreamly old.

(*c*) *The Year of our Lord, 140.*] 'Tis commonly believed, that he was born towards the end of *Trajan*'s Reign, or in the beginning of *Adrian*'s. But this does not agree with what we have obſerved concerning him, by which it undeniably appears, that he only knew S. *Polycarp* in his old Age, when he himſelf was exceeding young: Beſides, S. *Irenæus* lived till the Year 202, or 203, wherein he ſuffered Martyrdom, and that he had Strength and Vigor enough ſtill left under the Pontificate of *Eleutherus*, towards the Year of our Lord 178. And this abundantly diſcovers the Error of thoſe Perſons, who have imagined, that *Irenæus* was the Angel of *Thyatira*, of whom mention is made in the *Apocalypſe*. 'Tis certain, that Book was writ before his Birth, for in his Fifth Book ſpeaking of the Revelations; *It is not very long*, ſays he, *ſince it has appeared in the World, almoſt in our own time, at the end of* Domitian's *Reign.*

[Mr. *Dodwel* has fixed the time when S. *Irenæus* lived, in his Third Diſſertation upon this Father, in this manner. *Irenæus* ſpeaking of S. *John*'s Revelation ſays (*Lib.* 5. *cap.* 30.) *Neque enim ante multum temporis viſum eſt, ſed pene ſub noſtro Seculo, ad finem Domitiani imperii.* So that the latter end of the Reign of the Emperor *Domitian*, was very near the time when S. *Irenæus* lived. Whence it muſt follow, that he was alive at leaſt under the former part of *Trajan*'s Government. But then the words, *Sub noſtro ſeculo*, are not ſo eaſie; becauſe *Seculum* at that time ſignified as often the time of the preſent Emperors Government as any thing elſe. *Irenæus* ſays alſo, that when he was ἐν πρώτῃ ἡλικίᾳ he heard S. *Polycarp* at *Smyrna*; when he was πάνυ γεραλέος. Now S. *Polycarp* was an old Man in the beginning of *Hadrian*'s Reign, to which time *Irenæus* being his Diſciple muſt be referred: For S. *Irenæus* in his Letter to *Florinus*, ſays, that he ſaw him when himſelf was very Young, making a very ſplendid Figure in the Emperor's Court. Now this can agree to none but *Hadrian*, who often went about his Empire, ſtaying long in ſeveral places, where their Antiquities and Hiſtories could afford him Entertainment. This of neceſſity muſt be about the Year CXXII. ſince no other time can be Aſſigned in *Hadrian*'s Reign for ſuch a Journey.

As for the time of his Death it muſt be carried as much higher as that of his Birth. The common Opinion is, that he ſuffered in the Perſecution which *Severus* raiſed in *Gaul*, after he had Conquered *Albinus*. But that is inconſiſtent with it ſelf; and it is no ways probable, that *Severus* ſhould raiſe Perſecution againſt thoſe Men, for favouring *Albinus*, who as *Tertullian* aſſures us, made it a great part of their Juſtification, that in all theſe Civil Wars they had never declared themſelves of any one Faction againſt the Emperor *Severus*; and this he appeals to as a thing notoriouſly known. Beſides, none of the Ancients within 300 Years of *Irenæus* ever mention his being a Martyr, a thing never omitted in thoſe Primitive times, whenever they had juſt grounds to give a Title, which of all others they thought the moſt Honourable. It is plain by the Controverſies concerning *Eaſter* and his Letter to *Florinus*, that he lived to *Commodus*'s time. And if he were 25 years old, when he ſaw *Florinus* at *Smyrna* about the Year CXXII, he muſt have been born near or in the Year XCVII. In the CLXXXII (the 3d. of *Commodus*) he wrote againſt *Blaſtus* and *Florinus*, when by this Account he himſelf was 85 years old. The laſt Controverſies concerning the time of obſerving *Eaſter* were in the Year CLXXXIX, in the 10th year of *Commodus*, when we are ſure that S. *Irenæus* was alive, becauſe his Opinion was appealed to, and he gave it ſo ſolemnly as to put an end to their Differences. Then he was by the former Account, in the XCII Year of his Age: After that we have no Memorials, either how long he lived, or what he did.]

(*d*) *S.* Jerome.] Ep. 29. ad Theodorum. *Refert Irenæus, vir Apoſtolicorum temporum, & Papiæ auditoris Johannis Evangeliſtæ diſcipulus.*

(*e*) *Who had beheld the Succeſſors of the Apoſtles.*] Lib. 4. c. 45. *Quemadmodum audivi a Presbytero, qui audierat ab his, qui Apoſtolos viderant,* c. 47. *valde inſenſatos oſtendebat Presbyter eos.* Item c. 49, 50, 52. and Lib. 5. c. 5. and cap. 17. he cites *Papias* by Name, *Lib.* 5. *c.* 33.

(*f*) *He went into* France.] *Gregory* of *Tours* writes, that he was ſent thither by S. *Polycarp*. We don't certainly know what Year, though 'tis probable he did not ſtay long in *Aſia*.

of

of *Lyons* by *Pothinus*, who was Biſhop of that See (*g*). And when this Holy Prelate had ſuffered Martyrdom in the 90th Year of his Age, being the 17th of the Reign of *Marcus Antoninus*, and the 178th Year of Jeſus Chriſt, *Irenæus* was Elected his Succeſſor upon his return from a Voyage that he made to *Rome* (*h*); having carried ſeveral Letters thither written to Pope *Eleutherus*, by the Martyrs of *Lyons*, concerning the new Sect of the *Montaniſts*. At the end of this Epiſtle, theſe Holy Men recommended S. *Irenæus* in theſe words: *We have deſired our dear Brother and Collegue* Irenæus, *to carry this Letter unto you; we commit him unto your Care; and we entreat you to eſteem him as a Perſon that hath very much Zeal for the Goſpel of* Jeſus Chriſt; *if we believed that his Dignity would add any thing to his worth, we would have recommended him to you in quality of a Prieſt; but he is much more recommendable for his Zeal and Piety.* S. *Irenæus*

S. *Irenæus* being conſtituted Biſhop, was not only employed in governing his particular Church with ſingular Prudence, but he applied himſelf alſo to the preſerving of all the other Churches in the World from the infection of Hereſies, which were then ſpread abroad in great numbers. And it was on this account (*i*) that he Compoſed in *Greek* (*k*) under the Pontificate of *Eleutherus* (*l*) five

(*g*) *By* Pothinus.] *Halloixius* was of Opinion, that he was ordained Presbyter by S. *Polycarp*. But there is more Reaſon to induce us to believe, that he was ordained by *Pothinus*, and therefore S. *Jerome* calls him the Presbyter of *Pothinus*.

(*h*) *At his return from a Voyage that he made to* Rome.] 'Tis certain, that the Martyrs had reſolved to ſend him to *Rome* to carry their Letter, but we can't certainly tell, whether he went thither or no. *Valeſius* thinks, that though they intended to ſend him, yet *Pothinus*'s Death preventing him, he was detained there to be his Succeſſor, and ſo never went to *Rome* at all. *Baronius* and *Petavius* ſay, That he went to *Rome*, and that he was not ordained till after his Return. They have the Authority of S. *Jerome* to ſupport them, who ſays the ſame thing in his Book of the Eccleſiaſtical Writers in the following Words. *Irenæus, Pothino Epiſcopi qui Lugdunenſem in Gallia regebat Eccleſiam Presbyter, a Martyribus ejuſdem loci ob quaſdam Eccleſiæ quæſtiones rogatus Romam miſſus, honorificus ſuper nomine ſuo ad Eleutherum perferi literas, poſtea tum Pothina prope Nonagenario Martyrio Coronato in locum ejus ſubſtituitur.* *Euſebius* alſo ſeems to be of the ſame Opinion, ſince he mentions a Letter wherein it is ſaid, that he was ſent to *Rome*, without telling us, that his Journey was ſtopt by the Death of *Pothinus*. The Conjecture of *Valeſius* is only founded upon the Improbability of the thing, that they would ſend S. *Irenæus*, who was the chief and the beſt known Member of the Church of *Lyons*, and who beſides was to ſucceed *Pothinus*, at a time when that Church ſtood ſo much in need of his Aſſiſtance. But beſides that in a Queſtion of Fact, as this is, a Conjecture of this Nature is of little Conſequence, ſo it may be replied, that he was ſent at the beginning of the Perſecution, and that he returned before the Death of *Pothinus*. *Feuardentius* imagines, that S. *Irenæus* carried Letters alſo into *Aſia* and *Phrygia*, which the ſame Martyrs wrote to their Brethren in thoſe Churches about the ſame Subject; but this is very improbable, and there is nothing in *Euſebius* to induce us to believe it. All that we Read there, amounts only to this, that the Churches of *Vienna* and *Lyons*, after the Death of *Pothinus*, and the other Martyrs, wrote a long Letter (which in all probability was Compoſed by S. *Irenæus*) to the Churches of *Aſia* and *Phrygia*, cited by *Euſebius*, towards the end of which, *They paſſed their Cenſure upon the Montaniſts, with a great deal of Piety and Devotion, ſetting before them* (ἐκθέμενοι) *the Letters which their Martyrs had written, while they were as yet in Chains, as well to the Brethren of* Aſia *and* Phrygia, *as to* Eleutherus *Biſhop of* Rome. But he does not ſay, that thoſe firſt Letters to the Brethren of *Aſia* and *Phrygia*, were carried by S. *Irenæus*, nor that they were ſent at all, till the Letter concerning their Martyrdom was writ, and it ſeems to be very improbable that they would ſend them the ſecond time, if they had been carried thither once before. As for what relates to the Ordination of S. *Irenæus* it is certain, that he was only a Presbyter, when he went to *Rome*, and this appears by the Letter of the Martyrs by *Euſebius*, and S. *Jerome*. It is more difficult to know, who ordained him afterwards. Father *Queſnel* in his Diſſertations upon S. *Leo*, pretends thas he was ordained by the Pope, and that he went purpoſely to *Rome* upon that account; others believe that he came back before the Death of *Pothinus*, and was ordained by him. It is more natural and more agreeable to the Teſtimony of the Ancients to believe that he was not Elected, and ordained Biſhop of *Lyons*, till after the Death of *Pothinus*; and whereas Father *Queſnel* pretends, that at that time there was only one Biſhop of *France*, and therefore it was neceſſary for S. *Irenæus* after the Death of *Pothinus* to go and be ordained at *Rome*, all this is precarious, and the rather, becauſe it appears that S. *Irenæus* was ſent thither while *Pothinus* was living, and upon another occaſion.

(*i*) *'Twas upon this Account.*] He himſelf tells us in his Preface to the fifth Book, that he Compoſed theſe Books to convert the Hereticks, and to preſerve the Novices in the Faith, leſt they ſhould be laid aſide by thoſe, who would uſe their utmoſt Endeavours to pervert them, and ſeduce them from the Truth.

(*k*) *In Greek.*] *Eraſmus* having found this ancient and barbarous Verſion, at firſt imagined, that theſe Books were Originally written in Latin, but afterwards he altered his Opinion, and no body doubts at preſent, but that they were written in Greek. For firſt S. *Jerome* places S. *Irenæus* among the Greek Authors. Secondly, *Euſebius*, S. *Epiphanius*, *Theodoret*, *Photius* and S. *John Damaſcene*, read and quoted him in Greek. Thirdly, This Author was leſs known to the Latins, than to the Greeks; and Laſtly, ſpeaking of the number of the Letters, and the Name of Anti-Chriſt, *Lib.* 5. he ſays ſeveral things that could not be ſaid but by an Author that wrote in Greek. We dont't know who made this Verſion; ſome have attributed it to himſelf, but this is a fooliſh Chimera; it was certainly Compoſed by a Man that underſtood neither Language as he ought. It was not known in the time of *Gregory* the Great, who in his 50th Letter to *Ætherius* tells him, that he had ſearched a long time after the Writings of S. *Irenæus*, without being able to find them. *Geſta vel ſcripta B. Irenæi jamdiu eſt quod ſolicite quæſivimus, ſed hactenus ex eis invenire aliquid non valui.* S. *Auſtin* cites a paſſage out of S. *Irenæus*, *Lib.* 1. *contra Jul. cap.* 3. which is of another Verſion.

(*l*) Eleutherus.] This appears, becauſe in his Catalogue of the Biſhops of *Rome*, from S. *Peter* down to his own time, he ends with *Eleutherus*, who, he ſays, was then living. *Nunc duodecimo loco Epiſcopatum ab Apoſtolis ſortitur* Eleutherus, *Lib.* 3. *c.* 3.

S. *Irenæus.* Books againſt Hereſies, bearing this Title (*m*), *The Confutation and Subverſion of that which is falſly called Knowledge.* He wrote likewiſe at the ſame time two Epiſtles to two ſeveral Hereticks of *Rome*, one whereof was directed to *Blaſtus*, and the other to *Florinus*, whom he knew when he was the Diſciple of S. *Polycarp*. In the firſt of theſe Letters he treated of *Schiſm*, and in the ſecond concerning *Monarchy*. In the latter he proved, that there was but one God, and that he was not the Author of Evil; for this was at firſt the principal Error of *Florinus*, tho' he ſoon fell into thoſe of the *Valentinians*, which obliged S. *Irenæus* to dedicate another Work to him, Entituled, περὶ ὀγδοάδος, becauſe it was written againſt the Octonary of the *Æons* of the *Valentinians*.

Not long after, under the Pontificate of *Victor* the Succeſſor of *Eleutherus*, the Controverſie that aroſe between the *Aſiatick* Biſhops and this Pope, gave occaſion to S. *Irenæus* to uſe his utmoſt endeavours to re-eſtabliſh Peace. The Subject of this Diſpute was to know on what day *Eaſter* ought to be obſerved; The Biſhops of *Aſia*, according to their ancient cuſtom, always celebrated that Feſtival on the 14th of the Moon of *March*, on whatever Day of the Week it happened, whereas the Weſtern Churches waited for the Lords-Day before they celebrated it. This difference in point of practice, which ſeems to be but of little conſequence, produced ſome diſturbance among the Churches of the firſt Ages; and when S. *Polycarp* came to *Rome* in the time of Pope *Anicetus*, theſe two Biſhops earneſtly endeavoured to accommodate this matter; but not being able to perſuade one another to leave their former Cuſtom, (ſo jealous have Churches always been of their Ceremonies and Cuſtoms) they parted very good Friends, thinking that a difference of ſo little moment ought not to interrupt their mutual Agreement. But under the Pontificate of *Victor*, this Conteſt was revived with greater heat; and had well nigh cauſed a diviſion in the Catholick Church. For this Pope, incenſed becauſe the Biſhops of *Aſia* being very far from ſubmitting to the Threats and Penalties which he had denounced againſt them, in caſe they refuſed to aboliſh their own Cuſtom, and to conform to that of the Weſtern Churches, had procured a large Epiſtle to be written to him by *Polycrates* Biſhop of *Epheſus* in vindication thereof; took a reſolution to drive *Polycrates* and the *Aſiatick* Biſhops out of their Churches, and *ſent every where Letters* (ſays *Euſebius*) *in which he declared them to be Excommunicated.* Whereupon the other Biſhops, and even thoſe that celebrated the Feaſt of *Eaſter* with thoſe of the Weſt, diſapproved the Proceedings of *Victor*, and wrote Letters to exhort him to take other Meaſures more conformable to Peace and Charity. But there was none that performed this with greater efficacy than S. *Irenæus*, who wrote an Epiſtle to him under the name of the Church of *France*, wherein he declares, that tho' he himſelf ſolemnized the Feaſt of *Eaſter* on the Lord's Day according to his manner, yet he could not approve of his undertaking to Excommunicate whole Churches for the obſervation of a Cuſtom which they had received from their Anceſtors. He advertiſeth him, that different Cuſtoms have been uſed in Churches not only in the Celebration of the Feſtival of *Eaſter*, but alſo of Faſts, and in divers other matters of practice. Laſtly, he lays before him, that his Predeceſſors did not contend with the *Aſiatick* Biſhops in this matter; and that S. *Polycarp* being arrived at *Rome*, and having holden a Conference with Pope *Anicetus* touching this affair, they decreed, that mutual Communion and Peace ought not to be broken for a matter of ſo ſmall importance. It is probable that *Victor* was convinced by theſe Reaſons; for tho' the *Aſiaticks* did not lay aſide their Cuſtom, yet it doth not appear that the Union between them and the Biſhops of *Rome* was thereupon diſcontinued. This Epiſtle is produced by *Euſebius*, who affirms, that this Father wrote many others of the like nature to other Biſhops.

To return to the Works of S. *Irenæus*, beſides thoſe that we have already mentioned, he wrote a Treatiſe againſt the Gentiles very conciſe and extreamly neceſſary, (ſays *Euſebius*) Entituled, *Of Knowledge* (*n*) περὶ ἐπιστήμης, as alſo another Tract which he wrote to *Marcion*, to ſhew what was the Doctrin that was Preached by the Apoſtles; and laſtly, a Book containing ſeveral Diſſertations διαλέξεις on different Subjects, wherein (according to the Teſtimony of *Euſebius*) he quotes the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, and the Book of the Wiſdom of *Solomon*. Theſe are all the Works of S. *Irenæus* that *Euſebius* and S. *Jerome* mention (*o*), but it is not known when theſe laſt were written.

(*m*) *Bearing this Title, &c.*] Ἐλέγχου καὶ ἀνατροπῆς τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως βιβλία πέντε. *Euſebius*, *Photius*, and others. This agrees with the name which he has given his Books in his Prefaces to *Lib.* 2, 3, and 4. and in the laſt Chapter of the 4th as well as the firſt of the fifth. The Hereticks of thoſe times called their knowledge γνῶσις, and themſelves *Gnoſticks*, which was alſo the name of a particular Sect.

(*n*) *Of Knowledge.*] St. *Jerome* diſtinguiſheth this Treatiſe of Knowledge from that againſt the Gentiles, for want of having ſufficiently minded a paſſage in *Euſebius*, *Lib.* 5. *c.* 26.

(*o*) *That* Euſebius *and S.* Jerome *mentions.*] S. *Jerome* ſpeaking of the Apocalypſe of S. *John* tells us, that S. *Juſtin* and S. *Irenæus* have interpreted it, from whence ſome conclude, that S. *Irenæus* compoſed a Commentary upon it. But S. *Jerome*'s true meaning is, that theſe two Authors cited and explained ſome paſſages of it. Some Authors formerly attributed to him the Book *De Vniverſo*, which was compoſed by *Caius* a Presbyter of *Rome*, mentioned by *Photius*, *Cod.* 48. The Author of the Queſtions attributed to S. *Juſtin*, cites a Book about *Eaſter*, *Queſt.* 115. and tells us, that there was an Account, that they did not pray kneeling on Sundays. and that there was mention made of the Pentecoſt, all which perhaps might be found in the intire Letter of S. *Irenæus* to *Polycarp*, of which *Euſebius* has only given us a fragment. *Euſebius* in his fourth Book, *ch.* 25. ſpeaking of the Book of *Philip* againſt *Marcion*, tells us, that S. *Irenæus* and *Modeſtus* had likewiſe wrote againſt the ſame Heretick. S. *Irenæus* himſelf, *lib.* 1. *c.* 29. promiſes to write particularly againſt that Heretick. We are not aſſured whether he ever did write againſt him or no, becauſe neither S. *Jerome*, nor *Euſebius*, who have given us a Catalogue of all the Books of S. *Irenæus*, mention it. 'Tis probable, that the Letter of the Churches of *Vienna* and *Lyons* concerning their Martyrs was writ by S. *Irenæus*.

The

The Death of S. *Irenæus* was no less glorious than his Life; for after having governed the Flock which Jesus Christ had committed to his Charge for 24 Years, he was not willing to abandon it in the time of the Persecution of the Emperor *Severus*, which was much more cruel in *France* than in any other part of the World. He suffered Martyrdom at *Lyons* with all the Christians that were found in that City, and in so great numbers that their Blood ran down through all the Streets, according to the report of *Gregory* of *Tours* in the first Book of his History, *Chap.* 27. We have not any particular account of his Martyrdom, which happened in the Year, 202, or 203, after the Nativity of Jesus Christ. S. *Irenæus.*

Of all the Works of this Father, there remains only in our possession a very barbarous Version of those against the Heresies, and some few Greek Fragments of these Books given us by *Eusebius*, *Theodoret*, S *Epiphanius*, and S. *Johannes Damascenus*, which are collected in the last Edition of *Feuardentius*, and in the Writings of *Halloixius*. There is also a Fragment of his Epistle to *Florinus* extant, and a considerable part of that to *Victor*, and an Advertisement which he had inserted at the end of his Book περὶ ὀκταδος, to oblige the Transcribers thereof, faithfully to revise and correct their Copy from his Manuscript. The Version of the five Books, concerning the Heresies, tho' Barbarous (as I have hinted already) and full of Faults, yet is a very valuable Fragment; for the Variety which is in it is admirable.

In the First Book, after having described at large the Errors of the *Valentinians*, in *Chap.* 1. He opposeth to them in the Second, the Faith of all the Churches in the World, which he comprehends in a kind of Creed; In the Third and Fourth Chapters, he proceeds to shew that all the Churches and all Christians agree in this Faith, and that the most Learned cannot add any thing to it, or make any Alterations from it, nor the most simple and ignorant, diminish any part of it. The following Chapters are spent in explaining the absurd Notions of *Valentinus* and his Disciples. In the 20th he returns to the Source and Original of the Hereticks, and beginning with *Simon Magus*, he gives an Account successively of all the Heresies that appeared since the time of the Sorcerer, even unto that wherein he wrote. This first Book indeed is extreamly tedious, being fill'd with almost nothing else but the wild Conceits, and extravagant Imaginations of the primitive Hereticks: There is a notable passage in it concerning Penance, upon the occasion of certain Women, who being defiled by a famous Impostor named *Mark*, afterwards did Penance, during the remainder of their Lives. In the Second Book, S. *Irenæus* begins to impugn the Errors which he had barely recited in the First: He chiefly makes use of the Principles of the Hereticks in opposing them, and shews that they contradict themselves, and that all their Whimsies are ridiculous and ill laid together. In the Third Book he confutes them by the Authority of Holy Scripture and Tradition: He proves that it is impossible, that all the Churches in the World should agree together, to alter the Apostolical Doctrin; that the Evangelists and Apostles knew but one only God, the Creator of Heaven and Earth, and one Jesus Christ God and Man, who was born of a Virgin, who is not the Son of *Joseph*, but was really Man, and that he actually suffered, and not in appearance only, as was pretended by the Hereticks. He occasionally refutes the Error of *Tatian*, concerning the Damnation of *Adam*, and maintains as a certain Truth, that he is saved. In the Fourth Book he continues to demonstrate, that there is but one God; particularly, he shews against *Marcion*, that the same God is exhibited in the Old and New Testament; he Answers all the Objections of the Hereticks, and especially those which they took from Scripture; afterwards he alledgeth the Reasons that induce a spiritual Man, that is to say, a Christian, to condemn the Pagans, Jews, Hereticks and Schismaticks. Lastly, he rejects the Opinion of those who affirmed, that Men were naturally good or evil, and proves the Liberty of Mankind. In the last Book, he Treats of the Redemption of Jesus Christ, of the Fall of Man, of the Resurrection of the last Judgment, of Anti-Christ, and of the State of Souls after Death. This is in General the Subject of every one of the Books of S. *Irenæus*; and they that peruse them will find several other passages relating to some weighty Articles of our Religion.

There are for Example, many excellent Paragraphs concerning the Holy Scriptures, and among others, one in Book 2. *Chap.* 46, and 47. There are very considerable passages touching the Eucharist in Book 3. *Chap.* 19. Book 4. *Chap.* 32, and 34. and in Book 5. *Chap.* 4. Where he proves the Resurrection of the Body against the *Valentinians*, because it is not credible, that being nourished with the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, it should remain in Corruption: He mentions the Three Persons of the Trinity (*p*). In many places of his Works, and almost as often as he speaks of the Word he establisheth his Divinity, Eternity (*q*), and Equality with the Father (*r*).

(*p*) *Of the Trinity*.] Lib. 1. c. 2. lib. 3. c. 20. lib. 4. c. 25, 37, and 75. and lib. 5.

(*q*) *His Divinity and Eternity*.] Lib. 1. c. 19. lib. 2. c. 18, and 48. lib. 3. c. 6. In all these places, and several others, he says, That the *Word is truly God*. Lib. 2. c. 43, and 56. and lib. 3. c. 20. he says, that the Word is, and was always co-existent with the Father.

(*r*) *And his equality with the Father*.] In the fourth Book, *ch.* 8. he says, That the Son is the measure of the Father, because he comprehends him. He seems to have said something contrary to this, *lib.* 2. where he says, that the Father is greater than the Son, that he knew not of the Day of Judgment; And in another, place he says, that the Father is invisible, and the Son visible. But as to the first passage, there is no more difficulty in it than in that of S. *John*, and he speaks there of Jesus Christ considered as a Man. And the second ought to be understood after the same manner, as we have explained a like passage of S. *Justin*. It is yet more favourable to us, because he says that the Son makes the Father visible, *Visibile Patris Filius*. Which shews, that the Father and the Son are of the same nature.

S. Irenæus.

In the Second Book (*s*), he Treats at large concerning the Faculties of the Soul; he conceives that it is diſtinguiſhed from the Body, and that it is of a different Nature; he there refutes the *Metempſychoſis*, or Tranſmigration of Souls out of one Body into another, and proves that thoſe of the juſt ſhall ſubſiſt Eternally. But he ſeems to have believed, as well as S. *Juſtin*, that they are immortal only through Grace, and that thoſe of the Wicked ſhall ceaſe to be, after they have been tormented for a long time. He maintains alſo another particular Opinion, that the Souls aſſume the Figure of their Bodies, but this word Figure may be underſtood of ſome peculiar Quality of the Soul.

He Diſcourſeth in many places of the Fall of the firſt Man, and of the lamentable Conſequences of his Sin (*t*), he teacheth that to repair this Loſs, and for the Redemption of Mankind, the Word was made Man, and that it is through Grace, that he hath merited for us by his Paſſion, that all Men may be ſaved (*u*). As for the State of Souls ſeparated from their Bodies, he determined that they were conveyed into an inviſible place, where they expected the Reſurrection of the Body, and that the Juſt after having Reigned with Jeſus Chriſt on Earth, during the ſpace of a Thouſand Years, and enjoyed temporal Pleaſures, ſhould enter into Heaven, to poſſeſs Eternal Happineſs (*x*). He imagined alſo, that our Saviour deſcended into Hell, to preach the Faith there unto the Patriarchs, and to the ancient juſt Men, as well Jews as Gentiles, and that they that believed at his Preaching ſhould be reckoned in the number of the Saints (*y*). Moreover he maintained ſome other particular Opinions; he believed for Example, that Jeſus Chriſt lived above Fifty Years upon Earth (*z*), and that as Man. He was ignorant of the Day of Judgment, *&c.* He approves the Judgment of S. *Juſtin*, that the Devil knew not his Condemnation before the coming of Jeſus Chriſt (*aa*). He aſſerts, that the Saints ſhall underſtand by little and little, thoſe things whereof they had no knowledge in their Entrance into Happineſs (*bb*). Laſtly, he imagines that God ſent *Enoch* to the Angels (*cc*), whom he conceives to be corporeal. The ancient Propagators of Chriſtianity ought to be excuſed for theſe ſorts of Opinions, there being ſcarcely one of them that had not admitted ſome Notions almoſt like theſe.

The Style of S. *Irenæus* (as far as we can judge by that part of his Works, which as yet remains) is ſuccinct, clear and ſtrong, but not very ſublime: He declares himſelf in his Preface to the Firſt Book; *That the Elegancy of a polite Diſſertation ought not to be ſought for in his Works, becauſe reſiding among the* Celtæ, *it is impoſſible but that he ſhould utter many barbarous Words; that he did not affect Diſcourſe with Eloquence nor Ornament, and that he knew not how to perſuade by the force of his Expreſſions, but that he wrote with a vulgar Simplicity.* He takes more pains to inſtruct his Reader, than to divert him, and he endeavours more to convince him by the Matters which he propounded, than by the manner of Expreſſing them. It cannot be doubted, but that he was a very profound Scholar in all ſorts of Knowledge, as well Prophane as Sacred; he perfectly underſtood the Poets and Philoſophers (*dd*); there was no Heretick of whoſe Doctrin and Arguments he was ignorant; he had an exquiſite knowledge of the Holy Scriptures; he retained an infinite number of things, which the Diſciples of the Apoſtles had taught by word of Mouth: Laſtly, he was exceeding well verſed in Hiſtory and in the Diſcipline of the Church, ſo that nothing can be more litterally true, than what is atteſted of him by *Tertullian*, Irenæus *omnium Doctrinarum Curioſiſſimus explorator*. Moreover, his Learning was accompanied with a great deal of Prudence, Humility, Efficacy and Charity, and it may be juſtly affirmed, that he wanted nothing that was neceſſary for the Qualification of a good Chriſtian, an Accompliſhed Biſhop, and an able Eccleſiaſtical Writer. However, the Learned *Photius* had reaſon to take notice of one defect, which is common to him, with many other ancient Authors; that is, *That he weakens and obſcures* (if we may ſo term it) *the moſt certain Truths of Religion, by Arguments that are not very ſolid (ee).* It were eaſie to produce ſome Inſtances of this defect, but it ſeems to me to be more expedient to leave them to the Judgment of the Readers of his Works.

Eraſmus firſt publiſhed the ancient Verſion of the Five Books of S. *Irenæus*, which was at firſt Printed at *Baſil*, in the Year 1526. A Second Edition was likewiſe ſet forth at the ſame place by *Frobenius* in 1528. afterwards in 1533, 1545, 1548, 1554, 1560, in *Folio*, and in 1571, at *Paris* in 1528, and 1563. in *Octavo* by *Petit*, in a very fair Character, and by the ſame Printer in 1567. again in *Octavo*. Theſe Editions were followed by thoſe of *Gallaſius* Miniſter of *Geneva*, in the Year 1570.

(*s*) *In the ſecond Book.*] Lib. 2. c. 51, *&c.* principally in the 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, and 64. where he ſpeaks of the Immortality of the Souls of the Juſt. See likewiſe *Chap.* 37. and 73. of the fourth Book, and *Lib.* 5. *c.* 32.

(*t*) *Of the lamentable conſequences of his Sin.*] Lib 3. c. 20, 33, 34, and 35. and in ſeveral places of the fifth Book.

(*u*) *That all Men may be ſaved.*] Lib. 3. cap. 18, 20, 22, and 23. Lib. 4. chap. 5.

(*x*) *To poſſeſs eternal happineſs.*] Lib. 5. c. 31, 32, *&c.*

(*y*) *Number of the Saints.*] Lib. 4. c. 39, and 45.

(*z*) *Above fifty Years upon Earth.*] Lib. 1. c. 40. &c.

(*aa*) *Before the coming of Jeſus Chriſt.*] Lib. 4. c. 78.

(*bb*) *Whereof they had no knowledge in their Entrance into happineſs.*] Lib. 2. c. 47.

(*cc*) *To the Angels.*] Lib. 4. c. 30.

(*dd*) *The Poets and Philoſophers.*] It is certain, he underſtood *Homer* very well, ſince he collects ſeveral Verſes taken out of different places, to deſcribe the carrying away of *Cerberus*, *lib.* 1. And as for the Pagan Philoſophers, he knew them ſo very thoroughly, that in the ſecond Book, *ch.* 11. he diſcovers all that the *Valentinians* had borrowed from each of them. We need only read over his firſt Book to be ſufficiently perſuaded, that he had very particularly applied himſelf to know all the Opinions of the Hereticks. One ſees by the Hiſtories which he cites as well in his Books, as in his Letter to *Victor*, how well he was verſt in Hiſtory, and in the Diſcipline of the Church.

(*ee*) *Arguments that are not very ſolid.*] Phot. Cod. 120. *Etſi in aliquibus Eccleſiaſticorum dogmatum certa veritas ſpuriis rationibus fuſcari videtur.*

Laſtly,

Laſtly, *Feuardentius*, a Profeſſor of Divinity of the Faculty of *Paris*, a Learned Man in his time undertook this Work, and Printed at *Paris* by *Nivelle*, in 1575 and 1576, the Five Books of S. *Irenæus*, Reviſed and Corrected in many places, from an ancient Manuſcript, and Augmented with Five entire Chapters, which were found in his Manuſcript at the end of the Fifth Book. He has added at the end of every Chapter ſeveral Notes, which he judged to be neceſſary for the better underſtanding of this Author; they are for the moſt part uſeful and Learned, but there are ſome which exceed the due Limits, that a Commentator ſhould preſcribe to himſelf, whoſe Deſign ought not to be, to make Oſtenation of his Learning, or to Treat of Matters of Controverſie, but barely to explain the Senſe of his Author. The Second Edition of *Feuardentius*, Printed at *Colen* in the Year 1596, and afterwards in 1630, and at *Paris* in 1639. is better than the former, becauſe it contains the Greek paſſages of S. *Irenæus*, which are extant in the Works of S. *Epiphanius*, and ſome other ancient Writers. To theſe may be added, thoſe that are Collected by *Halloixius* from the Writings of S. *Joannes Damaſcenus*, in a Manuſcript of the Cardinal *de la Rochefoucauld*. I am of Opinion, that it would be uſeleſs to make a new Edition of the Works of S. *Irenæus*, at leaſt until the Greek Text ſhall happen to be found; for to Compoſe one from the Verſion, that we now have in our Poſſeſſion (as *Halloixius* propoſes) would be a Buſineſs ſcarce of any manner of uſe. S. *Irenæus.*

Victor, Polycrates, Theophilus *of* Ceſarea, *and* Bachillus *of* Corinth.

SAint *Jerome* places *Victor* among the Eccleſiaſtical Writers, becauſe he wrote ſome little Pieces about the Day of the Feſtival of *Eaſter*, which he believed ought not to be celebrated upon any other Day but a *Sunday*. *Euſebius* mentions but one Roman Synod publiſhed in the Name of *Victor*. *Victor*, &c.

Polycrates Biſhop of *Epheſus* wrote a Letter againſt the Opinion of *Victor*, wherein he pretended that we ought to celebrate this Feſtival upon the 14th day after the appearance of the Moon in *March*, upon what day of the Week ſoever it fell. *Euſebius* c tes part of this Letter written in the Name of *Polycrates*, in the 24th Chapter of the Fifth Book of his Hiſtory, wherein he aſſerts, that S. *Polycarp*, and ſeveral other Diſciples of the Apoſtles, celebrated the Feaſt of *Eaſter* on the ſame Day, as was generally obſerved in *Aſia*; that is to ſay, the Fourteenth Day after the appearance of the Moon in *March* upon what day ſoever it happened. This difference, as we have already obſerved, raiſed ſome Diviſions among the Churches, and exerciſed the Pens of the moſt Learned Biſhops. The Biſhops of *Paleſtine*, *Narciſſus* of *Jeruſalem*, *Theophilus* of *Ceſarea*, *Caſſius* of *Tyre*, and *Clarus* of *Ptolomais*, wrote a Letter in the Name of the Council, wherein, after they had proved that they derived this Cuſtom from the Apoſtles, they gave Orders to have their Letter ſolemnly publiſhed, and declared, That they celebrated *Eaſter* after the ſame manner as the Church of *Alexandria* did. *Bachillus* Biſhop of *Corinth* wrote alſo a Letter in the Name of the Biſhops of *Achaia* upon the ſame Subject, and in *Euſebius*'s time the Letters of the Biſhops of *Pontus* of the Province of *Oſroene* were exant. But all theſe Books are loſt, and we have nothing that is ancient upon this Subject, except the Fragments of a Letter of S. *Irenæus*, and of that of *Polycrates* cited by *Euſebius*, *lib.* 5. *c.* 4. All theſe Letters were writ towards the end of the Reign of *Commodus*, or the beginning of that of *Severus*. There goes indeed under the Name of *Polycrates*, a Book Entituled, *The Paſſion of Bleſſed* Timothy, mentioned by *Sigebert*, and publiſhed by *Stapulenſis*, but 'tis a ſuppoſititious Work, and never mentioned by the Ancients.

Several Writers, of whom nothing remains, and who were little known among the Ancients.

THERE lived at this time ſeveral Writers, whoſe Works were extant in *Euſebius*'s time, who mentions theſe that follow, *lib.* 5. *cap.* 27. Heraclitus *upon* S. Paul; *Some Books of* Maximus *upon that common Queſtion among the Hereticks, From whence proceeds Evil*; and *About the Creation of Matter*; *The Commentaries of* Appion, *and of* Candidus *upon the* Hexameron; Sextus's *Book concerning the Reſurrection*; A Treatiſe of one *Arabianus*, and the Writings of ſeveral others, whoſe time, ſays *Euſebius*, we are not able to find out, there being no Traces or Signs of it; and laſtly, the Diſcourſes of ſeveral Authors, whoſe Names we don't ſo much as know, who, though they were Orthodox, and of the Church, as appears by their Explication of the Scriptures, yet they were for the moſt part unknown, and without reputation, becauſe their Books carried not the Names of their reſpective Authors. To theſe we muſt add a certain Perſon named *Judas*, who Compoſed a Diſſertation *upon the Seventy Weeks of* Daniel, wherein he has compoſed a Chronology that reaches down to the Tenth Year of the Emperor *Severus*, and would perſuade the World, that Anti-Chriſt was then at hand. So much had the Perſecution, raiſed againſt the Chriſtians at that time, troubled the Church. *Several Writers* &c.

SERA-

SERAPION of ANTIOCH.

Serapion of Antioch.

SErapion the Eighth Bishop of *Antioch* was advanced to this Dignity in the Tenth Year of the Emperor *Commodus*, in the Year of our Lord 191. He wrote a Letter to *Caricus* and *Pontius* against the Sect of the *Montanists*, a Fragment whereof *Eusebius* had cited, wherein he opposes the Authority of *Apollinarius* Bishop of *Hierapolis*, and the (a) Subscriptions of two Bishops of *Thrace* to the *Montanists*. There was also in the time of *Eusebius* another Letter of his addressed to *Domninus*, who of a Christian turned Jew, to reduce him from his Apostacy, and a Book concerning the Gospel falsely attributed to S. *Peter*. *Eusebius* cites a Fragment of this Book, by which it appears, that the subject and occasion which induced *Serapion* to write it, was a Contest that arose in the Church of *Rhossus* in *Cilicia* about the truth of that Gospel, that *Serapion* happening to be there, permitted them to read it, but that afterwards being convinced, that those Persons who defended it, were secret Hereticks, and that *Marcion*, who was the principal Asserter of it, received it from some Hereticks named the *Docetæ* (who believed that Jesus Christ did not really suffer, but only in appearance) he wrote this Letter to them, till he could go to see them himself, to acquaint them with the falsity and errors of that Gospel.

S. *Jerome* takes notice, that in his time there were some short Epistles of the same Author that were conformable to his austere rigid way of living; but they are wholly lost. This Bishop governed the Church of *Antioch* till the first Year of the Emperor *Caracalla*, and the Year of our Lord 203. *Antoninus* succeeded him, and was the Ninth Bishop of *Antioch* after the Apostles.

(a) *The Subscriptions of two Bishops of* Thrace.] These Subscriptions occasioned *Baronius* to imagine, that a Council was held upon this Subject; but they are only the Subscriptions of the Letters of two Bishops of *Thrace*, who wrote to the Asiaticks concerning this new Sect (as the Church of *France* had done) and therefore there is no necessity of saying that there was a Council assembled upon this occasion.

RHODON.

Rhodon.

RHodon, though he was of *Asia*, studied at *Rome*, and had *Tatian* for his Master. He wrote many Books, and among the rest a Treatise against the Heresie of *Marcion*, dedicated to one *Callistion*. He likewise wrote a Piece upon the *Hexameron*. S. *Jerome* attributes to him a Book against the *Montanists*, a Fragment of which, as he supposes, *Eusebius* has cited. But since *Eusebius* says nothing of its being written by *Rhodon*, and since it is certainly of a later date, we may be sure that it cannot be his. So that we have nothing of *Rhodon*'s left, save only a passage or two cited by *Eusebius*, taken out of his Book against the Heresie of *Marcion*, wherein he observes, that this Heresie in his time was divided into several Sects; that one *Apelles* acknowledged but one Principle, but that he rejected the Prophecies; that some others, as *Potitus* and *Basilicus* acknowledged two, and others introduced three Natures. He also tells us, That he had a Conference with *Apelles*, and that he himself being convinced of several Errors in their Conference, said, That we are not obliged to examine what we believe, and that all those who place their hope in Jesus Christ crucified, would be saved; that the Question about the Nature of God was exceeding obscure; that he in truth believed there was but one Principle, but that he was not assured of it, and that the Prophecies were contrary one to another. Lastly, *Eusebius* adds, that *Rhodon* says in this Book, that he was *Tatian*'s Disciple at *Rome*; that *Tatian* had written a Book concerning the most difficult Questions of Scripture, promising to explain them, but that having never done it, he himself endeavoured to perform it. And this is all we know of this Author; he flourished under the Emperors *Commodus* and *Severus*.

PANTÆNUS.

Pantænus.

PAntænus, a Stoick Philosopher (a), born in *Sicily*, about the beginning of the Reign of the Emperor *Commodus* (b), presided over the celebrated School of *Alexandria*, where from the time of S. *Mark* the Founder of that Church, they had always a Divine that was eminent for his Learning and Piety, to explain the Holy Scriptures, and to instruct them in Human Learning.

(a) *Born in* Sicily.] Some have thought that he was an *Hebrew*, but they are mistaken, for S. *Clement* speaking of the Master he had in *Ægypt*, who was our *Pantænus*. *Lib.* 1. *Strom.* calls him the *Sicilian Muse*, which shews that he was a *Sicilian*, for otherwise he would as soon have called him the *Attick Muse*. That Master of his, whom he calls an *Hebrew*, was another Person that instructed him in *Palestine*.

(b) *Presided.*] Eusebius, *lib.* 5. *c.* 10. *and* S. Jerome, *in Catalogo.*

He

He was obliged for a time to leave this Employment to undertake another far more excellent. For the *Indians* having sent to the Bishop of *Alexandria* to furnish them with a Divine to instruct them in the Christian Religion, *Demetrius* sent *Pantænus* thither, who undertook this Mission with Joy, and behaved himself very worthily in it. 'Tis reported, that he found that the *Indians* had already some Tincture of the Christian Religion, which had been infused by S. *Bartholomew* the Apostle, and that he met with the Gospel of S. *Matthew* among them written in *Hebrew* (*c*), which that Apostle had left there. *Pantænus.*

After *Pantænus* was returned to *Alexandria*, he re-assumed the Government of the School of that City, which in his absence he in all probability had committed to the care of his Disciple S. *Clement*, a Presbyter of *Alexandria*. He continued to explain the Holy Scripture publickly under the Reign of *Severus*, and *Antoninus Caracalla*, and as S. *Jerome* tells us, was more serviceable to the Church by his Discourses, than by his Writings. Nevertheless he published some Commentaries upon the Bible, where he has discovered, as *Eusebius* says, the Treasures of the Scripture. We may judge after what manner he explained the Sacred Text, by the like performance of S. *Clement* of *Alexandria*, *Origen*, and the rest that were brought up in that School. They abound in Allegories, they find Mysteries and Instructions in every thing, and scarce ever follow the literal sense, and fill their Annotations generally with a great deal of Learning. A Man ought to have abundance of Wit and Eloquence to keep up this way of writing Commentaries, and to render it advantageous and entertaining to the People, otherwise it will degenerate and grow flat and tedious. The Commentaries of *Pantænus* are all lost. We only know, that he was the Author of that Rule, which has been ever since followed by all the Interpreters of Prophecies; that the Prophets often express themselves in indefinite Terms, and that they make use of the present time, instead of the past and future. *Theodotus* has related this Opinion of *Pantænus*, but he speaks of it, as if he had rather said it than writ it.

(*c*) *Which that Apostle had left there.*] S. *Jerome* tells us, that *Pantænus* brought it with him, and that it was in his time preserved in the Library of *Alexandria*. I cannot easily prevail with my self to believe this Story, and indeed I should rather believe, that this was the Gospel according to the *Hebrews*, which the *Nazarines* owned, which might pass for that of S. *Matthew*; for why should S. *Bartholomew* leave an *Hebrew* Book with *Indians*?

S. CLEMENT *of* ALEXANDRIA.

SAint *Clement* (*a*), a Presbyter of *Alexandria*, and Disciple of *Pantænus* (*b*), was after him, or rather at the same time with him, Master of the School at *Alexandria*, and Catechist of the Catechumens (*c*), belonging to the Church of that City. He flourished under the Emperors *Severus* and *Antoninus Caracalla*, and it plainly appears, that he lived till the Reign of *Heliogabalus*, or *Alexander Severus*, that is, till about the Year Two hundred and twenty from the Birth of Christ (*d*). As he was endowed with extraordinary Learning, and a singular Talent in Writing, so he Composed several considerable Works, which discover great Industry and Study. This is plain by the Catalogue which is left us of them, by *Eusebius* and S. *Jerome*. 'The Eight Books 'of *Stromata*; Entituled the Commentaries, or *Stromata* of *Titus Flavius Clemens*, concerning 'true Knowledge; Eight Books of *Hypotyposes*, or Instructions, an Exhortation to the Gentiles, 'quoted in the Seventh Book of the *Stromata*; Three Books commonly called the *Pedagogue*; and a S. *Clement of Alexan.*

(*a*) S. *Clement.*] He was called *Titus Flavius Clemens.* S. *Epiphanius*, in the Heresie of the *Secundians*, says, that he was called *Athenienſis* by some, and *Alexandrinus* by others, which has been the occasion that it was generally believed that he was of *Athens*, and that he was called *Alexandrinus* from the name of the Church whereof he was a Priest, but his Country is not certainly known. He was of the Sect of the *Stoicks*.

(*b*) *Disciple of* Pantænus.] S. *Clement* had several Masters, as he tells us himself, *Lib.* 1. *Stromat. q.* 274. He says that he had two in *Greece*, one of *Cœlosyria*, and the other of *Egypt*. And two others in the East, whereof one was an *Assyrian*, and the other of *Palestine*, and descended from the *Hebrews*: But that at last he found out one in *Egypt*, who was more Excellent than all the rest. This last was *Pantænus*, whom he often mentions in his Book of *Institutions*. We do not know who were the other four. *Baronius* believes that the *Assyrian* was *Bardesanes*, and he of *Palestine*, *Theophilus* of *Cæsaria*; but *Bardesanes* was not properly an *Assyrian*, and *Theophilus* of *Cæsaria* was rather S. *Clement*'s Companion than his Master. *Velasius* thinks with greater probability, that *Tatian* was the *Assyrian*, and *Theodotus* the *Hebrew*, under whose Name there is a Fragment of the *Institutions* at the end of the Work of S. *Clement*.

(*c*) *Catechist of the Catechumens*, &c.] *Eusebius*, Book 5. Chap. 10. and Book 6. Chap. 6. and S. *Jerome* in his *Catalogue*. We have already said, that *Pantænus* left the School of *Alexandria* to his Care when he went to preach to the *Indians*, and it is probable, that after his return they both taught in the same School.

(*d*) *About the Year two hundred and twenty from the Birth of Christ.*] It is generally believed that he died about the Year 200 from the Birth of *Christ*, but he must needs have lived longer, for *Pantænus* who was his Master lived to this time, and tho Ancients assure us that he survived him. He wrote his *Stromata* in the time of the Emperor *Severus*.

S. Clement of Alexandria.

'Book Entituled, *What rich Man can be saved*; a small Treatise concerning Easter; a Discourse of 'Fasting, another of Slander; an Exhortation to Patience, written to the *Catechumens*; a Book 'Entituled, *The Ecclesiastical Rule*, against the Jews, Dedicated to *Alexander* Bishop of *Jerusalem*. Besides these Books, S. *Clement* in his Second Book of the *Pedagogue*, *Chap.* 10. tells us, That he wrote a Book of *Continence*, and in his Third Book, *Chap.* 8. a Book concerning *Marriage*. Of these Works we have still Three remaining that are very considerable, *The Exhortation to the Gentiles*, the *Pedagogue*, the Eight Books of the *Stromata*, and the little Tract Entituled, *What rich can be saved*, which *Johannes Mattheus Cariophylus*, Arch-Bishop of *Iconium*, published from a Manuscript of the *Vatican* Library, whence Father *Combefis* made a new Version which he set forth, together with the Original Greek, in the last Volume of his Supplement to the *Bibliotheca Patrum*. [It was Printed also at *Oxon* in Twelves, 1683. Doctor *Cave* says, That it was published formerly under *Origen*'s Name, being Printed by *Michael Gheislerus*, with *Origen*'s Commentaries upon *Jeremiah*.]

The *Exhortations to the Gentiles*, is a Discourse written to convert the *Pagans* from their Religion, and to persuade them to embrace that of Jesus Christ. In the beginning of it, he shews what Difference there is between the Design of Jesus Christ, and that of *Orpheus*, and those ancient Musicians, who were the first Authors of Idolatry, by telling us that these drew in Men by their Singing, and the sweetness of their Musick, to render them miserable Slaves to Idols, and to make them like the very Beasts, and Stocks and Stones which they adored; whereas Jesus Christ, who from all Eternity was the WORD of God, always had a compassionate Tenderness for Men, and at last took their Nature upon him, to free them from the Slavery of *Dæmons*; to open the Eyes of those that were blind, and the Ears of those that were deaf; to guide their Paths in the way of Justice; to deliver them from Death and Hell; and to bestow on them everlasting Life; to put them in a Capacity of leading a Heavenly Life here upon Earth; and Lastly, that God made himself Man, to teach Man to become like unto God. Having thus represented the Advantages of the Christian Religion, he exhorts them in a few words, to embrace Vertue, Justice, Temperance, and to imitate the Example of Jesus Christ, that so they may become worthy of eternal Salvation. He afterwards shews the Falshood of the Pagan Religion: First, by discovering the Infamy, and Vanity of their Mysteries, which he enumerates and describes exactly. Secondly, by shewing the Original of Idolatry, and after what manner Men first invented those false Deities. 'Some, says he, contemplating the Stars, 'and admiring their Courses, deifyed them; so the Indians adored the Sun, the *Phrygians* the Moon, 'and others gathering with Pleasure the Fruits that grow out of the Earth, made a Deity of Corn, 'which they call *Ceres*, and another of the Vine, and that they call *Bacchus*. Others dreading Pu-'nishments, Afflictions, Miseries and Calamities, invented particular Deities, who were either the In-'struments of sending them upon Mankind, or else of diverting them from Men: Some Philosophers 'following the Fancy of the Poets, made Deities of the Passions, such as Love, Hope and Joy, and 'others placed the Vertues in the Rank of Gods, representing them by external Shapes; *Hesiod* and '*Homer* in their Accounts of the Generation of the Gods, and Descriptions of their Actions have 'given Rise to a new sort of Theology. Lastly, the common People have made Gods of those, 'from whom they have received any considerable Benefit. After having thus discovered the Original of Idolatry, he shews the Folly of it, by proving that the principal Gods, as *Jupiter*, *Mars*, *Vulcan*, *Æsculapius*, &c. were Men like others, and that we know their Country, their manner of Living and Employments, and that we may see their Sepulchres to this Day: That the Poets have set down their Loves, their Wounds and their Crimes: That the wisest of the Heathens have owned the Falshood of these Deities: That the several Religions of the Pagans destroy one another: That it is a strange kind of Blindness, to adore Statues as real Deities. Then he goes on to the principal Design of his Work, which is to exhort Men to adore the true God, and to embrace the Religion of Jesus Christ: He shews that the wisest of the Philosophers, as *Plato*, *Cleanthes*, *Pythagoras* and *Xenophon*, have confest that there was but One true God; and that even the most ancient Poets, as *Aratus*, *Hesiod*, *Euripides* and *Orpheus*, have been obliged to acknowledge the same; and that the Sibyls, the Prophets, and the Books of Scripture teach only the Worship of One God. Afterwards he is very earnest to persuade Men to embrace the Christian Religion, in consideration of the great Advantages that it carries along with it, towards the Attainment of eternal Salvation, which they cannot otherwise hope for, and for preserving themselves from eternal Torments, which they cannot possibly avoid, but by believing in Jesus Christ, and by living conformably to his Laws. 'If you were permitted, says he, 'to purchase eternal Salvation, what would you not give for it? And now you may obtain it by Faith 'and Charity. There is nothing can hinder you from acquiring it, neither Poverty, nor Misery, nor 'Old Age, nor any other State of Life: Believe therefore, in One God who is God and Man, and re-'ceive eternal Salvation for a Recompence. Seek God, and you shall live for ever. Thus he concludes with a long Exhortation, wherein he most earnestly presses Men to quit their Idolatry and Vices, and to live and believe as the Christians do.

The Second Book Entituled the *Pedagogue*, is a Discourse entirely of Morality. It is divided into three Books. In the first he shews, what it is to be a *Pedagogue*, that is to say, a Conductor, Pastor, or Director of Men: He proves that this Quality chiefly and properly belongs only to the WORD Incarnate. He says that it is the part of the *Pedagogue* to regulate the Manners, conduct the Actions, and cure the Passions. That he preserves Men from Sins, and heals them when they have been already Guilty. That the WORD performs these Functions by forgiving our Sins, as he is God, and instructing Us as he is Man, with great Sweetness and Charity. That he equally informs

Book I.
Chap. 1.
Chap. 2.
Chap. 3.
Chap. 4.

Men

Men and Women, the Learned and Ignorantt, becauſe all Men ſtand in need of Inſtruction, being all Children in one Senſe. Yet however, that we muſt not think that the Doctrin of the Chriſtians is Childiſh and Contemptible: But that on the contrary, the Quality of Children, which they receive in Baptiſm, renders them perfect in the knowledge of Divine Things, by delivering them from Sins by Grace, and enlightning them by the Illumination of Faith: And that ſo we are at the ſame time both Children and perfect Men, and that the Milk wherewith we are nouriſhed, being both the Word and the Will of God, is a very Solid and Subſtantial Nouriſhment. That the WORD guided the Jews in the Old teſtament by Fear; but that after it was Incarnate, it has changed this Fear into Love. The Reproaches, Afflictions and Puniſhments, which the WORD makes uſe of to chaſtiſe Men, are not Signs of his bearing any hatred towards them, but effects of his Juſtice, and of the Care which he takes to Correct them: That it is the ſame God, the Creator of the World, who is both Good and Juſt, that puniſhes and ſhews Mercy: That he is good upon his own Account, and juſt as to Men: That Reproofs and Chaſtiſements are for their Good; that there are two kinds of Fear, the Fear which Children have of their Father, or Subjects of their King; and the Fear which Slaves have of their Maſter. That both theſe Sorts of Fear are profitable to Men, but that the Firſt is by much the moſt perfect. That the WORD enclines Men to good by its Exhortations, and prevents them from Sinning, by its Threatnings: That he performed the Function of a *Pedagogue* by *Moſes* and the Prophets, and that he is at laſt come himſelf to give men ſuitable Remedies to their ſeveral Miſeries, and to Conduct them according to the Dictates of right Reaſon. That the whole Life of a Chriſtian is a continued *Series* of Actions, conformable to Reaſon, and that Sin is produced by the going out of that way.

S. *Clement* of *Alexan.* *Chap.* 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. *Laſt Chap.*

In the 2d and 3d Book of the *Pedagogue*, S. *Clement* deſcends to the Recapitulation of Human Actions, and gives Rules for Temperance and Chriſtian Modeſty. In the former of theſe he ſhews, that the End and Deſign of Eating, ought not to be Pleaſure but Neceſſity, and that therefore we muſt avoid Exceſs both in the Quantity, and the Quality of our Meat. That Wine is not to be Drunk but with great Moderation, and that young Perſons particularly ought wholly to abſtain from it. He finds great Fault with Luxury in Houſhold-ſtuff and Moveables. He is of Opinion, that Vocal and Inſtrumental Muſick, ought to be baniſhed from the Chriſtian Feſtivals, and that we ſhould only celebrate therein the Praiſes of God. He is againſt immoderate Laughter, and uttering ſuch Words as are unſeemly. He requires that exact Modeſty be obſerved in the Countenance, and in Diſcourſe; he reprehends thoſe who put Crowns and Garlands upon their Heads, and who perfumed themſelves with Balm. He allows but little Sleep, and that in ſuch Beds, that are neither too ſtately nor too delicate. That it is not lawful to Marry but with a Deſign of begetting Children; That we ſhould not make uſe of Cloaths, but for the ſake of Decency. He declaims againſt Luxury of Apparel, againſt precious Stones, againſt Fantaſtical Dreſſes in Men or Women, and againſt publick Baths. He deſcribes and inveighs againſt all theſe things better than ever *Juvenal*, or any of the ancient Satyriſts had done before him. He intermixes his Satyr with ſeveral Curious Inſtructions, and deſcends to particulars like a Caſuiſt.

Book II. *Chap.* 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 10. 11. and 12. *Book* III. *Chap.* 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.

He paſſes in the next Place to the Precepts of Vertue oppoſite to the Vices he has been reprehending: He ſhews, that there is none but the Chriſtian, who is truly Rich. That he ought to live in an entire Frugality. That he muſt not make uſe of any Exerciſes, and Pleaſures, no farther than is abſolutely neceſſary for his Health. He adds moreover divers Inſtructions, more particularly ſuited to the Women, to perſwade them to carry themſelves always Civilly, and Modeſtly, and more eſpecially in Churches. Laſtly, he makes a Collection of ſeveral Places of Scripture, which relate to Morality, and the Conduct of our Life, and concludes by exhorting Men to harken unto, and to obey the Precepts of Jeſus Chriſt, their Supreme and Sovereign *Pedagogue*, to whom he Addreſſes a Prayer, praiſing him with the Father, and the Holy Ghoſt, and returning him Thanks for making him a Member of his Church. Theſe Books are very profitable for thoſe that ſtudy Morality, and if the Caſuiſts of our Times had peruſed and conſidered them well, they had not fallen into that damnable Remiſneſs, wherein they have ſuffered themſelves to be overtaken: They might alſo be very uſeful to all Chriſtians, and I much wonder that no Perſon has undertaken to tranſlate them in this Age, wherein ſeveral Pious and Learned Men, have employed their Time and Labour in rendring intelligible to all People the moſt excellent Writings of the Fathers, by tranſlating them into our Language with a Clearneſs of Expreſſion, and Exactneſs of Style not to be imitated. But if any would undertake the Tranſlation of the *Pedagogue*, he muſt leave out ſeveral Paſſages, that are not fitting to be read by every Body, and accommodate ſome other Places to the Manners and Cuſtoms of our Times.

Chap. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. *Laſt Chap.*

The Books Entituled *Stromata* (e) are ſo called, becauſe they contain ſeveral choice Thoughts (f) Collected from divers Places, and joyned together, ſo as to make a Variety ſomewhat like that in *Turky-work*

(e) *The Books entituled* Stromata.] This Book was called, as *Euſebius* tells us, The *Stromatic* Commentaries of *Titus Flavius Clemens* concerning the *Gnoſticks*, according to the True Philoſophy; This Title is at the end of the Firſt Book, oppoſing the Falſe *Gnoſticks* to the True ones, which are the Sober and Diſcreet Chriſtians.

(f) *Choice Particulars.*] The Word στρωματεις properly ſignifies a Sheet of Linnen, or a Bag to incloſe Pieces of Tapeſtry; it likewiſe ſignifies a certain Fiſh with Speckles on the Back. It is here taken for that neat Mixture we ſee in Tapeſtry, and it imports as much as *Miſcellaneous Commentaries or Diſcourſes*. *Ruffinus* tranſlates it, *Opus varie contextum*; *Plutarch* wrote a Book with this Title, and *Origen* wrote another after S. *Clement*.

S. *Clement of Alexan.*

Carpets. Let us ſee how S. *Clement* ſpeaks of his own Work, in the Beginning of his Fourth Book. 'Theſe Books, ſays he, are ſtor'd with Varieties, as their Name imports; we here paſs on continually 'from one thing to another, and we often mention things that are Foreign to our Subject. He afterwards compares this Work to a Meadow, a Tract of Land, or a Garden, wherein one may find all ſorts of Herbs, Flowers and Fruits, of which we may gather what we pleaſe. 'But not, *as he 'ſays in another Place*, to thoſe beautiful Gardens, where the Trees and Plants are ranged only to 'pleaſe the Sight; but rather to a thick and ſhady Mountain, where the Cypreſſes, the Linden-'Trees, the Lawrels, the Ivy, the Apple-Trees, the Olives, the Figg-trees, and other kind of Trees 'both fruitful and barren, are mixt together. He ſays that he has obſerved this Method deſignedly, 'that ſo he might not clearly diſcover our Myſteries to thoſe who were not yet initiated, and yet 'ſo as others might comprehend them, and might thence make their Advantage; as, ſays he, the 'Fruit-Trees of this Mountain, whereof we but juſt now ſpake, are concealed from thoſe who would 'rifle them, whereas the Labourer, who underſtands them, may pluck them up, and make a Garden, 'or a pleaſant Foreſt. Do not therefore expect, ſays he, in theſe Books, either Order or Politeneſs; 'ſince our Deſign was to conceal, and, if I may ſo ſay, to embroil Things, that ſo none but the In-'telligent, and thoſe who will take the Pains to inform themſelves, may be able to comprehend 'them: So that as S. *Clement* has not obſerved any Method in theſe Books, but intermixed ſeveral Notions all-a-long of Philoſophy, and Religion, it is a difficult Matter to make ſuch an Abridgment of them, as we have given of the Books of the *Pedagogue*. However we ſhall endeavour to give an Account of the principal Matters, which he there diſcourſes of.

In the Firſt Book, after having ſhewn how advantagious it is, for Perſons of Ability to Compoſe Books, he propoſes the Subject of his, ſaying that they ſhall contain the principal Verities of Religion mixt, or rather concealed under the Maxims of Philoſophy. Thence he takes occaſion to refute thoſe who find fault with Philoſophy; to ſhew the Profit and Advantage of it; to Diſcourſe of the Uſe that may be made of it: And he concludes by ſhewing that the Philoſophy of the Hebrews is the moſt Ancient of all, juſtifying this Truth by a moſt curious and exact Chronology.

In the Second Book he treats of Faith, and its Effects, which are Repentance, Hope and Fear; he proves that Faith is neceſſary; that it is not in us by Nature, but by Will; that it is God's Gift, but ſo as to depend upon our own Free-will; that true Repentance conſiſts in doing no more that which we are troubled for having done already; that there are two kinds of it, the Firſt is that of thoſe, who turned to the true Faith, to efface the Sins they committed, whilſt they were Heathens; the Second is that of thoſe, who have fallen after their Converſion, but yet have an Opportunity of obtaining Forgiveneſs, provided they are heartily ſorry for their Sin; but that thoſe who often fall into the ſame Sin, and by that means make a Circle of Repenting and Sinning, are like to thoſe who have no Faith: And that it is only a ſeeming, and no true Repentance, in thoſe who ask Pardon for thoſe very Sins which they never intend to reform. Upon occaſion of Repentance he Diſcourſes of Sin. He ſays that Men commit it freely, and that they are purified from it by Faith and Charity. That the Fear of God is very profitable for us, that it inſtructs us, that it cauſes us to avoid Sin, and that it incites us to Love. He commends Charity, Temperance and Hoſpitality. He condemns thoſe that plunge themſelves in ſenſual Pleaſures: And propoſes to them the Example of the Martyrs who ſuffered Fire, Torments, and Death it ſelf for the Defence of Juſtice and Truth. Afterwards he Diſcourſes of Marriage, and defines it to be a lawful Conjunction between a Man and a Woman, for the Propagation of Children. He approves of it, and ſhews its Advantages, telling us that it is never lawful to leave the Woman, in order to Marry another, upon any Pretence whatever.

He continues in the Third Book, to ſpeak againſt the Incontinence of the *Nicolaitans*, *Carpocratians*, *Valentinians*, and ſeveral other Hereticks, and he defends Marriage againſt the *Marcionites*, againſt *Tatian*, and the other Hereticks that blamed it, tho' he prefers Virginity before it as a greater good; *Provided*, ſays he, *that it be kept merely for the Love of God, and for the obſerving his Commands.* He maintains that Marriage is indiſſoluble, he does not entirely condemn Second Marriages, but blames them. He occaſionally tells a Story of *Nicholas* one of the Seven firſt Deacons, who is ſuppoſed to be the Author of the *Nicolaitans*, who having a handſom Wife, and being accuſed of Jealouſie, brought her, as they ſay, before the Apoſtles, and gave her leave to Marry whom ſhe pleaſed of them. But he excuſes *Nicholas*, and ſays, that thoſe who boaſt of being his Diſciples have put a wrong Conſtruction upon this Action, as well as upon his Words: That he was informed, that he never had any Commerce with any other Woman, but his Wife: That his Daughters remained Virgins, and his Son was very Chaſt. He ſays that the Apoſtles S. *Peter*, and S. *Philip* were Married, and that they had Children: That even S. *Philip* Married his Daughters; and he adds alſo, that S. *Paul* had a Wife, wherein he is miſtaken.

[Tho' it is uncertain whether S. *Paul* was ever Married, yet it is a raſh thing to ſay poſitively he was not. S. *Clement* alledges a Tradition in this Matter, which might eaſily be conveyed entire down to his time. It is plain, that the true *Yoke-fellow*, *Philip.* 4. 3. was a Woman; which others of the Ancients underſtood of his Wife, beſides S. *Clement*. His Expoſtulating with the *Corinthians*, and aſſerting that he had a Power to lead about a Siſter, or a Wife as well as S. *Peter* or any of the Apoſtles, may as well prove, that S. *Paul* juſtified his own Practice, 'as that he thought the thing ſimply lawful: eſpecially ſince he is there making a Defence for himſelf. The Queſtion however is very far from being certain in the Negative, and therefore at leaſt ought to be left undetermin'd.]

In the Fourth Book he treats of Martyrdom, and Chriſtian Perfection. He ſhews the Excellency of Martyrdom, and exhorts Chriſtians to undergo it, confuting the Hereticks, who held that Martyrdom

tyrdom was no Vertuous Action: He makes the Perfection of Christianity, to consist in the Love of God and our Neighbour. He would have us love Sinners, and yet detest their Sin; that we should do good out of a Principle of Love, and not for Fear. 'For that Man, says he, that abstains from 'Evil only out of a slavish Fear, is not good voluntarily, but for Fear-sake; and he who would not 'have abstained but in Consideration of the Recompence, cannot be said to be Just with a good 'Heart. For in the one 'tis Fear, and in the other the Hope of a Reward, which renders them Just, 'or rather which makes them appear so to the Eyes of the World. He says that God inflicts Punishments upon Men for Three Reasons. First, that the Man whom he Chastises may become better. Secondly, that those who are to be saved, may take Warning by these Examples. Thirdly, lest he should be despised by Men, if he did not avenge Affronts and Injuries done to himself. S. *Clement of Alexan.*

In the Fifth Book, after having shewn that the way of instructing by Allegories and Symbols was very ancient, not only among the Jews, but also among the Philosophers, he proves that the Greeks took the greatest part of the Truths, which are in their Books, from the Barbarians, and principally from the Hebrews. This Book is full of Citations from the Poets, and the Heathen Philosophers.

In the Sixth Book, he speaks again advantagiously of Philosophy. Afterwards he begins to draw a Character of the *True Gnostick*, that is to say, to give the *Idea* of a Christian, that is perfectly Good and Wise. These are the principal Strokes of his Picture. The *True Gnostick* has the Command over his Passions. He is exactly Temperate, and allows his Body no more than what is necessary. He loves God above all Things, and the Creatures for God's-sake, and the Relation they bear to him, and nothing is able to separate him from this Love. He bears with Patience all unfortunate Accidents. He makes it his Business to know all things which relate to God, without neglecting human Learning. His Discourses are regular and to the purpose, full of Sweetness and Charity. He is never overcome with Anger. He prays continually by Charity, that unites him to God; First, begging of him the Remission of his Sins; and then the Grace not to sin any more, but to do Good. Afterwards S. *Clement* enlarges upon the Source or Spring, from whence this *Gnostick* derives this true Knowledge, and compleat Science. He says that it is the Holy Scripture, the Law and the Prophets, and in particular the Decalogue which he briefly explains; and Lastly the Doctrin of Jesus Christ foretold by the Prophets, preached throughout the World, and received notwithstanding all the Contradiction of Kings, and the great Men of this World, who opposed it with all their Might.

In the Seventh Book, he goes on to describe the Vertues of his *Gnostick*; he says that he employs himself entirely in honouring God, in loving him, in understanding, hearing and imitating his WORD, which was made Man for our Salvation; that he does it not only upon certain Days, but during the whole Course of his Life; that the Sacrifices by which he Honours him, are the Prayers and the Praises which he offers up at all times and in all Places; that he is Gentle, Courteous, Affable, Patient, Charitable, Sincere, Faithful and Temperate; that he despises the good things of this World, and that he is ready to suffer every thing for Jesus Christ; that he does nothing either out of Ostentation, or Fear, or the Desire of being rewarded, but out of pure Love to the Goodness and Justice of God: Lastly, that he is entirely Holy and Divine. Afterwards S. *Clement* Answers several Objections of the Greeks and Jews, who affirmed that the multiplicity of Heresies ought to hinder Men from the embracing the Religion of Jesus Christ. To which he Answers, that this multitude of Sects is likewise to be found among the Heathens, and the Jews; that it was foretold by Jesus Christ, that such a thing should happen among the Christians. That it ought not to make us forsake the Truth, but rather on the contrary to seek after it, with the greater Care and Diligence. That there is an infallible Rule to distinguish Truth from Falshood; that this Rule is the Holy Scripture, which being an incontestable Principle serves for a Proof of whatever we say. That it must be Confessed, that the Hereticks make use of it as well as the Catholicks. But then first they do not make use of all the Sacred Books. Secondly, those which they do use are corrupted. Thirdly, they chiefly urge ambiguous Passages, which they explain according to their own Fancy, by departing from the true Sense, and keeping only to Terms. Hence he takes occasion to condemn in general all Hereticks, who rejecting the Tradition of Jesus Christ, and his Apostles, and forsaking the Faith of the Church, have made themselves the Authors of particular Sects, by inventing new Doctrins, and corrupting the Truth. He says, that there is but only One Catholick Church, which is more ancient than all the Assemblies of the Hereticks; that it was founded by Jesus Christ, who dyed under *Tiberius*, and established it in the World by the Apostles, before the end of *Nero*'s Reign. Whereas there was hardly so much as one Heresie older than *Adrian*'s Time, and that they all bore the Name of their Author, or that of the Places and Countries where they first appeared, or from the Doctrin they taught, or the things which they honoured, which sufficiently discovers their Falshood and Novelty. He concludes by making the Description of these Books of the *Stromata*, and by promising to begin another Subject in the following Book.

The Last Book in our Editions, is a Collection of Logical Principles, which contains nothing that regards the Christian Religion, or that is worth giving an Account of. *Photius* observes, that in his Time there were some Editions, where this last Book was Entituled; *What Rich Man can be saved?* And that it began with these Words. *Those who make Pieces of Oratory.* But *Eusebius* distinguishes that Book from the *Stromata*.

S. *Clement* of *Alexandria*, does not start at all from the Doctrin of the Church in those Works of his, whereof we have already given the Abridgment. He does not only mention Three Divine

S. *Clement of Alexan.*

Persons, but he invokes them as One only God (*g*). Besides, he uses the Name of the most Holy Trinity. He says, That the WORD, which was from the beginning in God, which is God, and equal to God, by which he created the World, and instructed all Men, did at last become Man to save us by his Doctrin, by his Example, and by his Death. It is true, in another Place he says, That the Nature of the Son is the most Perfect, the most excellent, and that which approaches nearest to Almighty God, Words which would seem to imply as if he believed, that the Nature of the WORD was different from that of the Father: But we know well enough, that the Ancients had not yet made so exact a Distinction between the Terms Nature, and Person, and that they often took one for the other. And indeed his way of discoursing of the Excellency of the WORD, in this and other Places, sufficiently declares, that he did not believe that he was of a different Nature, taking the Word Nature in the same Sense as we at present. For he says, that the WORD is God, that it is without Beginning, that he is equal to the Father, that he is in the Father, that he created all Things, &c. Expressions which clearly discover what his Opinion was concerning the Divinity of the WORD. He seems however to follow the way of speaking of some of the Ancients, in saying that the WORD is Visible, that he may be known, and that it is by him that we know the invisible Father, of whom he is the Image; but it is an easie matter to accommodate these Expressions to the Doctrins of the Church, as we have shewn in our Critical Remarks upon several Authors already. He says, that the Blessed *Mary* remained a Virgin after she brought forth. He holds that the *Dæmons* sinned through Incontinency. He acknowledges *Adam*'s Fall, and the Punishment of his Sin, which all Men have incurred. But he seems not well to have understood the Nature of Original Sin. 'Tis true, that in the Passage commonly alledged from him against Original Sin, he contradicts the Opinion of those who affirmed, that the Generation was Corrupted. But he speaks after such a manner as would make us think that he did not believe Original Sin, or at least, that he never considered it. *Let them tell us*, says he, *how an Infant that is but just born has prevaricated, and how he who has already done nothing, could fall under* Adam's *Curse*, &c. He often exhorts Men to do good by the Hopes of Eternal Happiness, and dissuades them from Evil, by the Fear of Everlasting Punishments, without speaking at all of the Opinion of the *Millenaries*. He holds, That without Faith in Jesus Christ none can be sav'd: But he says, That Jesus Christ, and the Apostles preached the Gospel in the *Limbi* to just Persons, as well Gentiles as Jews, that they might obtain this Faith, wherein they were before deficient. He ascribes much to Free-Will, he believes that our Salvation, and Faith which is the beginning hereof depends upon our selves, though not without the Assistance of Divine Grace (*b*). He speaks nobly of the Necessity and Efficacy of Baptism. 'Bap-'tism, *says he*, is called Grace, Illumination, Perfection, Washing, by which Name it is called, be-'cause it cleanses us from our Sins; it is called Grace because it remits the Punishment due for our 'Sins; Illumination, because it enlightens us with the Illumination of Faith; Perfection because it 'makes us perfect. *And afterward, p.* 95. These Bonds of Sin are immediately broken by the Faith 'of Man, and the Grace of God; Sins are remitted by this admirable Remedy of Baptism, and we 'immediately cease to be Sinners; from being Blind as we were before, we become clear-sighted, 'for what is taught to the *Catechumens* is purely Instruction to guide them to that Faith, which is 'thus internally conveyed by the Holy Spirit. We have given an account of the difference that he makes between the Remission of Sins committed after Baptism, and that which is obtain'd by Baptism. We have shewed that he allowed but one Repentance after Baptism, and that he rejects the Repentances of those Persons who often relapse into the very same Sins, as things of no value; that he approves of Marriage, and believes it indissoluble; that he blames Polygamy, and even second Marriages. He speaks but little of the *Eucharist*, and what he says of it is very obscure, because he endeavours to conceal this Mystery from those who were not Baptised. But he declares expressly in the Second Book of the *Pedagogue*, Chap. 2. That the Bread and Wine are the Matter of it, and condemns the Hereticks who used any thing else besides Bread, and Wine mingled with Water. He observes that in several Churches, after the Eucharist was distributed, it was left to the liberty of each of the Faithful to take a part of it. He often cites *Apocryphal* Books, as the Gospel according to the *Egyptians*, the Book of *Hermas*; yet in the mean time he only allows the Four Gospels to be Canonical. He admits of the Authority of Tradition, and that of the Church. These are the Opi-

Book IV. *Pag.* 537. *and* 565.

Book VII. *Pag.* 756.

Book V. *of the Strom. p.* 550.

Book II. *p.* 2. *Chap.* 2.

Book III. *Pag.* 468. *and* 449.

In Protrpr. p. 54. *& sequentibus.*

Book 1. *Pæd. Chap.* 8 *and* 9.

Book 3. *Ch.* 11. *and* 12.

Lib. 1. *Stromat. p.* 3. 11. *Lib.* 3. *p.* 444.

Lib. 6. *p.* 661. *In Protr. p. p.* 53. *& Pæd. Lib.* 1. *c.* 9.

Lib 3. *Stromat. p.* 452, *& 465. Lib.* 1. *Stromat. init. Lib.* 7. *p.* 754.

(*g*) *As being One only God.*] Lib. 1. Pædag. Cap. 8. *Unus est universorum Pater, unum etiam verbum universorum, & spiritus sanctus unus, qui & ipse est ubique.* And Book 3. Chap. 12. 'Let us praise the Father 'and the Son, says he, the Son because he is our Pe-'dagogue and our Master, together with the Holy 'Ghost who alone is the Whole, in whom are all 'things, and by whom all things are one, to whom 'be Glory for ever and ever.

And again, Book 5. Page 544. *The Father is not without the Son, neither the Son without the Father.* And Pag. 598. after having quoted some Words of *Plato*, he understands them of the Trinity; *For*, says he, *the Holy Ghost is the Third, and the Son, by whom all things were made, is the Second.*

(*b*) *Though not without the Assistances of Divine Grace.*] Lib. 5. Stromat. p. 547. *Nam neque fieri potest ut sine libero animi arbitrio & instituto consequamur, neque universum est positum in nostra voluntate, quale sit id quod est venturum. Gratia servamur, sed non absque bonis operibus. Et oportet quidem cum natura apti simus ad bonum, ad id aliquod adhibere studium. Oportet mentem quoque habere bonam, & quæ nulla retardetur pœnitentia a boni consequutione. Ad quod maxime divina opus est gratia, rectaque doctrina, castaque & munda animi affectione, & patris ad ipsum attractione.* And Lib. 4. pag. 518. he says, That it is God which gives us Continence. Pag. 530. he says, That it is Grace that enables us to run our Course without any Impediment. Pag. 495. he says That it is the Power of God which makes us resist Temptations.

nions

nions of S. *Clement* upon the Principal Articles of our Faith, which are conformable to the Doctrin of the Church, in all the main Points, and different only in some things of lesser Consequence. S. *Clement of Alexan.*

But this cannot be said concerning his Work of *Institutions*, which according to the Testimony of *Photius* contained several Errors, even contrary to what he had taught in his other Works. Let us see what this Learned Critick says of the Matter. *The* Hypotiposes, says he, *were written upon some Passages of the Old and New Testament, which he explains and interprets briefly; but though he has in several Places very Orthodox and True Notions, yet in others he has some that are very Erroneous and Fabulous; For he says that Matter is Eternal, and he feigns Eternal* Idea's *produced by the Decrees of God; he places the Sun in the number of Created Beings; he holds the* Metempsychosis; *he pretends that there were several Worlds before* Adam; *he fancies* Eve *to be produced from* Adam *after an infamous manner, and different from that which is set down in the Scripture; he imagines, that the Angels having had to do with Women, begat Children of them; he thinks that the WORD was not really and truly Incarnate, but only in Appearance; he feigns two WORDS of GOD, the one Superior and the other Inferior, this last was that which appeared unto Men; he adds, that this WORD is not of the same Nature with the WORD of GOD, that it was not the WORD of the Father that was Incarnate, but a certain Vertue and Power of GOD proceeding from the WORD, which being a Spirit entred into the Souls of Men. He endeavours to prove these Opinions by Scripture. In a word, these Eight Books are full of such sort of Errors and Blasphemies; whether it be the Author of this Book that has written them, or whether it be any other who puts them out under his Name. The Intent and Design of the whole Work appears to be an Explanation of* Genesis, Exodus, *the* Psalms, *the* Canonical Epistles, *and* Ecclesiasticus. *The Author observes that he was the Disciple of* Pantænus.

If this Work was so full of Errors, as there seems no reason at all to doubt after the Testimony of *Photius* who had seen it, it must needs have been composed by S. *Clement*, before he was throughly instructed in the Christian Religion, and had altogether quitted the Opinions of *Plato*; which seems very probable, for we cannot say that he was not the Author of these Books, which are attributed to him by all Antiquity, and there is no likelihood that they were falsified by the Hereticks in so many Places. Besids, that these are the Opinions of one who would accommodate the Platonick Philosophy to the Christian Religion, or rather of one who was half a Platonist and half a Christian. However, among the Ancients these Books have been had in sufficient Esteem and Reputation. *Eusebius* cites several Passages out of them. In the First Book, *Chap.* 12. of his History he brings one out of the Fifth Book, where it is said that *Cephas*, *Matthias*, *Barnabas*, and *Thaddæus*, were of the number of the Seventy Disciples of Jesus Christ. The same *Eusebius* in the Second Book, *Chap.* 1. produces another Passage taken out of the Sixth Book, where he says that *Peter*, *James*, and *John* (though they were preferr'd by Jesus Christ to the other Apostles) did not dispute about Precedency, but chose with one consent S. *James* the Just to be Bishop of *Jerusalem*. And another out of the Seventh Book, where he says, That these Three Apostles had the Spirit of Knowledge, which they communicated to the Seventy Disciples. In the 9th Chapter there is another Passage taken from the Seventh Book, where he says, That *James* the Brother of *John* by his Constancy converted his Accuser, and that they were both beheaded for the Faith of *Christ*. In the 15th Chapter, he says, that S. *Clement* in his Sixth Book of Institutions affirms, That S. *Mark* composed his Gospel by the Direction of S. *Peter*, and that this Apostle approved of it when it was finished. Lastly, *Eusebius* in his Sixth Book 14th Chapter tells us, That S. *Clement* in his Institutions explains all the Books of the Old and New Testament, not omitting even those of which many Persons doubted, as the Epistles of S. *Jude*, S. *Barnabas*, and the Revelation of S. *Peter*: That he says that the Epistle to the *Hebrews* was written by S. *Paul*, and translated by S. *Luke*: That S. *Paul* would not put his Name to it, because he was hated by the *Hebrews*. He sets down the Order of the Gospels; he says that the Gospels of S. *Matthew* and S. *Luke* were first written, that S. *Mark* composed his at *Rome* at the Instance of the Faithful, and by S. *Peter*'s Order, and that S. *John* writ his last at the Desire of his Friends, to explain what was most Spiritual in Jesus Christ, the others having sufficiently spoken of his Body.

The famous *Valesius* has observed, That we have still a very considerable *Greek* Fragment of this Work at the end of S. *Clement*, Entituled, *An Extract of the Oriental Doctrin of* Theodotus. For it contains those very Errors, concerning *Christ*'s Person, which *Photius* has observed in the *Hypotiposes*; and the Author says towards the end, that *Pantænus* was his Master. It is also likely that the other Fragment which follows, which is a Collection of Words and Expressions of Scripture, is likewise taken out of these Books, for besides that it is found with the Works of S. *Clement*, it is written after that manner in which *Eusebius* and *Photius* acquaints us, that the Work of S. *Clement* was composed, and it appears that it is the very same Design.

There is also another considerable Fragment of S. *Clement* taken from his Book, *What Rich Man can be saved*, in *Eusebius*, *Book* 3. *Chap.* 23. where he tells us a famous Story of S. *John*. He says that this Apostle coming to a City of *Asia*, recommended to the Bishop a young Man who seemed to have very good Parts: That this Bishop presently took care of him, and having sufficiently instructed him, he baptiz'd him; but afterwards neglecting to look after him as before, this young Man grew lewd, and became the Ring-leader of the Robbers; that S. *John* returning some years after, demanded of the Bishop the Trust which he had committed to his Charge, and let him know, that he required this young Man from him. The Bishop telling him that he was utterly lost, and that he was become the Head of the Thieves, this Holy Apostle being extreamly concern'd at this unfortunate Accident, immediately took Horse, caused himself to be taken by the Robbers, and to be brought before the Chief, who remembring him, immediately fled; but S. *John* running after him, made

him

S. Clement of Alexan.

him acknowledge his Fault, promiſed to obtain for him *Chriſt*'s Pardon, and brought him back along with him, and having put him into a Courſe of Repentance, he did not leave him till he was reconciled to the Church. We have this Book entire in the laſt Volume of the Supplement of the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, tranſlated by *Giſlenius*, and the Greek Text publiſhed by *Cariophylus*: 'Tis an excellent Diſcourſe, wherein S. *Clement* explains the Words of *Jeſus Chriſt* to the young Rich Man recorded by S. *Mark*, *Chap.* 10. And it ſhews, that in order to Salvation, 'tis not neceſſary for any one abſolutely to quit his Poſſeſſions and Riches, provided he makes a good uſe of them. Upon occaſion of this Queſtion, he diſcourſes of Love towards God, and towards our Neighbour, and of Repentance. By the way he ſays ſomething of the Advantage there is in having a Director, to reprehend us ſeverely for our Faults, and to give us ſuitable Remedies for our Amendment. And it was to ſhew the efficacy of Repentance, that he told this Story of S. *John*. We find under the Name of S. *Clement*, in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, ſome Explications upon ſeveral Paſſages of the Old Teſtament, and Commentaries upon the Canonical Epiſtles. If theſe Fragments are really his, they muſt be taken from his Books of *Inſtitutions*, which is not very improbable, becauſe they have a near Relation to what *Photius* ſays of the *Inſtitutions*, and beſides they have the Genius of S. *Clement*.

There is no doubt but S. *Clement* was a Perſon of Extraordinary Qualifications. S. *Jerom* makes no Scruple of ſaying that no Man had ever more Knowledg than this Father; and it is certain, that of all the Ancients, there is none whoſe Books are ſo full of Profane Learning as his *(i)*: He even ſhews too much of it for a Chriſtian Writer, and we may ſay that he was more a Philoſopher than a Divine, though he was by no means ignorant of our Religion, and perfectly underſtood the Holy Scriptures. But he is much more Emphatical upon the Moral than upon the Doctrinal Part of Chriſtianity; and he explains almoſt all the Paſſages which he cites, after an Allegorical manner in imitation of *Philo Judæus*. He writes almoſt always without Method and Coherence. His Style is careleſs; which may be particularly obſerved in his *Stromata*. For in his Exhortation to the Gentiles and his Pedagogue, he writes more ſtoridly, as *Photius* has obſerved, and he is all-a-long buoyed up with a certain Majeſtick Gravity, which is very delightful.

The Works of S. *Clement* have been Printed in *Greek* at *Florence* in the year 1550 for *Torrenſis*, by the Care of *Petrus Victorius*. They were tranſlated by *Gentianus Hervetus*, which Tranſlation was Printed at *Florence* by the ſame Perſon in the year 1551; at *Paris* in 1566, 1572, 1590, 1592, and in 1612; at *Baſil* in 1556, and with S. *Irenæus* in 1560, and 1566; at *Amſterdam* in 1613. *Silburgius* afterwards took Pains upon this Author, and having collected the Obſervations and Corrections of ſeveral Learned Perſons, cauſed it to be Printed in *Greek* by *Commelinus* in the year 1592, in Folio. Afterwards it was publiſhed in *Greek* and *Latin* by *Heinſius*, who reviſed the Tranſlation, and added ſome new Obſervations, and cauſed it to be Printed in *Greek* by the ſame *Commelinus* in the year 1616. This Edition was followed by thoſe of *Paris* in the year 1629, and 1621, which is the beſt of all; That of 1641 is not ſo Fair and Correct.

(i) Whoſe Books are ſo full of Profane Learning as his.] I believe the Reader will not think it tedious to read the followng Paſſage of *Gentianus Hervetus* concerning the Learning of S. *Clemens*. Do you deſire, *ſays this Author*, to read Hiſtories that are very ancient and very Curious? Read S. *Clement* who underſtood all Ancient Hiſtory ſo perfectly well, that one would think him to have been ignorant of nothing that had paſſed in the World. Have you an Eſteem and Veneration for the Verſes of the ancient Poets and the Anſwers of the Oracles? You cannot put too high a Value upon S. *Clement*, who quotes Paſſages from ſeveral ancient Poets, whoſe Works we have loſt. Would you be willing to know the Rites and Ceremonies which were obſerved in the Sacrifices of the Heathen Gods? Read S. *Clement*, who diſcovers the moſt hidden Myſteries of the Pagans. Beſides, Is there any one among the Chriſtians who has any Reſpect for the Superſtitions of the Heathens, who commends their Manners and Cuſtoms (and I wiſh to God there were no ſuch Perſons left) but if there be any, they may diſabuſe themſelves by reading S. *Clement*, who clearly makes out the Falſhood of the Pagan Religion, ſo that after having read it, they cannot but be aſhamed of their Folly. Have you a mind to underſtand the Opinions and Maxims of the ancient Philoſophers? Read S. *Clement*, who diſcourſes of the Original of Philoſophy, of all the Sects of Philoſophers, and of their Doctrin, yet ſo as he always prefers the Philoſophy of the Chriſtians before all others, and proves by invincible Arguments, that This is That which is only Divine, whereof God himſelf is the Author. Would you know the Tenets of the Hereticks who infeſted the Church in its Infancy? S. *Clement* explains them conciſely, and confutes them very ſolidly and ſubſtantially. Do you ſeek for Teſtimonies againſt the Hereticks of our Times? S. *Clement* will furniſh you with ſeveral. Have you a deſign to correct that abominable corruption of Manners in this preſent Age? There is no Author that reproves Vice more ſeverely, that exhorts more powerfully to the practice of Virtue, and that gives better Rules and Inſtructions for leading a Chriſtian Life. Laſtly, have you a mind to re-eſtabliſh the ancient Diſcipline of the Church? You cannot have too high an eſteem for the Learning and Sanctity of S. *Clement*, who being a Prieſt carried himſelf, and lived after ſo holy a Manner, that it were very much to be wiſhed, that there were more Perſons in this Age like him.

Miltiades;

Miltiades; *The Two* Apollonii; *And Two Anonymous Authors, who wrote against the Heresies of* Montanus *and* Artemo.

Miltiades, &c.

'TIS not known neither what was the Country, nor the Profession of *Miltiades*; he wrote a Book against the *Montanists*, wherein he particularly maintains, That a Prophet ought not to speak in an Ecstasie or Fury (*a*). *Eusebius* affirms, that he has left evident Proofs of his Skill, and the Pains which he took in the Study of the Holy Scripture, in those Books which he wrote against the Gentiles and the Jews, each of which was divided into two Volumes. And that besides these Discourses, he wrote an Apology for the Christian Philosophy, Dedicated to the Governours of the Provinces (*b*). This Author lived under the Emperor *Commodus*.

There were at the same time two different Authors, both of which were called *Apollonius*. The false is a *Greek* Author, who wrote against the Sect of the *Montanists*, wherein he confutes their last Prophecies step by step, and Censures the Practice and Manners of those Hereticks. *Eusebius* gives us a Fragment of it in *Book* V. *Chap.* 18. where he describes the Exorbitances of *Montanus* and his Prophetesses; he accuses them for taking Sums of Mony and Presents. He particularly reprehends two Persons of this Sect, who boasted of their being Martyrs. Besides *Eusebius* observes, that *Apollonius* says in this Book, that it was forty years since *Montanus* invented his Prophecies; that he makes mention of *Thraseas*, who was a Martyr in his time, and that he mentions a Tradition, that *Jesus Christ* had given Orders to his Apostles not to go out of *Jerusalem* for twelve Years.

The second *Apollonius* was of *Rome*, a Senator of that City, if we may believe S. *Jerom* (*c*). He was accused in the time of the Emperor *Commodus* for being a Christian, and was brought into the Judgment-Hall before *Perennis* the *Præfectus Prætorio*. His Accuser was condemned (*d*) according to the Law of the Emperor, which punished the Accusers of the Christians with Death, and *Apollonius* was sent back to justifie himself before the Senate; where he appeared, and made a very Eloquent Oration in Defence of his Religion, tho' notwithstanding that he was condemned to Death, because there was an Ancient Law which ordain'd, That those Christians, who were once judicially accused for their Religion, should not be acquitted if they did not forsake it. S. *Jerome* says, that he Composed this Oration to Present to the Senate. But *Eusebius* assures us on the contrary, that he spoke it before them. But whether he wrote it with a Design to speak it, or that the Christians had taken care to preserve it, it was extant in *Eusebius*'s time among the ancient Acts of the Sufferings of the Martyrs.

The same *Eusebius* gives us a Fragment of an Anonymous Author against the Heresie of *Montanus*. This by some is attributed to *Apollinarius*, and by S. *Jerome*, sometimes to *Rhodon*, and sometimes to *Apollonius*. Tho' it was not written by either of these Authors, but by one more modern, who lived, as we have said, after the Death of *Montanus* and his Prophetesses. It was divided into five Books. *Eusebius* relates some Passages taken from the First, Second, and Third. In that which is taken from the first Book, the Author describes the furious Transports of *Montanus* and his Prophetesses, and those who pretended to Prophecy. In the Passages taken from the second Book, he says, That *Montanus* and *Maximilla* killed themselves; that *Theodotus* likewise threw himself down headlong; and that very Holy Bishops, as *Zoticus* of *Comana*, and *Julian* of *Apamia*, being willing to Convict the Prophecies of *Maximilla* of Imposture, were hindred by some who favoured that Sect. He adds, that *Maximilla* foretold, before she died, Wars and Persecutions, and yet that after her Death both Church and State enjoyed perfect Peace and Tranquility. In the Passage taken from the

(*a*) *In an Ecstasie of Fury.*] This is taken from the Author against the Heresies of the *Montanists*, in *Eusebius*, Book 5. Chap 17. and the meaning of it is, that true Prophets ought never to deliver themselves in a Fury, nor to be out of their right Senses, as the *Montanists* were. This likewise is the Rule which S. *Chrysostom* gives for distinguishing the False Prophets from the True. *Homil.* 29 *in Epist. ad Corinth.* 8. And S. *Jerom*, in his Preface upon *Nahum*, *Non enim loquimur in Extasi, ut Montanus, & Prisca, Maximillaque delirant, sed quod Prophetat liber est visionis intelligentis.* S. *Jerom* here uses the Term *Ecstasie* in the same sense with the Anonymous Author.

(*b*) *To the Governors of the Provinces.*] Πρὸς τοὺς χοσμικοὺς ἄρχοντας. *Eusebius* and S. *Jerom* understood these Words of *Emperors*; but since there was but one in this Author's Time, it is more natural to explain this Expression by *Governours of Provinces*.

(*c*) *If we believe* S. Jerom.] *Eusebius* does not say, that *Apollonius* was a Senator, but S. *Jerom* affirms it in his Catalogue to *Magnus*. We cannot tell whether he knew it certainly, or whether it be only by Conjecture that he says so. But it is likely, that it was upon the account of his being a Senator, that the *Præfectus Prætorio* sent him back to the Senate to be Tryed there.

(*d*) *His Accuser was condemned.*] It was his Slave, if we may believe S. *Jerom*, and 'tis very probable, for he was condemned to have his Bones broken, the ordinary Punishment of Slaves.

third

Miltiades, &c.

third Book, he ſays, That the Martyrs, of which they boaſt, cannot juſtifie themſelves, ſince even the *Marcionites* likewiſe have made the ſame Pretences: But that the Martyrs of the Church do carefully avoid Communicating with thoſe of this Sect, as has been practiſed in the City of *Apamia* by the Martyrs named *Alexander*, and *Caius*, who were of *Eumenia*. Moreover in the following Chapter *Euſebius* relates a Paſſage taken from the ſame Book, where he ſays, That all the Prophets which have been ſince the time of the New Teſtament, ſuch as *Agabus*, *Judas*, *Silas*, the Daughter of *Philip*, *Quadratus*, were not agitated by the ſame Spirit of Prophecy as *Montanus* and *Maximilla*, whoſe Falſe and Lying Prophecies were made in a ſudden Heat, accompanied with Lewdneſs and Impudence, which took its Riſe from Ignorance, and ended in Involuntary Folly: But that in the ancient Prophecies, nothing like this was to be found. That ſince the time of *Maximilla* and *Montanus*, there has not been any Perſon of this Sect, who could boaſt of being a Prophet, whereas the true Gift of Prophecy ought to be always in the Church.

The other Author, whereof *Euſebius* gives us a Fragment without naming him, in the fifth Book of his Hiſtory, Chap. 28. had written a Diſcourſe againſt the Hereſie of *Artemo*, who believed, that *Jeſus Chriſt* was only a meer Man. It is related in this Fragment, that thoſe of this Sect affirmed, that till *Victor*'s Days the true Apoſtolical Doctrin was preſerved, but that it was corrupted from the time of *Zephirinus*. 'Which poſſibly may be ſomewhat probable, *(ſays this Author)* if what they 'aſſert had not been firſt confuted by the Holy Scripture; and ſecondly by the Writings of thoſe 'Chriſtians who were more ancient than *Victor*, ſuch as *Juſtin Martyr*, *Miltiades*, *Tatianus*, *Clemens*, 'and ſeveral others that maintain in their Diſcourſes the Divinity of *Jeſus Chriſt*. For who can be 'ignorant of the Writings of *Irenæus* and *Melito*, who have taught, that *Jeſus Chriſt* was God and 'Man at the ſame time? And even thoſe Hymns and Pſalms written by the Faithful ſince the begin-'ning of Chriſtianity, extol the Word of God, attributing Divinity thereto. So that ſince the Do-'ctrin of the Church has been Preached for ſo many Years, how can they ſay, that till *Victor*'s time 'the whole Church was of their Opinion? Are they not aſhamed to invent this Calumny againſt '*Victor*, who knew very well that *Theodotus* the Currier, who was the firſt Author of the Sect of 'thoſe that deny the Divinity of *Jeſus Chriſt*, was turned out of the Church by *Victor* himſelf? For 'if this Biſhop had been of the ſame Mind with *Theodotus*, how comes it to paſs that he Excommu-'nicated him upon the account of his Doctrin? And what probability is there, that *Zephirinus*, 'who ſucceeded *Victor*, and continued in the See of *Rome* for ten Years, ſhould make an alteration in 'the Doctrin of the Church? And thus it is that this Author confutes the General Principle of all Hereticks that ever were, or ever ſhall be, giving us an infallible Rule to convince them, which has been, and ſhall always be, the Cuſtom in the Church of God. For there was never any Age, wherein the Hereticks did not ſay, that the Church had changed its Doctrin, nor was there ever any time wherein they were not confuted firſt by Scripture, and ſecondly by Tradition, that is to ſay, by the Teſtimony of Authors, who lived before the Riſe of theſe Hereſies. *Euſebius* adds another Fragment from the ſame Author, where he ſpeaks of the Penance of a Confeſſor called *Natalis*, who ſuffering himſelf to be abuſed by *Aſclepiodotus*, and *Theodotus* the Goldſmith, the Diſciple of *Theodotus* the Currier, was tormented for ſeveral Nights as a Puniſhment for his Fault, and afterwards did publick Penance for the ſame in the Pontificate of *Zephirinus*, and ſo was Reconciled to the Church. To conclude, in this laſt Paſſage he deſcribes the Character of theſe Heretics, and he ſays, that they have corrupted the Scriptures, and overthrown the Rule of Faith; that when we object to them any Paſſages of Scripture, they try whether they can make thereof any Compound or Disjunctive Syllogiſms; that they ſtudy Geometry and Logick, and that they pervert the Simplicity of the Faith taught in the Holy Scriptures, by their falſe Subtilties, which is the Common Character of all Hereticks. We do not know who this Author is, nor what was the Title of his Book *(e)*: But this Fragment ſet down by *Euſebius* plainly diſcovers, that he was a Learned Man, and well ſkilled in the Controverſie, and underſtood how to Reaſon cloſely againſt the Hereticks, and to give admirable Rules for their Conviction.

(e) *We do not know who this Author is, nor what was the Title of his Book.*] *Nicephorus* calls it the *Labyrinth*, and *Theodoret*, Lib. 2. *Hæret. Fabul.* confirms this Title. *Photius*, Cod. 48. attributes the Book of the *Labyrinth* to *Caius*, and others aſcribed it to *Origen*.

TER-

TERTULLIAN.

Tertullian.

TErtullian (*a*) was a Native of *Africa*, of the City of *Carthage* (*b*). His Father was a Centurion in the Troops which ſerved under the Proconſul of *Africa* (*c*). And there is no doub to be made, but that he was firſt a Heathen (*d*), but it is not known when, nor upon what occaſion he was entred into the Church (*e*). He flouriſhed chiefly under the Reigns of the Emperors *Severus*, and *Antoninus Caracalla* (*f*), from about the year of our Lord 194, till towards the year 216. And it is very probable that he lived ſeveral years after, ſince S. *Jerom* relates, that it was repo ted in his time, that he lived to an extream old Age (*g*). But we do not exactly know the time of his Dea h.

The Books that he wrote to his W.fe ſufficiently ſhew, that he was a Married Man, but we cannot gather from thence when he was Married. The l earned are divided as to this Matter, ſome pretending that he Married his Wife before he was a Chriſtian, and that he left her after he embraced Chriſtianity; others believing, that he was not Married till after he was Baptized. Which has been the occaſion that ſome have found a difficulty in clearing this Point, which at firſt ſight ſeems to be of no great moment, whether, as it is commonly believed, that *Tertullian* was ordained a Prie. within a little time after his Converſion; if he married his Wife after he was Baptized, and afterwards remained with her, it would ſeem that it might be concluded from thence, that in his time it was lawful for Prieſts to Marry. And this is that which has made *Pamelius* ſay, that *Tertullian*, before he was ordained Prieſt, made a Vow of Continence to his Wife. But becauſe it appears in the Books which he directed to her, that he ſtill lived with her when he wrote them, the Author of the Life of *Tertullian* and *Origen* has been obliged to ſay, that he might maintain *Pame ius*'s Opinion, that theſe Books were written by *Tertullian* immediately after his Converſion: Though it is more probable, that *Tertullian* was not Married till after he was Baptized (*h*), and that he did not write theſe Books to his Wife till he was old (*i*), a little before he fell into the Errors of the *Montaniſts*.

(*a*) *Tertullian*.] He was called *Q. Septimius Florens Tertullianus*, which diſtinguiſhes him from the Conſul *Tertullus* and *Tertullian* the Martyr.

(*b*) *And of the City of* Carthage.] He teſtifies as much himſelf in his Book *De Pallio*, *c.* 2. and in his Apology, *c.* 9. *Witneſs*, ſays he, *the Troops of our Country*, ſpeaking of the Troops under the Proconſul of *Carthage*. S. *Jerom* confirms the ſame in his *Chronicon*, and in his Book of *Eccleſiaſtical Writers*.

(*c*) *And ſays, that his Father was a Centurion of theſe Troops, which was no very conſiderable Employment.*] *Euſebius* ſeems to ſay, that *Tertullian* was a *Roman*, and a Perſon of Quality, *Hiſt. l.* 2. *c.* 2. Τοῦτο Τερτυλλιανὸς τὰς Ρωμαίων νόμους ἠκριβωκὼς, ἀνήρ τε ἄλλα ἔνδοξος καὶ δὴ μάλιστα ἐπὶ Ρωμαίοις λαμπρὸς ὤν. What he ſays of *Tertullian*'s being well ſkilled in the Roman Laws, has made ſome believe, that he was a Lawyer, and indeed there is a Lawyer of the ſame Name: But it is certain, that he is a different Perſon from our *Tertullian*; and *Euſebius* does not ſay, that he was a Lawyer, but that he was well verſed in the Roman Laws. What *Euſebius* adds of his Country and his Extraction, is by no means to be maintained, if we do not underſtand it of the Roman Writers; and that the Senſe muſt be, that *Tertullian* was one of the moſt Excellent of all the Latin Authors. *Ruffinus* has given this Senſe to this Paſſage of *Euſebius* by tranſlating it, *Inter noſtros Scriptores admodum clarus*. *Pamelius* ſays, that *Tertullian* was a Lawyer, but he brings no good Argument for it, relying only upon the Authority of *Trithemius*, who is a modern Author.

(*d*) *But that at firſt he was a Heathen.*] He himſelf ſays, ſpeaking to the Heathens in his Apology, *We have been like-wiſe of your Party; Men are not born Chriſtians, but they become ſo.* And in his Book *De Spectaculis*, and in that concerning *the Reſurrection of the Fleſh*, chap. 19. and 59. he ſays, That he had aſſiſted at thoſe Sights and Spectacles, and that he had ſpent part of his Life in Lewdneſs.

(*e*) *But it is not known when, nor upon what occaſion he was converted to the Church.*] *Pamelius* ſays, that he was converted by the Anſwer of an Oracle, and Father *George* of *Amiens* affirms, that it was by a Viſion, but neither of theſe are to be credited.

(*f*) *And* Antoninus Caracalla.] S. *Jerom* affirms, that he flouriſhed under theſe Emperours, and this appears by his Writings; ſome have ſaid, that he flouriſhed about the year 160, but they are miſtaken.

(*g*) *To an extream old Age.*] S *Jerom*, in his Book of *Eccleſiaſtical Writers*, ſays, *Uſque ad Decrepitam ætatem vixiſſe fertur.*

(*h*) *That he was not Married till after he was Baptized.*] His Wife was a Chriſtian; and he does not ſay in any place of his Works, that ſhe was converted with him, or that ſhe had converted him; it is therefore more probable, that he Married her after he was a Chriſtian. For there is no likelihood, that while he was a Heathen, he ſhould Marry a Chriſtian Woman: and if ſhe had been converted with him, or that ſhe had converted him, he would without doubt have taken ſome notice of it in the Books which he wrote to her.

[His urging S. *Paul*'s Authority and Command in his ſecond Book to his Wife, when he adviſes her to marry a Chriſtian if ever ſhe married again, is a ſtrong preſumption, that if he married after his Converſion, his Wife was a Chriſtian at that time.]

(*i*) *Till he was pretty well advanced in Years.* Theſe Books are compoſed in the form of a Laſt Will or Teſtament; In the firſt, he exhorts his Wife to preſerve her Continency after his Death; a ſign that ſhe had but little regard of it in his Life time. In the ſecond he tells her plainly, that it is a Duty to endeavour to maintain that Continency in their Widowhood, which they could not preſerve in their Married Eſtate: Which ſhews, that *Pamelius*'s Opinion is nothing but a groundleſs Suppoſition. Theſe Books were written by *Tertullian* towards the end of his Life, as may be proved. Firſt by the Manner of the Compoſition, which is in form of a Laſt Will or Teſtament. Secondly, becauſe a Man ſeldom troubles himſelf to write to his Wife, what he would have her to do after his Death, but till he is in years. Thirdly, becauſe though *Tertullian* was not a thorough-paced *Montaniſt* when he wrote thoſe two Books, yet he ſeems to be leaning very much that way.

[*This is not a neceſſary Conſequence.*]

Tertullian. There is no Passage in his Writings from whence it can be concluded, that he was a Priest of the Catholick Church (*k*); but S. *Jerom* affirms it so positively (*l*), that there is no reason to question it. It is commonly believed, that he was a Priest of the Church of *Rome* (*m*): But being of *Carthage*, and having almost always remained there, he ought rather to be called a Priest of the Church of *Carthage*, than of *Rome*. He was not so happy as to preserve this Dignity to the end of his days, for after having continued in the Church for about 40 or 45 years, he separated from it in the beginning of the Third Century (*n*), to follow the Sect of *Montanus* and his Disciples.

As to the Reasons of his Separation some have said, that it was Jealousie that carried him to this Excess, because *Victor* was Preferred before him to the See of *Rome*; Others say, that he was angry because he could not get the Bishoprick of *Carthage*, which he put in for, and that this made him take up such a Resolution; And lastly, others have assigned different Reasons (*o*), which are yet less probable: But this is rather to divine, than to give the Reasons of *Tertullian*'s Change; which are no where grounded upon the Testimony of any ancient Writer. That which has the most likelihood, is what is related by S. *Jerom*, that the Envy which the *Roman* Clergy bore him, and the Outragious manner wherewith they treated him, exasperated him against the Church, and induced him to separate from it. And besides, the extraordinary Austerity which appeared in the Sect of the *Montanists*, suited very well with his violent and severe Temper, which caused him to carry every thing to Extremities. And it was for this reason that he was so enraged against the Catholicks, and that he treated the Church with such Fury, after his Separation from it. It does not appear by his Books, that he ever afterwards returned from his Error, and none of the Ancients have affirmed it; but on the contrary, they have all spoken of him, as of a dead Man out of the Communion of the Church. It would therefore be a thing altogether against common Sense to imagine, as some have done, that he at last returned into the Bosom of the Church.

And this is an exact Abridgment of *Tertullian*'s Life; let us now proceed to his Writings, and begin by examining the Order, according to which they were Composed, that so we may afterwards make a more exact Judgment of them. And by considering them in this manner with relation to the order of Time, they may be divided into two *Classes*: The first, comprising those which he composed whilst he was still a *Catholick*; And the second, those which he wrote after he was a *Montanist*. They are easily distinguished, because he never fails in his latter Books, of speaking of the Holy-Ghost of *Montanus*, of the Prophecies of the *Montanists*, and of their Extraordinary Fasts, of declaiming against Second Marriages, and against the Absolution which is granted by the *Catholicks* to those who fall into Sin after Baptism; or lastly, of Railing against the Catholicks whom he calls *Psychici*, that is to say, *Carnal* and *Sensual*. But we must consider them more particularly, and examine in what Years the several Books were written.

It is evident, that *Tertullian* wrote his Book *Of Pennance*, whilst he was yet a Catholick; for therein he expresly confutes one of the Principal Errors of the *Montanists*, by proving, that those who have committed Sins after their Baptism, may obtain Absolution from the Church, provided they do Penance. *Erasmus* questions, whether this Book be *Tertullian*'s or no, because it is written more politely than his other Books; and the Authority of *Erasmus* has made *Rhenanus* reject this Discourse, though since 'tis quoted under *Tertullian*'s Name by S. *Pacianus* an Author of the Fourth Century,

(*k*) *There is no Passage in his Writings from whence it can be concluded, that he was a Priest of the Catholick Church.*] There is a Place in his Book *de Animâ*, c. 9. whence it may be concluded, that he preached in the Church of the *Montanists*, and that they related to him strange Visions. But as all the *Montanists* talked after this rate in their Assemblies, it cannot certainly be concluded from hence, that he was a Priest; and we have only the Authority of S. *Jerome* for it.

(*l*) *But S. Jerome affirms it so positively.*] In his Treatise of Ecclesiastical Writers, *Cum usque ad mediam ætatem Presbyter Ecclesiæ permansisset, ad Montani Dogma delapsus est.*

(*m*) *It is commonly believed, that he was a Priest of the Church of* Rome.] That which makes it believed that he was a *Roman* Priest, is what S. *Jerome* says of his falling into the Error of the *Montanists*, because he was provoked by Envy, and the Injuries which he received from the Clergy of that Church. But there is no necessity for all this that he should be at *Rome*, since there was a sufficient Intimacy and Correspondence between these two Churches, so that it might be easily known at Rome, what was said and done at *Carthage*, and though he had been then at Rome, yet it would not have followed, that he was Priest of that Church: None of the Ancients affirm it, but on the contrary, *Optatus* calls him a *Carthaginian*, as he calls *Zephirinus Urbicus*, that is, the Bishop of *Rome*: And also *Victorinus Pataviensis*. The *Prædestinatus* of *Simondus* calls him plainly a Presbyter of *Carthage*.

(*n*) *In the beginning of the Third Century*] The *Epocha* of his Change is certain, for we may easily fix it, because he says in his Book against *Praxeas*, that this Heretick being come to *Rome*, hindred the Bishop of that Church from acknowledging the Prophecies of *Montanus*, that he wrote against him at that time, and had obliged him to revoke his Opinion; that afterwards he acknowledged the *Paracket*, or Comforter. Now it is very likely, that *Victor* was this Bishop that rejected the Prophecies of *Montanus*; For *Tertullian* says, that *Praxeas* hindered him from consenting to these new Prophesies, by urging the Authority of his Predecessors, who could be no other than the Popes *Anicetus* and *Eleutherus*, in whose time these new Prophecies of *Montanus* first began to appear: So that *Tertullian* could not be turned till after the Pontificate of *Victor*, who was Pope from the Year 193, to the Year 201. He was a *Montanist* when he composed the Books against *Marcion*, which were written in the Year 207. So that *Pamelius*, who fixes his Change in the Year 210, is mistaken.

(*o*) *Have given different Causes thereof.*] *Baronius* is the Author of the first Opinion, *ad An.* 201. *n.* 9. *Pamelius*, in his Life of *Tertullian*, of the second. And there are others besides, who have assigned other Causes for his Change, which are all groundless.

there

there seems no reason to question its being *Tertullian*'s: Besides, the difference of the Style is not very considerable, and it is no wonder that *Tertullian*, when he was a young Man, and newly Converted, should write a Book, upon which he bestowed so great pains, more politely than usual. *Tertullian.*

His Book of *Baptism* was written about the same time: For it is not only free from all the Errors of the *Montanists*, but even what he says, That Baptism is reserved to the Bishops, and that it is never permitted to Women to Teach or to Baptize, is expresly contrary to their Discipline.

Besides, we have no reason to doubt, but that he composed the Discourse of *Prayer* whilst he was yet a Catholick: For speaking therein concerning Fasts, he says, that there is no Solemn Fast among the Christians, but that which is before *Easter*; which is contrary to the Discipline of the *Montanists*, who observe several *Lents*. Besides, he cites in this Treatise the Book of the *Pastor*, which he rejected after he was a *Montanist*. We cannot exactly tell in what Year these Books were written, nor which of the three were Composed first.

His *Apology for the Christian Religion* was wrote about the year 200 (*p*), in the beginning of the persecution under the Emperor *Severus*. It is commonly believed, that he wrote it at *Rome* and Address'd it to the Senate: But it is more probable, that it was Composed in *Africa* (*q*), and indeed he does not address himself to the Senate, but to the Proconsul of *Africa*, and the Governors of the Provinces.

The Books concerning *Patience*, and the *Exhortation to the Martyrs*, may have been written about the same time: But that to *Scapula* was not composed till some years after as well as the *Two Books to the Nations*.

Afterwards, as he began to incline towards the *Montanists*, he wrote about the year 202, or 203, the Discourses concerning *Publick Sights and Spectacles*, and of *Idolatry* (*r*). This is the last of the two, the other being quoted Chap. 13. He was not yet a thorough-paced *Montanist*, but he began to imbrace their Opinions, though he had not yet openly left the Church. He still kept the same Opinions when he composed his Books *Of the Ornament, and Dresses of Women* (*s*): And two Books Dedicated *to his Wife*. His Book of *The Testimony of the Soul* has no certain *Epocha* (*t*); but as we do not find therein any Foot-steps of the Errors of the *Montanists*, we may believe that it was written by *Tertullian* before he separated from the Church.

And these are all the Works that can be attributed to *Tertullian* whilst he remained Orthodox, all the others being certainly written after his returning *Montanist*. His Books against *Marcion* are the

(*p*) *His Book of the Apology for the Christian Religion was written about the Year* 200, *from the Birth of Christ.*] It is very likely that it was Composed about this time. M. *Allix* pretends, that it was not written till the Year 211, but his Reasons are but weak. He says, that he alludes in the 47th Chapter to the Book of *Præscriptions*; but though he here makes use of the term *Præscribe*, it does not thence follow, that this Book was Composed after that of the *Præscriptions*. The second Reason is taken from an Eclipse seen at *Utica*, in the Year 210, to which, says he, *Tertullian* alludes in the 20th Chapter; but he does not speak at all in this place of any particular Eclipse. The last and principal Reason of M. *Allix*, is that in the 4th Chapter of the *Apology*, he speaks of *Severus*, as if he were dead. *Severus*, says he, *A Prince of great Constancy, has he not lately abolish'd by his Authority the* Papian *Law, which ordains, that one should have Children before the Age in which the* Julian *Law gives permission to Marry.* But this might be said of *Severus* whilst he was yet living, and it is likely that he abolished this Law (if yet he did abolish it at all, for it was rather *Constantine* that did it,) in the beginning of his Reign. But what we read in the 5th Chapter, *Who are those that have made Laws against the Christians, 'tis neither* Adrian, *nor* Vespasian, *nor* Antoninus, *nor* Severus, might prove that he wrote after the Death of *Severus*, but we must read *Verus*, as it is in the latter Editions, and not *Severus*.

(*q*) *It is more probable that it was composed in* Africa.] *Pamelius* and several Authors are of Opinion, that he wrote his Apology at *Rome*, and that he addressed it to the Senate. But there is not one Passage in this Book, that gives any ground for this Conjecture. On the contrary, this Book is Addressed to the Chief Governours of the Cities. *Tertullian* speaks of *Rome* and the *Romans*, as not being in their City, nor with them. In *Chap.* 21, 24, 35, and 45. he speaks of the Proconsul, and there was not any at *Rome*. As to what we say, that it was not Addressed to the Senate, but to the Governors of the Provinces, the beginning of the Apology does evidently shew: Which is this, *Si non licet vobis Romani Imperii Antistites, in aperto & in ipso vertice civitatis Præsidentibus ad judicandum palam despicere, & coram Examinare quid sit liquidum causæ Christianorum, si ad hanc solam speciem Auctoritas vestra de Justitiæ Diligentia in publico aut timet, aut erubescit inquirere. Si denique demesticis indiciis nimis onerata sectæ hujus infestatio obruit viam defensioni, &c.* Those which he calls *Imperii Antistites* are the Governors and Proconsuls, and that which follows plainly shews it, for he says, that they preside *in vertice civitatis*, which does not signifie the City of *Rome*, which is always called *Urbs*; and what he adds, that it belongs to them to examine the Cause of the Christians, to try them, and to receive Informations against them, does evidently prove that he speaks of the Governours of Places. Secondly, he does not mention so much as one word of the Senate in the whole Book. Thirdly he speaks of the Proconsul, as of the Supream Magistrate, *Chap.* 45. Lastly, he always calls those to whom he Addresses this Work *Præsides*, a Title which properly agrees to the Governours of the Provinces.

(*r*) *The Discourses concerning publick Sights and Spectacles and of Idolatry.*] In the 5th Chapter of the Book concerning *Idolatry*, he alludes to the Joy at the Birth of *Geta*; He speaks in his Book concerning Publick Sights and Spectacles, *Chap.* 7. of the City of *Rome*, like a Person who was not there, so that this Book could not be made at *Rome* as has been believed.

(*s*) *His Books of the Ornament and Dresses of Women.*] The Latin Titles are, *De cultu Muliebri, & de habitu Muliebri.*

(*t*) *His Book of the Testimony of the Soul has no certain Epocha.*] It is was written after his Apology, as may be concluded from the 5th Chapter.

Tertullian. firſt of theſe laſt kind of Books (*v*); The *Epocha* of them is certain, for in the firſt Book, *chap.* 15. he ſays, That he writ it in the 15th Year of the Emperor *Severus*, that was the 207th after Chriſt. In the firſt of theſe Books he promiſes his Book of *Præſcriptions* (*x*): So that although this be a very excellent Diſcourſe, and that it contains nothing but what is *Catholick*, yet it muſt be confeſſed that he compoſed it when he was a *Montaniſt*, unleſs we ſhould ſay, that he kept it by him for ſome time unpubliſhed: However it be, it was compoſed when he wrote his Book concerning the *Fleſh of Jeſus Chriſt*, wherein he refers to the Book of *Præſcriptions* in the ſecond Chapter.

The Book concerning the *Soul* was written after the Books againſt *Marcion*, which are cited in the ſecond Chapter; but before the Book concerning the *Reſurrection of the Fleſh*, where he quotes his Book concerning the *Soul*, and alſo that concerning the *Fleſh of Jeſus Chriſt*. So that this is the Order of the Books compoſed by *Tertullian* after thoſe againſt *Marcion*. The Book of *Præſcriptions*, of the *Soul*, of the *Fleſh of Jeſus Chriſt*, of the *Reſurrection of the Fleſh*; theſe were all compoſed from the year 207 to the year 210.

His *Scorpiacus* (*y*), his Book *De Corona* (*z*), and that *De Pallio* (*aa*), were written about the ſame time, but we do not know the year. In his Book *De Corona*, he ſays that he had compoſed a Treatiſe concerning the *Confeſſions, and Sufferings of the Martyrs*. *Baronius* believes, that it is the *Scorpiacus* which he means: But I believe it is rather that Book concerning *Flight in time of Perſecution*. For his *Scorpiacus* was written againſt Hereticks, whereas that which he intended, when he wrote the Book *De Corona*, ought to have been againſt the Paſtors, who withdrew themſelves in time of Perſecution.

The Book againſt the *Jews* was written towards the end of the Reign of *Severus*, in the year 209. as appears by what he ſays of the State of the *Roman* Empire in the ſeventh Chapter (*bb*). We do not certainly know the time when thoſe Books were written againſt *Praxeas*, againſt *Hermogenes*, and againſt the *Valentinians*, but only that they were written by *Tertullian* when he was a *Montaniſt* (*cc*). Neither can we give any account of the time of his writing the following Treatiſes in Defence of the *Montaniſts* againſt the Church; His Diſcourſe of *Chaſtity*, of *Feſts*, of *Monogamy*, his *Exhortation to Chaſtity*, of *Flight in time of Perſecution*, and that wherein he proves, *That Virgins ought to be veil'd*. S. *Jerom* adds to theſe, Six Books of *Extaſie*, and a Treatiſe againſt *Apollonius*, which are loſt.

I have now nothing to conſider, but the ſmall Treatiſe addreſſed to *Scapula*, which we certainly know when it was written, for it was after the Death of *Severus* under *Antoninus Caracalla*, about

(*v*) *His Books againſt* Marcion *are the firſt of this laſt ſort.*] It is evident that he was a *Montaniſt*, when he Compoſed the Books againſt *Marcion*; this appears by the 28th Chapter of his Firſt Book, by the 24th of the Third Book, by the 22d of the Fourth Book, and by the 15th of the Fifth Book. In the Fourth Book, *Ch.* 22. he calls the Catholicks *Pſychici*.

(*x*) *He promiſes his Book of Præſcriptions.*] Lib. 1. cap. 1. *Alius libellus hanc gradum ſuſtinebit adverſus Hæreticos, etiam ſine tractatu Doctrinarum revincendos, quod hoc ſit de Præſcriptione novitatis*; We may affirm, that it was written before, and that he only publiſh'd it then, that he might confirm ſome Arguments in his Books againſt *Marcion*. Which has given occaſion to ſome, to think that this Book was written by *Tertullian*, whilſt he yet was Orthodox, becauſe he ſpeaks ſo Advantageouſly for the Church againſt Novelties. But he makes uſe of the very ſame Principles in his Book againſt *Marcion*, and againſt *Praxeas*. The Catalogue of the Hereticks, where he puts the *Montaniſts* in the Number of Hereticks, is not *Tertullian*'s; ſo that reaſon which might contribute to make it believed, that he wrote his *Præſcriptions* whilſt he was a Catholick, is of no conſequence.

(*y*) *The Book entituled* Scorpiacus.] This Book of *Scorpiacus* was written after the Books againſt *Marcion*, as may be ſeen by the 5th Chapter.

(*z*) *The Book* de Coronâ.] It was written upon occaſion of a Donative granted by the Emperors *Antoninus Caracalla*, and *Severus*, to the Soldiers, about the Year, 209.

(*aa*) *The Book* De Pallio.] *Scaliger* pretends that this was his firſt Work; and *Salmaſius* on the contrary ſays, that it was written when he was made Prieſt. The firſt believes, that the *Cloak* was a Habit for all Chriſtians. And the ſecond maintains, that it was only a Habit for the Prieſts; but both of them are miſtaken, for the Chriſtians and Prieſts wore both long and ſhort Garments indifferently, according to the Cuſtoms of the Places where they were. The *Cloak* was a Habit for Philoſophers, and ſuch as made Profeſſion of a more auſtere Life than ordinary. What is ſaid in the ſecond Chapter of his Book *De Pallio*, that the triple Virtue of the Emperor had intirely routed the Barbarians, and procured Peace and Tranquility to the People, can no otherwiſe be underſtood, but of the latter end of the Reign of *Severus*, who enjoyed a moſt profound Peace after he had defeated all his Enemies, and taken in as Partners in the Governments, his two Sons *Caracalla* and *Geta*, and this is what *Tertullian* calls *Triplex Imperii Virtus*, as when he ſays, *Barbari excluſi*, he alludes to the Wall which *Severus* cauſed to be built in *Britain*, to put a ſtop to the Incurſions of the Barbarians.

(*bb*) *What is ſaid concerning the State of the* Roman Empire, *in the Seventh Chapter.*] He aſcribes in this place the flouriſhing Condition of the Empire, the *Germans* beaten back, the *Britains* hemmed in and ſecured, the *Moors* beſieged by the Roman Legions, &c. Which agrees to the time of the Emperor *Severus*, though this cannot be underſtood, but of the latter end of his Reign, when after he had Conquered all the *Barbarians*, he cauſed that Wall to be built, which we juſt now mentioned, and diſperſed the Roman Legions about the Frontiers of the Empire, as *Dion Caſſius* obſerves.

(*cc*) *We do not certainly know the time when theſe Books were written againſt* Praxeas, &c.] It is evident, that the Book againſt *Praxeas* was Compoſed after he was a Montaniſt, *ſupra*. In his Book againſt *Hermogenes*, he accuſes this Heretick of Pretending to be Married, &c. which is a Reproach exactly agreeable to the temper of the *Montaniſts*; And in the Book againſt the *Valentinians*, he commends *Proclus* or *Proculus*, a famous Montaniſt. This Book was written after his Book againſt *Hermogenes*, for he obſerves there, that he had already written againſt this Heretick.

the

the year 213 *(dd)*. And the two Books to the *Gentiles* were compoſed about the ſame time *(ee)*. And this is the Chronology of all the Works of *Tertullian*.

There are ſome others which are falſly attributed to him: And amongſt theſe we are to reckon the ſmall Catalogue of *Hereſies*, which is at the end of the Book of *Præſcriptions*. For firſt of all, it is of a different Style. Secondly, it was not to be found in the old Manuſcript of *Agobardus*, which is the moſt ancient Manuſcript of *Tertullian*'s Works, nor in another old Manuſcript, which *Rhenanus* made uſe of for the firſt Edition of *Tertullian*. Thirdly, in thoſe Manuſcripts where it is to be found, it is ſeparated from the *Præſcriptions*, and ſometimes in ſtead of being at the end, it is placed in the beginning, and ſo *Trithemius* both ſaw, and quoted it. Fourthly, the *Præſcriptions* have a Concluſion before this Catalogue, wherein *Tertullian* does not promiſe to make ſuch an Abridgment of the Hereſies, but to write againſt them all ſeparately. Fifthly, 'tis the Work of ſome Author that lived after S. *Epiphanius*, from whom he borrows the Hiſtory of *Marcion*, and perhaps he may have taken from S. *Jerom* what he ſays concerning the *Jews*.

There goes likewiſe under *Tertullian*'s name a Letter concerning *Jewiſh Meats*, but it is of a quite different Style, and the places of Scripture are there quoted after another manner than they are in *Tertullian*'s Works, which plainly ſhews that it is none of his: 'Tis a Letter of a Paſtor to his Church, written in the time of Perſecution. S. *Jerom* attributes to *Novatian* a Letter concerning *Jewiſh Meats*, which in all probability is this very Treatiſe that bears the ſame Title.

There is likewiſe attributed to *Tertullian*, a Book concerning the *Trinity*, which is none of his: For beſides the difference of the Style, that Author mentions the Hereſie of *Sabellius*, which was after *Tertullian*'s time. S. *Jerom* obſerves, that *Novatian* writ a Book of the *Trinity*, wherein he had made an Abridgment of *Tertullian*'s Book; and he adds, that ſeveral Perſons attributed *Novatian*'s Book to S. *Cyprian*. The Book of the *Trinity*, whereof we ſpeak, might poſſibly be this Abridgment of *Novatian*, eſpecially ſince *Ruffinus* obſerves, that *Novatian*'s Book was corrupted by the *Macedonians*, which agrees with this Treatiſe whereof we ſpeak, in which there are Errors concerning the Divinity of the Holy-Ghoſt.

There paſs alſo under *Tertullian*'s Name ſeveral Poems, which are no more his, than they are *Virgil*'s or *Homer*'s. The Poem called *Geneſis*, ſeems to be that which *Gennadius* attributes to *Salvian* Biſhop of *Marſeilles (ff)*, that concerning the *Judgment of God* was, perhaps, compoſed by *Verecundus (gg)* an *African* Biſhop, mentioned by *Iſidorus Hiſpalenſis*, in the ſeventh Chapter of his firſt Book of *Illuſtrious Men*. In the Poem againſt *Marcion (hh)*, there are ſome Opinions different from thoſe of *Tertullian*. There is likewiſe a Poem to a *Senator* in *Pamelius*'s Edition, one of *Sodom*, and one of *Jonas* and *Ninive* in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, of which we do not know the Authors; the firſt is ancient, and the other two ſeem to be written by the ſame Author. Beſides, S. *Jerom* affirms, that *Tertullian* writ ſeveral other Treatiſes, which were loſt in his time, and amongſt others, a Book *Of the Habits of Aaron*, whereof this Father ſpeaks in his Letter to *Fabiola*. He quotes likewiſe a Book *Of the Circumciſion*, another *Of thoſe Creatures that are Clean, and of ſuch as are Unclean*, a Book concerning *Extaſie*, and another againſt *Apollonius*; *Tertullian* himſelf cites ſeveral other Treatiſes of his own compoſing, as in his Book *Of the Soul*, a Diſcourſe concerning *Paradiſe*, and in his Book *Of the Teſtimony of the Soul*, chap. 2. a Diſcourſe *Of Deſtiny*; and in another place, a Book concerning *The Hope of the Faithful*, and another againſt *Apelles*. He had alſo compoſed a former Work againſt *Marcion*, which being loſt in his own time, he was obliged to write a new one. Laſtly, he wrote the Diſcourſes *Of Baptiſm*, *Of Publick Sights and Spectacles*, and that wherein he proves, *That Virgins ought to be veil'd*, in Greek.

But we have ſaid enough of *Tertullian*'s Works as to what relates to Criticiſm and Chronology, we will now look upon them with relation to what they contain. And conſidering them thus, we may

(*dd*) *About the Year* 213.] *Severus*, ſays he, the Father of *Antoninus*, had ſome regard for the Chriſtians.

(*ee*) *The two Books to the Nations compoſed about the ſame time.*] In the Firſt Book, *Chap.* 17. he alludes to the Titles of *Antoninus Caracalla*, who cauſed himſelf to be called *Parthicus* and *Germanicus*; and in the ſame place, *Chap.* 9. he ſays, That there was not yet elapſed 300 Years from the Death of Jeſus Chriſt to his own time, which ſhews, that the Third Age was then already advanced. Beſides, that theſe Books were written ſince his *Apology*, which is the Subject of this, and which he here enlarges, and poliſhes, and puts into order in theſe two Books, wherein we may find ſeveral Phraſes and Expreſſions taken from the Books which he wrote after he was a *Montaniſt*.

(*ff*) *Which* Gennadius *Biſhop of* Marſeilles *attributes to* Salvian.] In Catalog. cap. 67. *In morem Græcorum de principio Geneſis uſque ad conditionem hominis compoſuit verſu Hexametro.* This is true of that Poem aſcribed to *Tertullian*.

(*gg*) *Perhaps that which was compoſed by* Verecundus.] *Iſidore de Viris illuſtribus*, cap. 7. *Verecundus Africanus Epiſcopus ſtudiis librealium Literarum diſertus edidit carmine dactylo, duos modicos, breveſque libellos, quorum primum de Reſurrectione, & Judicio ſcripſit, alterum de Pœnitentia.* The Poem concerning *Judgment* is alſo concerning the *Reſurrection*. *Garcias* ſays, that he had ſeen the Poem concerning *Penance*, and he repeats the firſt Verſe of it, which is written after the ſame manner as the beginning of this Poem concerning *Judgment*; but yet there are ſome Paſſages, which ſeem to come from a later Author than *Verecundus*, who, as it is believed, lived in the Fifth Century.

(*hh*) *In the Poem againſt* Marcion.] *Tertullian*, in his Book *De Anima*, *cap.* 57. ſays, that it was not the Soul of *Samuel*, but only a Phantaſm, which the Witch raiſed up; and the Author of the Poem in his third Book ſuppoſes, that it was *Samuel* himſelf that was raiſed, to acquaint *Saul* what was to befall him. *Tertullian*, in his Book of *Præſcriptions*, makes S *Clemens* to ſucceed S. *Peter*; but this Author places him the Fourth, making two Popes of *Clerus* and *Anacletus*.

diſtin-

Tertullian. diſtinguiſh them into three Claſſes: The firſt, comprizing thoſe which were written againſt the *Gentiles*. The Second, thoſe which were made againſt *Hereticks*. And the Third, thoſe which relate to *Diſcipline* and *Manners*. The firſt Book of this firſt Claſſis is his *Apology againſt the Gentiles*, wherein he ſhews the Injuſtice of thoſe Perſecutions and Sufferings which they inflicted on the Chriſtians, and the Falſhood of thoſe Accuſations which were laid to their Charge; and at the ſame time proves the Excellency of their Religion, and the Folly of that of the Heathens. He begins, by ſhewing that there is nothing more unjuſt or oppoſite to the very intent and deſign of Laws, than to Condemn without Underſtanding, and to Puniſh without conſidering whether there be any juſt Ground for ſuch a Condemnation. And yet that this is put in practice every day againſt the Chriſtians, that they are Hated, Condemned, and Puniſhed meerly upon the account of their being Chriſtians, without ever conſidering or giving themſelves the trouble to be informed what it is to be a Chriſtian. That there are indeed ſome Laws made by the Emperors, which forbid Men to be Chriſtians, but that theſe Laws are Unjuſt, ſubject to Alteration, made by Evil Emperors, and contrary to the Opinions of the Juſteſt and Wiſeſt amongſt them. He afterwards confutes the Calumnies which were ſpread abroad againſt the Chriſtians, as that they uſed in their Night-Meetings to cut a Child's Throat, and to devour it; and that after they had put out the Candles, they had filthy and abominable Converſations among themſelves. He ſhews, that there is not only ſo much as the leaſt Proof of theſe Crimes alledged againſt them, but that their Life, their Manners, and the Principles of their Religion, were directly oppoſite to theſe Abominations. 'We are, *ſays he*, beſet daily, we are continually betrayed, 'we are very often ſurprized and oppreſſed, even in the very time of our Meetings; But did they 'ever find this Child dead, or a dying? Was there ever any one that could be a Witneſs of theſe 'Crimes? Has ever any one of thoſe who have betrayed us diſcovered theſe things? Beſides, he preſſes the Heathens further, by ſhewing that theſe Crimes were frequently committed amongſt themſelves, that they have ſlain Children in *Africa* in Honour of *Saturn*, and that they have ſacrificed Men in other places, that their Gods have been guilty of a thouſand ſhameful and abominable Practices; whereas the Chriſtians are ſo far from killing a Child, and drinking its Blood, that they do not ſo much as eat the Fleſh of thoſe Beaſts that have been ſtrangled, that they are ſuch inveterate Enemies to all kind of Inceſts, that there are ſeveral amongſt them who preſerve their Virginity all their Lives. After having thus confuted thoſe Calumnies which were ſet on foot, on purpoſe to render the Chriſtians odious; he gives an Anſwer to that Objection which was made to them, That they did not own the *Pagan* Deities, and that they did not offer up Sacrifices to them for the Proſperity of their Emperors; from whence they concluded, that they were guilty of Sacriledge and Treaſon. He anſwers in a word, that the Chriſtians did not pay any Honour to the Gods of the Heathens, becauſe they were not true Gods, and he appeals, for a Teſtimony of this, to the Conſciences of the wiſeſt of the Heathens themſelves. He evidently demonſtrates that their pretended Gods were Men, and for the moſt part Criminals, that were dead, and that their Images cannot be Adored without the greateſt Folly and Madneſs in the World, that even the Wiſeſt of the Heathens deſpiſed them. He occaſionally confutes what has been objected by ſome to the Chriſtians, that they worſhipped an Aſſes Head, and adored Croſſes. And from thence he takes occaſion to explain the Doctrin of the Chriſtians. 'We Adore, *ſays he*. One only God, the Creator of the World, who 'is Inviſible and Incomprehenſible, who will Recompence Good Men with Everlaſting Life, and 'Puniſh Wicked Men with Eternal Torments, after he has raiſed them from the Dead. He proves this Truth by the whole Creation, which ſo evidently demonſtrates that there is a God: 'That it is, '*ſays he*, the greateſt Wickedneſs that can poſſibly be conceived, not to acknowledge him, of whom 'tis impoſſible that we can be ignorant, even by the very Dictates which Nature inſpires into all 'Men, which oftentimes cauſe them to Invoke the True God, as when we ſay, *If God thinks good*, '*if God pleaſes*, *God ſees us*, and the like. *And this he calls*, The Teſtimony of a Soul that is natu-'rally Chriſtian: *Teſtimonium Animæ naturaliter Chriſtianæ*. Laſtly by the Antiquity of the Books of *Moſes*, which are more ancient than all the Writings of the *Greeks*, and by the Authority of the Prophets, who foretold thoſe things that were to come to paſs. Then after having proved the Unity of God, which the Jews acknowledge as well as the Chriſtians, he goes on to that Faith of Jeſus Chriſt, which is peculiar to the Chriſtians: He ſays that the Chriſtians do not look upon him as a mere Man, but as God, who is the WORD of God begotten of the ſame Subſtance, that he is thus God and the Son of God, and that his Father and He are One; that the WORD coming down into the Womb of a Virgin, (as was formerly foretold) took Fleſh upon him, and was born God-Man: He only deſires them to conſider it as a Fable like theirs till he has proved it by Invincible Arguments: Which he preſently does by the Authority of the Prophets, who have plainly foretold Jeſus Chriſt by the Miracles which he wrought by that extraordinary Eclipſe which happened at his Death, that is taken notice of in the very Records of the Heathens; and laſtly, by his Miraculous Reſurrection. 'And all theſe Things, *ſays he*, are Authorized by the Teſtimony of *Pi-'late*, who being already a Chriſtian in his Heart, wrote them to *Tiberius Cæſar*, and the *Cæſars* had 'then been Chriſtians, if it had been poſſible either that the World could ſubſiſt without Emperors, 'or that the Emperors could be Chriſtians. He adds to theſe Proofs, that of the Eſtabliſhment of the Church notwithſtanding Perſecutions; and that which may be drawn from the Confeſſion of the Heathen Gods, that is to ſay, the *Dæmons* who ſubmitted themſelves to *Jeſus Chriſt*, and were againſt their wills driven out of the Bodies of thoſe that were Poſſeſſed only by the name of *Jeſus Chriſt*. And here he makes a Digreſſion, to prove, that the *Romans* owed not their Greatneſs and Proſperity to their Gods; from whence he concludes, that the Chriſtians are not guilty of Treaſon,

ſince

since the Gods, whom they will not own, have not any Power to Succour and Preserve the Emperors. 'But, *says he*, we Invoke for their Prosperity the Eternal, the True, and the Living God, *Tertullian.* 'who gave them their Life and their Empire, who alone has power over them, and who alone is 'above them; and after whom they are the Chiefest. They are Great, only because they acknow-'ledge themselves Inferior to him, *Ideo magnus est, quia Cælo minor est.* 'Tis this God to whom the 'Christians pray with their whole Hearts, for all the Emperors, that he would grant them a long 'Life, a peaceable Reign, a faithful Council, valiant Soldiers, an obedient People, and in a word, all 'that a Man and an Emperor can possibly desire. He adds, that the Christians have greater Obligations upon them for the Performance of this, than other Men. First, because the Holy Scripture enjoyns them to it; and Secondly, because being perswaded that the World should end together with the *Roman* Empire, they desired to retard those Calamities which were to happen at the end of all Things, by praying for the Preservation of the Empire. That it is true, that the Christians do not swear by the *Genii* of the *Cæsars*, nor by their *Health*, which is more precious than those *Genii* who are only *Dæmons*, and that they do not Solemnize the Festivals of the Emperors, but that this is only for fear of falling into Idolatry. That in other things they are more Obedient, and better Subjects than other Men, though they have the Power in their hands, if they had a mind to defend themselves. 'We have been, *says he*, but a little time in the World, yet we are to be met with in all 'places; you may find us in the Cities, in the Villages, in the Armies, in the Courts of Justice, in 'the Senate, and in the Markets. We have left you your Temples alone to your selves. What Wars 'might not we be capable of Undertaking? And with what Resolution might not we carry them on, 'though we had not near so many Troops as you; we, who die daily with so much Joy, were it 'not a Law amongst us to suffer our selves, rather to be killed, than to kill others. *Si non apud istam 'Disciplinam magis liceret occidi quam occidere.* But how could the Heathens object, That the difference of Religion could cause any disturbance in the Commonwealth, or make Parties and Factions? He says, that the Christians have no Ambition, nor Pretentions in this World, as they are Christians; are so far from forming any Parties against the Government, that they think upon nothing less than State-Affairs. And that he might perswade the whole World of this Truth, see the Description which he makes of the Christians of his time, and of their Assemblies. 'We make up, *says he*, a 'Body that is united by the Bond of the same Religion, the same Discipline, and the same Hope. 'We assemble our selves, and compose, if I may so say, a Body of an Army, to force Heaven by 'our Prayers, and this Violence is very acceptable to God. We pray not only for our selves, but 'also for the Emperors; for their Ministers, for the Magistrates, for the good of the State; for 'the Peace and Quietness of the Empire; and lastly, for the retarding the end of the World. Be-'sides, we assemble our selves to Read the Holy Scriptures according to our different Wants and 'Necessities, for our Instruction, and Information in our Duty. These Sacred Oracles are of signal 'Use for the preserving our Faith, the confirming our Hope, and the regulating our Manners, by 'the Meditation upon its Precepts. And 'tis in these Assemblies that the necessary Exhortations 'and Reproofs are to be expected. The Judgments which are there delivered, are given with all 'the Equity and Circumspection imaginable; because those who pass Judgment are verily perswaded, 'that Almighty God takes notice of them. Their Censures are all Divine, and 'tis a great Presumption of God's future Judgment against any One, when he has committed any Sin, for which he 'deserves to be separated from the Communion of Bread, and from Prayer, and the Assembly of 'the Faithful; and in a word, to be deprived of all manner of Communion of holy Things. 'Those who preside among us, are the most Ancient, and such whose Probity is very well known; 'and this Honour is not to be purchased for Money, but it is bestowed upon pure Virtue; for all 'those Concerns which relate to God, are not to be valued at a Price. If we have any kind of 'Treasure, it is not to be look'd upon as a Blessing that is any ways dishonourable to our Reli-'gion, as if it was to be purchased upon any account. Every one contributes according to his 'Ability what Alms he pleases, and when he pleases, which yet is commonly done Monthly. None 'are compelled; every one gives freely what he will. These Contributions are the Contributions 'of Piety, for we do not employ them in making merry Meetings, or in other unnecessary Expen-'ces: But to maintain and bury Orphans, and poor People, to relieve old Men and infirm Persons, 'to assist the Faithful who were exiled into the Islands, or condemned to work in the Mines, or con-'fined in Prison, for having embraced the Faith of Jesus Christ. We all call our selves Brethren, 'not only because we are all Brethren by the Right of Nature, but because we all acknowledge 'One and the same God for our Father, because we have all one and the same Spirit which sancti-'fies us: And lastly, because all things are common among us, but our Women. Our Feasts are 'called *Agapæ*, that is to say, Entertainments of Love and Charity. They were not Instituted for 'debauched Parasites, but for the Entertainment of the Poor, being assured that God has a more 'especial Regard for them. And if the Reason of the Institution of these Feasts is wholly Sacred, 'the Consequences of them are equally so. There is nothing here to be seen, that is any ways con-'trary to Civility and Modesty. They do not sit down at Table, till they have refreshed and nou-'rished the Soul by Prayer; they eat no more than what is necessary to suffice Nature, and they 'drink no more than what is fitting and convenient for chaste and regular Persons; they take care 'not to glut themselves, so as to hinder their rising in the night to worship God. They discourse of 'such things as are profitable, because they look upon themselves, as in the Presence of God, who is 'a Witness of every thing that we say. The Supper is concluded with Prayer, and they do not break 'up in a Tumult or Disorder; but they retire regularly and with great modesty, as it is not hard for

'such

Tertullian.

'ſuch Perſons to do, who take greater care to nouriſh their Souls, with that holy Diſcipline, in which 'they are inſtructed, than their Bodies with the Victuals which they eat. After having thus deſcribed the Aſſemblies of the Chriſtians, he ſhews, that thoſe Calamities and Misfortunes which happen in the World, are unjuſtly attributed to them, as if they were the cauſe of them. He maintains, that 'tis theſe are the Men who divert and prevent them, and that they are very far from being any ways the occaſion of attracting them. He concludes, by proving that we admire thoſe Virtues in the Philoſophers, which are diſcernible in a much more excellent and higher Degree in the *Chriſtians*.

The *Two Books to the Nations* are almoſt of the very ſame Subject with the Apology. And *Tertullian* repeats therein the greateſt part of the things which he had ſaid before in his Apology, but he puts them in another Order, explaining and enlarging upon them: So that the difference between theſe two Books is this, that the firſt is written with Heat, and without much Study; and the ſecond is a Methodical Treatiſe, and compoſed with great Conſideration. The *Second Book to the Nations* was written againſt the falſe Gods of the Heathens, wherein he gave an exact Account of the Deities of the ſeveral prophane Religions, and ſhewed how exceedingly fooliſh a thing it is to own them; but this Book is ſo imperfect, and there is ſo little Coherence in all that we have extant of it, that it cannot be of any great advantage to us.

In the Book of *The Teſtimony of the Soul*, he enlarges upon one Proof for Religion, which he had advanced before in his Apology, that the Soul does naturally, and even againſt its will, acknowledge, that there is but one God, and that there is another Life after this. He proves it by thoſe Notions which Nature hath inſpired into us, and which are ſo deeply engraven in our Minds, that nothing is able to efface them: So that they often come from a Man, when he thinks of them the leaſt. As when one ſays without any reflection, *God grant it*, *what pleaſes God*, *God help me*, *good God*, &c. Expreſſions that manifeſtly ſuppoſe, that the Soul is penetrated with the knowledge of a God, as the Fear which we naturally have of Death, the deſire of leaving behind us a Name to Poſterity, and that Compaſſion which we have for the Dead do evidently ſuppoſe, that there is another Life after this. Now theſe Notions being natural to the Soul, and to be found in every Body, it muſt neceſſarily follow, that they come from God. And this is the Subject which *Tertullian* enlarges upon very ingeniouſly in this Little Treatiſe.

The Book to *Scapula*, was compoſed to diſſwade the Governour of *Africa* from the Perſecution which he had raiſed againſt the Chriſtians. He begins, by repreſenting to him, that the Chriſtians rather wiſhed for Martyrdom, than feared it; and that therefore it was not out of any Apprehenſion he had of them, that induced him to direct this Diſcourſe to him, but the earneſt Deſire which he had for the Salvation of the Heathens, becauſe the Religion of the Chriſtians obliges them to love their Enemies, and to endeavour to convert them from the Error wherein they are at preſent. He afterwards tells him, that the Chriſtians adore that God whom Mankind knows by Nature; he repreſents to him, that it ought to be left to the free Direction of Men to embrace that Religion, which ſeems to them to be moſt agreeable to Truth: That another Man's Religion does neither hurt nor good to any body: That it is not an Act of Religion to conſtrain Men to embrace a Religion, which they ought to chuſe voluntarily. *Non eſt Religionis cogere Religionem, quæ ſponte ſuſcipi debet, non vi.* He adds, that the Life of Chriſtians is unblameable; that they pay an entire Obedience to the Emperors; that they were never found engaged in a Party with the Rebels. 'They are, *ſays he*, Enemies to no Man, and 'leaſt of all to the Emperor, very well knowing that it is their God who has eſtabliſhed him, they 'love, honour, and reſpect him, moſt heartily wiſhing his Preſervation, and that of the Empire, as 'long as the World ſhall continue; We therefore honour the Emperor after that manner, which is 'lawful for us, and which only can be of advantage to him; that is to ſay, as a Man who is next 'under God, and who has received from God every thing that he has. We likewiſe offer Sacrifices 'for his ſafety, but they are Sacrifices of Prayer: For God does not ſtand in need of Incenſe, 'nor of the Blood of Victims. After having thus vindicated the Chriſtians from the Crime of High-Treaſon, he diſſuades *Scapula* from the Perſecution againſt Chriſtians, by the Examples of thoſe who have been puniſhed for perſecuting of them, and likewiſe by the Examples of thoſe who have had ſo much moderation, as to permit them to enjoy their Liberty and Tranquility. And theſe are the Books written by *Tertullian*, in defence of the Chriſtian Religion againſt the Gentiles.

This muſt be owned to have been a great piece of Ingenuity in a Doctor of Sorbon, *when the Perſecution of the* Hugonots *was at the height in* France.

There is but one Book of his againſt the *Jews*, wherein, Firſt, he proves, that the Law of *Moſes*, and its Ceremonies, were eſtabliſhed but for a time, and that they were to ceaſe at the coming of *Jeſus Chriſt*. And Secondly, that the Meſſiah expected by the Jews, and foretold by the Prophets is already come, and that this is *Jeſus Chriſt*. Which he evidently makes out from the Prophets, who foretold the time of his Coming, and the circumſtances of his Life and Death. He obſerves, that the Original of the Jews miſtake aroſe from their confounding his laſt Coming, wherein he will appear in great Power and Glory, with his firſt Coming, wherein he was ſeen in great Humility, and took upon him the mean Condition of other Men.

Although the Book of *Præſcriptions* againſt the Hereticks is not, in the order of Time, the firſt that *Tertullian* has written againſt them, yet it is ſo, as to the Order of the Matters which it contains; becauſe it is deſigned againſt all Hereſies in general, whereas the others are only againſt ſome particular Hereſie. This Book is entituled, *Of Præſcriptions*, or rather, *Of Præſcription againſt the Hereticks*; becauſe herein he ſhews, that their Doctrin is not to be admitted by reaſon of its Novelty. Before he enters upon the Matter, he endeavours to obviate the Scandal of thoſe, who admire,

admire, how there could be any Hereſies in the World, how they could have been ſo great and ſo powerful; and how it comes to paſs that ſo many conſiderable Perſons in the Church, have been ſeduced to embrace them, by ſhewing that Hereſies have been foretold, that they are neceſſary Evils for the Tryal of our Faith, and that we muſt not judge of Faith by Perſons, but of Perſons by their Faith; *Ex perſonis probamus fidem, an ex fide perſonas?* After having given this neceſſary Caution, he lays down the firſt Principle of Preſcription. "We are not allowed, ſays he, to introduce any thing "that is new in Religion, nor to chuſe by our ſelves, what another has invented. We have the Apo- "ſtles of our Lord for Founders, who were not themſelves the Inventors, and Authors of what they "have left us; but they have faithfully taught the World the Doctrine which they received from "Jeſus Chriſt. Hereſies have riſen from Philoſophy and humane Wiſdom which is quite different "from the Spirit of Chriſtianity, We are not allowed to entertain our Curioſity, nor to enquire af- "ter any thing that is beyond what we have been taught by Jeſus Chriſt and his Goſpel, *Nobis curioſi-* "*tate opus non eſt poſt Chriſtum Jeſum, nec inquiſitione poſt Evangelium.* And when we have once be- "lieved, we are to give credit to nothing any farther than as we have already believed. And here it is, that he Anſwers the Objection of the Hereticks, who urged this Paſſage of Scripture, *Seek, and you ſhall find*; by telling us, that it is not permitted to ſeek when we have once found; that it would be a Labour to no purpoſe, to ſeek for Truth among all the Hereſies; and laſtly, that if it be permitted to ſeek, it is after having admitted the Rule, that is to ſay, the principal Articles of Faith, which are contained in the Creed. But as the Hereticks did often alledge the Holy Scripture, in Defence of themſelves; he proves that the Church was not obliged to enter into a Diſcuſſion of thoſe Paſſages which they quoted; that this way of confuting them is very tedious and difficult, becauſe they do not acknowledge all the Books of the Scriptures, or elſe they corrupt them, or put a falſe Interpretation upon them; which renders the Victory that is to be obtained over them uncertain and difficult. He ſays then, that it is to better purpoſe to underſtand perfectly, who it is, that is in Poſſeſſion of the Faith of Jeſus Chriſt; who thoſe Perſons are, to whom the Scriptures were committed in Truſt; and who are the firſt Authors who have given an Account of our Religion. He goes back even to Jeſus Chriſt, who is the Source and Original of this Religion, and to the Apoſtles who received it from him. He ſhews that it is impoſſible, that the Apoſtles ſhould preach any other Doctrin, than that of Jeſus Chriſt, and that all the Apoſtolical Churches ſhould embrace any other Faith, than that which the Apoſtles had delivered to them; from whence he concludes, that it muſt of neceſſity follow, that that Doctrin, which is Conformable to that, which is found to be the Faith of all the Churches, muſt be that which was taught by Jeſus Chriſt: And that on the contrary, that that which is oppoſite thereto, muſt be a Novel Doctrin. He farther confounds the Hereticks by the Novelty of their Opinions. It is evident, ſays he, that the moſt ancient Doctrin is that of Jeſus Chriſt, and by conſequence that alone is true, and that, that on the contrary, which had not any Date till after his Aſcenſion, muſt be falſe and ſuppoſititious. Having laid down this infallible Rule, he proves the Doctrin of the Hereticks to be of a later Date than that of the Church, becauſe the Authors of the Hereſies were after the Eſtabliſhment of the Church, from which they have ſeparated themſelves. That the ſeveral Sects of the Hereticks cannot reckon their Original from the time of the Apoſtles, nor ſhew a Succeſſion of Biſhops, from their Times, as the Apoſtolical Churches can, with whom they do communicate. That though they could pretend to ſuch a Succeſſion, yet the Novelty of their Doctrin condemned by the Apoſtles, and the Apoſtolical Churches would convince them of being Cheats and Impoſtors, and that what they have added, taken away, or changed in the Books of the Holy Scripture, does farther diſcover, that they invented their Doctrin after theſe Books were compoſed. That laſtly, their Diſcipline and Conduct, which is abſolutely Humane, and Earthly, without Order, and without Rule, renders them every way contemptible. I have exactly ſet down the Reaſonings of *Tertullian* in this Work; becauſe, as himſelf obſerves, they are not only proper to confute the Hereſies that were in his Time, but alſo to diſprove all thoſe that ſprang up afterwards, or that ſhould ariſe hereafter, even to the end of the Church. *Tertullian.*

I ſhall not enlarge ſo much upon the Works which were written againſt thoſe Hereſies which are now extinct. The moſt conſiderable, is, that which he compoſed againſt *Marcion*, which is divided into *Five Books*. This Heretick maintained that there were two Principles, or two Gods; the one Good, and the other Evil; The one Perfect, and the other Imperfect; that this laſt is the God whom the Jews worſhip, who created the World, and delivered the Law to *Moſes*; whereas the firſt is the Father of Jeſus Chriſt, whom he ſent to deſtroy the Works of the Evil One; that is to ſay, the Law and the Prophets, which *Marcion* rejected. He affirmed likewiſe, that Jeſus Chriſt was not Cloathed with true Fleſh: And by conſequence, that he did not ſuffer really, but only in appearance. Theſe are the Errors which *Tertullian* confutes in this Work. In the Firſt Book, he ſhews that the unknown God of *Marcion*, is only a Fantaſtical and Imaginary Being. In the Second he proves, that that God, the Creator of the World, whom the Jews worſhipped, is the Only true God, and the Author of all Good. After having demonſtrated this Truth by invincible Arguments, he reſolves thoſe Difficulties which are raiſed by the *Marcionites* againſt God's Conduct in the Old Teſtament. He explains for Example, Why he has permitted Sin? Why he ſuffers Sinners? Why he puniſhes Men ſo ſeverely? Why he ſeems ſometimes to alter his Conduct and Deſign, *&c.* In the Third Book he ſhews, that Jeſus Chriſt is the Son of God, who is the Creator of the World, and the Author of the Law, that he has been foretold by the Prophets, and that he took upon him true Fleſh, by taking upon him our Nature. In the Fourth Book he ſhews, that it is the ſame God, both in the Old and in the New Teſtament. He reconciles the pretended Contradictions alledged by *Marcion*, and ſhews

Tertullian. that the whole Life of Jeſus Chriſt was foretold, and figured in the Old Teſtament. That Jeſus Chriſt has explained and confirmed the Prophets, and perfected the Precepts of the Law. In a word, he proves at the end of this Book, that Jeſus Chriſt is the Son of God, the Creator of the World, by the Doctrin of the Prophets, by his own Doctrin, by his Inclinations, by his Vertues, by his Opinions; and laſtly, by his Reſurrection. In the Laſt Book, he ſhews from the Epiſtles of S. *Paul*, that it is the ſame God, that is preached both in the Old and in the New Teſtament, and that Jeſus Chriſt is the Son of the Creator of the World. There are in this Book two difficult Paſſages concerning the Euchariſt, which have given Subject to very great Diſputes; of which I ſhall not ſpeak in this Place, contenting my ſelf to refer the Reader to thoſe, who have diſcourſed of them at large, that ſo I may paſs on to the other Works of *Tertullian*.

After having maintained the Unity of God againſt *Marcion*, he defends the Trinity of Perſons againſt *Praxeas*. This Heretick came from *Aſia*, to diffuſe the Poiſon of his Error in *Rome*, he was naturally of a very unquiet and uneaſie Temper, and beſides was vainly puſt up with the falſe Opinion of being a Martyr, which Quality he took upon him, becauſe he was for a ſhort time impriſoned for the Faith. Being come to *Rome*, under the Pontificate of *Victor*, he prevented this Pope from acknowledging the New Prophecies of *Montanus*; beſides he made him, if we believe *Tertullian*, revoke the Communicatory Letters which he had granted to the Montaniſts. He begun to divulge his Hereſie in the City of *Rome*, and afterwards went into *Africa*, where he made ſome Proſelytes; but he was convinced by a Catholick (which without doubt muſt be *Tertullian*) and obliged to put down in Writing a Recantation of his Error. So after he had concealed his Doctrin for ſome time, he publiſhed it anew, and *Tertullian*, who had confuted him before, whilſt he was yet a Catholick, wrote againſt him, after he fell into the Error of the Montaniſts. He eſtabliſhes in this Book, the Diſtinction of the WORD, and the Trinity of Perſons againſt the Hereſie of *Praxeas*, who acknowledged but One Perſon in God, making no Diſtinction between the Father and the Son, and by conſequence maintained, that the Father made himſelf Man, and ſuffered for Us. *Tertullian* oppoſes to him the Rule of Faith, which obliges us to acknowledge only One God in Three Perſons, which are all Three of the ſame Subſtance, and have all one and the ſame Power; and that it was the Perſon of the Son, who was incarnate, and died for Us. He ſhews that this Trinity of Perſons, does no ways prejudice the Unity of the Godhead, as the Unity of the Godhead does no ways hinder the Trinity of Perſons. That the Son is of the Subſtance of the Father, and that the Holy Ghoſt proceeds from the Father by the Son. That the WORD which was from all Eternity in God, and who did, as it were, come out of him to create and govern the World, as a Perſon ſubſiſting, who nevertheleſs has not a different Subſtance from that of the Father, ſo that it does not follow from hence, that we believe Two Gods, and Two Lords; that it is the Son, and not the Father, who made himſelf Man, without ceaſing to be God, and that the Properties of humane Nature, are only to be found in Jeſus Chriſt. In a Word, he explains very handſomly in this Treatiſe, the Faith of the Church, concerning the Myſteries of the Trinity and the Incarnation. It muſt be owned, that in ſome Places he expreſſes himſelf after a manner, not very agreeable to that which has been uſed in the following Ages (*i*). But we muſt pardon theſe kind of Expreſſions in the Ancients, who wrote before thoſe Terms, which they made uſe of, were fixt and limited to a certain Senſe.

But it is a difficult matter to excuſe him, where he ſeems to aſſert, as well in this Book, as in other Places of his Works, that God had a Body, or rather that he was Corporeal. Yet there are ſome Authors that vindicate him from this Error, and this has occaſioned a Queſtion, which is ſo common, and if I may ſay it, ſo trivial, that I do not think it neceſſary to ſay any thing of it in this Place.

Hermogenes was another *African* Heretick, who maintained that Matter was Eternal, and that God did not create it when he made the World, but that he only made uſe thereof, to form Things as we ſee. He ſuckt this Error from the Philoſophy of the Stoicks, and defended it by Syllogiſms, connected according to their Methods of Reaſoning, which made *Tertullian* ſay in the Treatiſe which

(*i*) *He expreſſes himſelf after ſuch a manner as is not very agreeable to that which has been made uſe of in the following Ages.*] He ſays firſt, that the WORD was begotten of the Father, when God created the World; but he acknowledges at the ſame time, that he was in God, and a Perſon diſtinct from the Father from all Eternity. And ſo the whole Ambiguity lies in the Term *Generation*, which he does not underſtand of the Eternal Proceſſion of the Son, but of a certain Prolation or Emiſſion without, which he ſuppoſes was done at the Inſtant of the Creation of the World, becauſe it is by the WORD that God Created it, and doth ſtill govern it. And this appears evidently in *Tertullian*'s Book, and we ought not to wonder, if in his Book againſt *Hermogenes*, he ſays, that there was a certain time, when the Father was not the Father, and when he began to be the Son, becauſe he believed that he had not the Quality and Name of Son, 'till this World was Created, though he was in God before, and diſtinguiſhed from the Father from all Eternity. Secondly, he ſays, that the Father is inviſible, and the Son viſible; but in that Senſe which we have explained, that is to ſay, that the Son, who has always rendred himſelf viſible to Men, by taking ſeveral Forms, under which he has appeared to them; and Laſtly, by making himſelf Man. Thirdly, He ſeems in ſome Places to inſinuate, that even the WORD, as it is the WORD, is inferior to the Father; but this muſt be underſtood of an Inferiority, which the Divines call *of Original*, that is to ſay, (as he explains it himſelf) becauſe he has received all from the Father; for he ſays expreſly in ſeveral places, that the Father and the Son are of one and the ſame Subſtance. Fourthly, He ſometimes makes uſe of the Word *Subſtance*, to ſignifie the *Perſon Subſiſting*, which is an uſual thing among the Ancients before the Council of *Nice*, and even among ſome of them after it.

he

he composed against him, that the Philosophers were the Patriarchs of the Hereticks. He there discovers the Fallacies of the Sophisms of this Heretick, and shews that our Religion teaches us, that God created even that Matter, whereof he made the World. *Tertullian.*

The Book against the *Valentinians*, is rather a Satyr and Raillery, than a serious Confutation of the Extravagant Sentiments of these Hereticks. *Valentinus*, the first Author of this Sect, separated from the Church out of spight, because hoping to be Elected a Bishop, by reason of his Wit and Eloquence, he was put by to prefer another Person, who had suffered for the Faith of Jesus Christ in times of Persecution. After he had separated from the Church, he invented, or rather revived an old Opinion, according to the Principles of which, he feigned a Succession, and imaginary Generation of a kind of Deities. His Disciples refined upon his Notion, and formed quite different Systems. But as all these Fancies were impertinent and ridiculous, so they took great Care to conceal them, lest if they should discover them, all the World should be presently sensible of their Extravagancy: 'Tis this which *Tertullian* upbraids them with. If you teach the Truth, *says he to them*, why don't you discover " it? It persuades by teaching, and it teaches by persuading; it is not ashamed or shewing it self; on " the contrary, 'tis ashamed of nothing, but of being concealed. You reproach us for our Simplicity; " it is true, we love it, because it is by this means, that we know, and make known the Will of " God. But 'tis no wonder that the Hereticks should blame this Simplicity, and should so carefully conceal their Principles; for they were so extravagant, that the bare Discovering of them would be sufficient to render them ridiculous: 'Tis this which *Tertullian* does in this Work. " I undertake, " *says he in this Book*, to discover to the Eyes of all Men, the hidden Mystery; but though I profess " to relate the Opinions of these Hereticks, without making a particular Confutation, yet I hope I " shall be pardoned, if I cannot forbear censuring them in some Places. What I do is nothing but a " Sport before a real Combat; I shall rather shew them where I could strike them, than lay them on. " But if there are found some Passages that may excite Laughter, 'tis because the very Subject causes " it. There are many things which deserve to be jeered and ridiculed at this rate, lest if we should " confute them seriously, we should seem to lay too great Stress upon them. Nothing is more due to " Vanity than Laughter; and to Laugh, does properly belong to the Truth, because it is pleasant, " and to Sport with its Enemies, because it is certain of the Victory.

And these are all the Books which are particularly against the Hereticks; there are others, in which *Tertullian* likewise confutes some Errors, and defends some Catholick Truths, though they were not written against any Hereticks in particular. Such are the following Books.

The Book of the *Flesh of Jesus Christ*, wherein he proves against the Hereticks *Marcion*, *Apelles* and *Valentinus*, that Jesus Christ took upon him true *Flesh*, like to ours, in the Womb of the Virgin.

The Title alone of the Book of the *Resurrection of the Flesh*, is enough to discover, that it was written against the *Sadducees*, and against the Hereticks who denied the Resurrection.

The *Scorpiacus*, so called, because it is a Remedy against the Poison of Hereticks, like Scorpions; defends the Necessity and Excellency of Martyrdom against the *Gnosticks*.

The Book *of the Soul*, written against the Opinions of the Philosophers, and the Hereticks, treats at large of the Nature of the Soul, and its Qualities. But it is full of false Principles and Errors. He pretends that the Soul is Corporeal, and that it takes a certain Form of Body, though it be invisible; He confutes the Opinion of *Plato*, concerning Reminiscency, or the Faculty of Remembring, and *Pythagoras*'s Transmigration; he affirms, that the Soul does not come from Heaven, but that it is formed with the Body, and that as the Body of the Parents produces a Body, so their Soul produces a Soul. That all Souls, and even those of the Martyrs, which some have excepted, are disposed of after Death, in a certain Subterraneous Place, where they receive Refreshment and Torment, according to the Good or Evil which they have done: And that they expect the Resurrection, and the Day of Judgment, which will render them entirely Happy, or entirely Miserable to all Eternity. There are likewise in this Treatise, some other particular Opinions; as for Instance, that the Soul and Breath are the same thing; that that which is unreasonable in the Soul, comes from the Devil; that every Soul has its *Dæmon*; that all Dreams are not vain.

The Book *of Baptism* is divided into two Parts; the First relating to *Doctrin*, and the Second to *Discipline*. In the First he defends the Necessity and Efficacy of the Sacrament of Baptism against the Hereticks called *Caiannites*; he proves that the Waters of Baptism do procure to us Forgiveness of our Sins, and of the Punishment which they deserve. " What can there be, *says he*, more miracu- " lous, than to see that by washing the Body by an external Baptism, we efface at the same time, the " Mortal Stain of the Soul, and when that Stain is once taken away, the Punishment is likewise re- " mitted to us? He afterwards discourses of the Imposition of Hands, and of the Unction which followed after Baptism, to make the Holy Ghost descend upon the Faithful, and to draw down upon them the Blessings of Heaven. " We do not receive, *says he*, the Fulness of the Holy Ghost by Wa- " ter; but it prepares us for receiving it by washing us from our Sins. And as S. *John* prepared the " Way of the Lord, so the Angel which is present in Baptism, prepares the Way for the Holy Ghost, " by the Absolution of our Sins, which we obtain by Faith, which is confirmed and sealed by the " Invocation of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. When we come out of the Font we are anointed; " and this Unction, which is performed on our Flesh, is profitable to our Soul, as external Baptism has " a spiritual Effect, which is to deliver us from our Sins. Afterwards, there is the Laying on of " Hands, to draw upon us the Holy Ghost, and this most Holy Spirit descends voluntarily from " Heaven, into purified and blessed Bodies. In the Second Part, he discourses of several Questions

Tertullian. concerning Baptiſm, which relate to Diſcipline. The firſt is concerning the Baptiſm of S. *John*, whether it were from Heaven, or from Earth? He ſays, that it was from Heaven, becauſe it was ordained by Heaven: However, That it did not beſtow any thing that was Heavenly, but that it made way for Heavenly Things, by bringing us to Repentance; and that it neither conferred the Holy Ghoſt, nor Remiſſion of Sins. The Second, is concerning the Neceſſity of Baptiſm, upon which he ſtarts a conſiderable Objection, taken from what there might ſeem that the Apoſtles, of whoſe Salvation no doubt can be made, were never Baptized. To this he Anſwers, That poſſibly they might have been Baptized, though we find no mention of it; and in the Second place, that that Familiarity which they had with Jeſus Chriſt, the Greatneſs of their Faith, and the Ardency of their Charity, might ſupply in them the Defect of Baptiſm, ſince Jeſus Chriſt has promiſed the Remiſſion of Sins, and Salvation to thoſe Perſons who had Faith, though they were not Baptized. That nevertheleſs, there is no doubt to be made, but that at preſent, Baptiſm is neceſſary to Salvation; and that though formerly a Man might be ſaved only by Faith in one God, yet that now we muſt believe in Jeſus Chriſt, and that it was neceſſary, that this Faith ſhould be ſealed by Baptiſm, that Jeſus Chriſt had made a Law for it, and preſcribed the Manner, ſaying, *Go and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt.* And that this Sentence of the Goſpel: *If a Man be not born again of Water, and the Holy Ghoſt, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of Heaven*, does invincibly eſtabliſh the Neceſſity of Baptiſm.

The Third Queſtion is, Whether one may Baptize more than once? He ſays expreſly, that there is but one Baptiſm, that it never ought to be reiterated. He excepts however the Baptiſm of Hereticks; *Who*, ſays he, *are not able to give it, becauſe they have it not. And therefore it is that we have a Rule among us to Re-baptize them.* He adds, that Martyrdom is a kind of Second Baptiſm, which is inſtead of the Baptiſm of Water, when any Perſon has not received it, and which repairs it, when that Grace is loſt, which it conferred.

This is alſo ingenuouſly taken notice of, becauſe the Church of Rome *allows Women to Baptize in Caſe of Neceſſity.*

The Fourth Queſtion is, concerning the Miniſter of Baptiſm: He ſays, the Biſhop has Power of Adminiſtring it, and after him the Prieſts and Deacons; nevertheleſs, with his Permiſſion, to ſet a higher Value on the Prieſthood. That in Caſe of Neceſſity, any Man may adminiſter it, and that we ſhould be Guilty of the Loſs of a Soul, if we did not afford it that Grace, whereby it may be ſaved; there are none but Women, to whom he ſeems abſolutely to prohibit the Adminiſtring of Baptiſm, in any Circumſtance whatſoever.

The Fifth Reflection, is concerning the Condition of thoſe who are to receive Baptiſm. He ſays, that it is not to be Adminiſtred raſhly, and that it is good ſometimes to put ſome Stop to it, that thoſe who receive it may be the better diſpoſed. He would chiefly have this Diſcipline obſerved in reſpect to Infants, and though he ſuppoſes that they are capable of receiving Baptiſm, yet he will not allow them to be Baptized without Neceſſity. " What Neceſſity is there, *ſays he*, to expoſe God-fathers to the " Hazard of Anſwering for thoſe whom they hold at the Fonts; ſince they may be prevented by " Death, from being able to perform thoſe Promiſes which they have made for the Children, or elſe " may be diſappointed by their evil Inclinations? Jeſus Chriſt ſays, indeed, *Hinder not little Children from " coming to me*; but that they ſhould come to him as ſoon as they are advanced in Years, as ſoon as they " have learnt their Religion, when they may be taught whither they are going, when they are be- " come Chriſtians, when they begin to be able to know Jeſus Chriſt. What is there that ſhould com- " pel this innocent Age to receive Baptiſm? And ſince they are not yet allowed the Diſpoſal of Tem- " poral Goods, is it reaſonable that they ſhould be entruſted with the Concerns of Heaven? For the " ſame Reaſon, *he farther ſays*, it is proper to make thoſe, who are not Married, wait for ſome time, " by reaſon of the Temptations which they have to undergo till they are Married, or have attained " to the Gift of Continency. Laſtly, *he ſays*, Thoſe who ſhall duly conſider the great weight and " Moment of this Divine Sacrament, will rather be afraid of making too much haſte to receive " it, than to defer it for ſome time, that ſo they may be the better capable of receiving it more " worthily.

The Sixth, Is concerning the proper time for Adminiſtring of Baptiſm. He ſays, That it may be done at any time; but that the ſolemn Days for performing it, are the Times of *Eaſter* and *Penticoſt*.

Laſtly, he ſays, That thoſe who are deſirous to dip themſelves Holily in this Water, muſt prepare themſelves for it by Faſtings, by Watchings, by Prayers, and by ſincere Repentance.

And this is what the Second Part contains, wherein there are but two Errors, the Firſt whereof concerning the Baptiſm of Hereticks, is common to him, with ſeveral others; and the Second, which relates to the Baptiſm of Infants, is particular to him alone, and we ſhall not find any of the Ancients ſpeaking after the ſame manner.

The Book *of Penance* is the Firſt of thoſe which relate meerly to the Diſcipline of the Church, therein he diſtinguiſhes two ſorts of Penance; the firſt is that which is performed before Baptiſm; and the ſecond is that of thoſe, who being ſo unhappy, as to fall into Enormous Sins after Baptiſm; do recover themſelves by a laborious Penance. In the Firſt Part, he ſhews the Neceſſity there is of proving and preparing Ones ſelf, for a long time, for the Reception of this Grace of Baptiſm, by a true Repentance. He fears not to ſay, That Baptiſm is to no purpoſe, if we have not repented of our Sins, and amended them, and that it is great Preſumption to imagine, that having led a diſorderly Courſe of Life till the very Day of Baptiſm, we ſhould be made Holy all of a ſudden, and that we

ſhould

should cease from Sinning immediately after we have received this Sacrament. 'Can it be believed, 'says he, that the Reformation is made just at the time when we are absolved? No certainly, it is *Tertullian.* 'made at the time when the Pardon is yet in suspence, and that we are afraid still of the Punishment, 'though we had not as yet deserved to be delivered from our Sins, that we might be in a Capacity 'of deserving it. When God still threatens us, and not when he has pardoned us------I confess that 'God grants Remission of Sins, to those who receive Baptism, but they must take Pains to be made 'worthy of it; for who would be so bold, as to confer this Sacrament on a Person, of whose Repen- 'tance he has any reason to make a Doubt? You may impose upon the Minister, and so procure Bap- 'tism, by false Pretences; but God, who knows the Hearts, keeps his own Treasures himself, and 'does not grant his Grace, but only to those that are worthy of it; so that none can imagine that he 'may sin more freely, because being yet but a Catechumen, he shall receive the Remission of his 'Sins in Baptism; for this Sacrament is the Seal of Faith, and Repentance is the Beginning and Stamp 'of Faith. Lastly, We are not washt from our Pollutions by Baptism, only that we might sin no 'more, but because we have our Heart already purified: *Quia jam corde loti sumus.* The Second Part of this Treatise, is of Penance after Baptism, called *Exomologesis.* He declares at first, that he finds it difficult to discourse of this Second Repentance, which is the last Hope that remains to those who have committed any Crimes, that is to say, Enormous Sins after Baptism: 'Lest, *says he,* by 'treating of this new Means of recovering our selves from Sin, which God offers to us; it might 'seem as if we would open a Way for Sinning afresh. However, *he says,* that God foreseeing Man's 'Infirmities, and the Devil's Temptations, was willing, that though the Gate of Remission was shut, 'and the Grace of Baptism refused for ever to those who had forfeited their Baptismal Innocence; 'they should yet have one Remedy left, which is a second Repentance, but that it is granted to them 'but once. He afterwards describes the laborious Exercises of this publick Penance, called *Exomo-* 'logesis. 'Tis, says he, an Exercise instituted to humble and abase the Sinner. It makes him lead a 'Life that is proper to prevail with God for Mercy; it makes him lie in Sackcloth and upon Ashes, 'entirely to neglect his own Body; it overwhelms his Mind with Grief and Sorrow; it reduces him 'to drink nothing but Water, and to eat nothing but Bread, and to take no more than what is neces- 'ry for his Sustenance; it obliges him to prolong his Prayers, and to feed them, if I may so say, by 'Fastings: It causes him to break out into Sighs, Groans and Tears, to cry Day and Night to the 'Lord, to cast himself at the Priest's Feet, and to prostrate himself before God's Favourites. Lastly, 'To conjure all his Brethren to pray to God for him, and to appease his Wrath by their Prayers. After having thus described the Fatigues of this *Exomologesis,* he shews the Necessity of it, and reproves those who were ashamed to embrace it, when they had committed Sins after Baptism.

His *Book of Prayer,* is a Discourse partly Moral, partly Ecclesiastical; for in the First Part, he explains the *Lord's Prayer*; and in the Second, he discourses of some particular Ceremonies, used in the *Prayers* of the Christians. First, he advises the Christians to be reconciled to their Brethren, to free their Minds from all sort of Trouble and Passion, to purifie their Hearts from all Sin, before they betake themselves to Prayer; Secondly, He says that the Christians do not use to wash their Hands before Prayer, but that in Praying, they commonly lift them up towards Heaven. Thirdly, That it is not necessary to take off our Cloaks when we Pray, nor to sit always after Prayer. Fourthly, That we ought to Pray with a modest Countenance, lifting our Hands towards Heaven. Fifthly, That our Voices must be low, that we must not speak louder than is necessary, to be heard. *For,* says he, *it is not the Sound of our Words that God gives Ear unto; but he regards the Intention of our Heart.* Sixthly, That when we fast in private, and for the sake of Devotion, we must not abstain from the *Kiss of Peace,* as when it is a solemn Fast against the time of *Easter.* Seventhly, That the Stationary Days, that is to say, those Days when several of the Faithful continued in Prayer and Fasting till Three a Clock in the Afternoon; we must not abstain from assisting at the ordinary Prayers, as if it was necessary to break our Fast, as soon as we have received the Body of Jesus Christ. 'Your Sta- 'tion, *says he,* will be more solemn. Receive the Lord's Body, and keep it, and so you shall be 'Partakers of the Sacrifice, and you will perform your Devotion the better.

In his Book concerning *Idolatry,* he shews, that the Crime of Idolatry is not only committed by Sacrificing to Idols, but also several other ways, of which he gives us a very pretty Account. He pretends, that all those Workmen who make Pictures, representing the False Gods; that the Astrologers, who have given to the Planets the Names of the Heathen Gods, and who attribute to them any Power and Efficacy; Professors of Rhetorick, who commend the Gods of the Heathens; the Merchants, that furnish Commodities for the Adorning the Temples and offering Sacrifices to the Gods, are all guilty of Idolatry. He maintains, that it is not lawful for the Christians to Feast on those Days which the Pagans Solemnize in Honour of their Gods, nor to adorn their Houses with Torches and Laurels, in Honour of their Princes and Magistrates; that they may be allowed to go to the Weddings of their Kinsfolks, though Sacrifices be offered there; but that this is only to satisfie that Duty to which we were obliged, upon the Account of our Relation. That it is likewise lawful for Servants to follow their Masters to the Sacrifices, and for Christians to render to Heathen Emperors that which is their Due. But that they ought not to accept of Offices, nor bear Arms, at least, that they cannot do it without countenancing of Idolatry. Lastly, he does not acquit those of Idolatry, who attribute the Name of God to the pretended Deities of the Heathens, or who swear by their Name, whether it be through Custom or otherwise. And all this is grounded upon this most certain Principle, That all those who any ways favour the Wicked in their Vice, or contribute to Wickedness in any manner whatsoever, are themselves guilty; but *Tertullian* seems to stretch it a little too

far

Tertullian. far in ſome Particulars, and to lay too great a Streſs upon the Rigour of Things which might be excuſed: As for Example, To bear Arms for the Defence of the Empire, to Adorn their Houſes with Torches and Laurels, in Honour of their Princes, and to make uſe of ſome ways of Speaking that are Cuſtomary, though they may have ſome Affinity to Idolatry.

And to the ſame purpoſe, defending in his Book *De Corona Militis*, the Action of a Soldier, who had refuſed to put a Crown upon his Head; he maintains that it is abſolutely prohibited to the Chriſtians to Crown themſelves, and even to bear Arms. He ſpeaks in this Diſcourſe very advantageouſly of Cuſtom and Tradition, and relates ſeveral remarkable Examples of Ceremonies, which he pretends to be derived from Tradition. 'To begin, *ſays he*, with Baptiſm, when we are ready to enter into the Water, and even 'before we make our Proteſtations before the Biſhop, and in the Church, That we renounce the Devil, all 'his Pomps and Miniſters; afterwards we are plunged in the Water three times, and they make us anſwer 'to ſome Things which are not preciſely ſet down in the Goſpel; after that they make us taſte Milk 'and Hony, and we bath our ſelves every Day, during that whole Week. We receive the Sacra-'ment of the Euchariſt, inſtituted by Jeſus Chriſt, when we Eat, and in the Morning-Aſſemblies, and 'we do not Receive it, but from the Hands of thoſe that preſide there. We offer Yearly Oblations 'for the Dead, in Honour of the Martyrs. We believe that it is not lawful to Faſt on a *Sunday*, and 'to pray to God kneeling. From *Eaſter* to *Whitſontide* we enjoy the ſame Priviledge. We take 'great Care not to ſuffer any Part of the Wine and Conſecrated Bread to fall to the Ground. We 'often Sign our ſelves with the Sign of the Croſs; if you demand a Law for theſe Practiſes, taken 'from the Scripture, we cannot find one there; but we muſt anſwer, That 'tis Tradition that has 'eſtabliſhed them, Cuſtom that has authorized them, and Faith that has made them to be obſerved.

The Book concerning *Flight in time of Perſecution*, is a further Mark of the extream Rigour of *Tertullian*, for there he maintains, That it is abſolutely Prohibited to Fly in time of Perſecution, or to give Mony not to be Perſecuted.

The Book *De Pallio*, is a ſmall Treatiſe, wherein he endeavours to prove, that he had reaſon to quit the *Toga*, or the long *Roman* Gown, and to wear a Cloak; he ſhews therein a great deal of Wit and Learning, and it ſeems as if he Compoſed it, rather to ſhew what he was capable of ſaying upon ſo trivial a Subject as this is, than ſeriouſly to defend the Action.

In his Book concerning *Publick Sights and Spectacles*, he diſſuades the Chriſtians from thoſe Sights and Spectacles, ſhewing how theſe Pleaſures are both ſhameful and dangerous to thoſe who have Renounced the Pomps and Pleaſures of the World, and Idolatry.

There is no need of giving the Reaſons why he wrote thoſe Books concerning the *Ornaments* and *Dreſſes of Women*, ſince the Titles themſelves do ſufficiently ſhew againſt what Abuſe they were written: So likewiſe the Title of the Book, that *Virgins ought to be Veiled*, does diſcover the Subject; but we are not to underſtand it only of Virgins Conſecrated to God; for *Tertullian*'s Deſign is to prove, that young Women ſhould be Veiled, that is to ſay, that they ſhould have their Face covered in the Church: Which he undertakes to prove, contrary to the Cuſtom of his Country, where only married Women were Veiled. And upon this Account he ſpeaks againſt this Cuſtom, and maintains, that it cannot preſcribe againſt Truth; which is true, when it relates to *Doctrin*, but not when it concerns only a Matter of *Diſcipline*, which is but of little Conſequence.

In the Firſt Book written to *his Wife*, he Exhorts her not to Marry again; and in the Second, he adviſes her, that in caſe ſhe will Marry again, to take a Chriſtian for her Husband.

The Treatiſe of *Patience* is an excellent Exhortation to the Practice of this Vertue: In which Diſcourſe, *Tertullian* ſets forth, with a great deal of Eloquence, all the Motives and Arguments which might induce Chriſtians to Patience, and diſſuade them from Impatience.

The Diſcourſe directed to the *Confeſſors*, whom he calls Martyrs, according to the ancient way of ſpeaking, is likewiſe a very powerful Exhortation to thoſe who were in Priſon upon the Account of the Religion of Jeſus Chriſt, to encourage them to bear with Patience their Chains and Torments, and to perſevere with Conſtancy to the End; nothing can be more Pathetical and Moving than this little Diſcourſe.

I have now nothing more to do, but to ſpeak of thoſe Books which *Tertullian* Compoſed againſt the Church, in Defence of the *Montaniſts*, and they are Four: His Book of *Modeſty*, of *Monogamy*, an *Exhortation to Chaſtity*, and *A Treatiſe of Faſts*. In his Book of *Modeſty*, he endeavours to prove againſt the Church, that it has no Power to Remit the Sins of Fornicators and Adulterers, and that when Men are once fallen into theſe Crimes after Baptiſm, they cannot be any more admitted into the Communion of the Church, how Penitent ſoever they may be. In his Book of *Monogamy*, and the *Exhortations to Chaſtity*, he abſolutely condemns ſecond Marriages, as being Adultery. Laſtly, In his Diſcourſe of *Faſts*, he commends the Exceſſive Faſts of the *Montaniſts*, who made ſeveral *Lents*, obſerving the Stationary Faſts, as if they had been expreſly enjoyned, making them to continue till Night, and not eating upon thoſe Days any thing but Bread and Fruits, nor drinking any thing but Water. In all theſe Books, excepting his Book of *Exhortation to Chaſtity*, he formally attacks the Church, and the Catholicks, whom he calls *Pſychici*, and ſpeaks every where very advantageouſly of *Montanus* and his Propheteſſes, believing that the Holy Ghoſt had inſpired them to ſet up and eſtabliſh a more perfect Diſcipline. For as to what relates to the Rule of Faith, that is to ſay, to the principal Doctrins of Religion, *Tertullian* and the firſt *Montaniſts* were of the ſame Opinion with the Church: And therefore it is, that in this Book againſt *Praxeas*, he ſays, that he always believed in One only God, in three Perſons, and that he ſtill believes it more firmly, ſince he has been inſtructed by the *Paraclete* or Comforter: And in his Book which he wrote, to prove that *Virgins ought to be Veiled*, he ſays, that excepting the Rule of Faith, which is immoveable, and can no ways be changed, Manners and Cuſtoms that relate to Matter of Diſcipline may be reformed and

altered

altered. That it is this which the *Paraclet* has done by the Miniſtry of *Montanus*, who has inſtructed Men in a much more perfect Diſcipline than that which the Apoſtles had taught them, that Juſtice was with him in the Cradle while he was an Infant: That the Law and the Prophets were as it were the Infancy, that the Gospel was as it were the Youth, but that there was no compleat Perfection to be found, but in the Inſtructions of the Holy Ghoſt, who ſpake by *Montanus*; for *Tertullian* and the firſt *Montaniſts* do not believe that *Montanus* was the Holy Ghoſt, but only that the Holy Ghoſt had inſpired him, and ſent him to Reform and Perfect the Diſcipline of the Church; and they did not attribute this Priviledge only to *Montanus*, but alſo to ſeveral of his Diſciples, and principally to Women; and they would have it believed, that there were among them ſeveral Perſons who had Revelations, and propheſied Things to come. Theſe Perſons were ſometimes ſtrangely agitated, ſometimes they fell into an Extaſie. This Sect gave a reſpectful Attention to all that they ſaid, either while they were thus agitated, or after they came to themſelves, as it was believed that theſe were ſo many Revelations, of which it was not lawful to make any doubt; they allowed them to ſpeak in their Aſſemblies when they would, and they believed that they had more Power and Authority than Prieſts and Biſhops. And this was the Reaſon that there was but very little Order and Rule obſerved in their Aſſemblies. But as to other things, they practiſed a very ſevere and auſtere Diſcipline; they for ever condemned not only thoſe, who after their Baptiſm had committed Murder or Idolatry, but alſo thoſe who had fallen into Fornication and Adultery, to lie under a perpetual Excommunication; They impoſed new Faſts, and obſerved them very ſtrictly, eating nothing but Bread and Fruits. They condemned ſecond Marriages; and they believed that it was not lawful to flee in Times of Perſecution. As ſoon as ever this Sect appeared in the World, it deluded a great many Chriſtians by that outward Shew of Perfection and Sanctity which it carried along with it. For on the one hand, the Auſterity of their Lives added Weight and Credit to their Revelations; and on the other hand, the Revelations cauſed their Diſcipline to be embraced. Several good Men were immediately brought into the Snare, and in a ſhort time we find the Churches of *Phrygia*, and afterwards other Churches divided upon the Account of theſe new Propheſies. Even the Biſhop of *Rome* himſelf was impoſed upon by them, and granted them Communicatory Letters, which he preſently Revoked, being ſenſible of his Error. The Chriſtians of the Church of *France* were more circumſpect as to this matter, and wrote to Pope *Victor* and the Churches of *Aſia* concerning theſe new Propheſies, giving ſuch a Judgment of them as was very diſcreet and agreeable to the Faith; as *Euſebius* tells us: But we do not certainly know what it was that they wrote, though it is very likely that they diſapproved of theſe new Revelations, wiſhing nevertheleſs, that they would treat with Gentleneſs and Moderation, thoſe who had ſuffered themſelves to be ſurprized by Error, that ſo they might be induced to return into the Boſom of the Church. At length the Biſhops of *Aſia* having met together ſeveral times, to examine theſe new Propheſies, conſidering of what Conſequence it was to put a Stop to their farther Progreſs, condemned them, and Excommunicated as well thoſe who were the Authors of them, as thoſe that followed them. And this is all that I thought neceſſary to ſay concerning the Sect of the *Montaniſts*, and the Condition in which it was in *Tertullian*'s time. We will now return to our Author, and ſpeak of his Genius, his Style, and the Judgment that ought to be paſſed upon his Writings. *Tertullian.*

He was of a very quick, ſprightly and ſharp Temper, but he had not all that Exactneſs and Clearneſs that might have been wiſhed. There is very often more Glittering than Solidity in his Reaſonings: He rather ſtrikes and dazles by his bold Expreſſions, than convinces by the Force of his Arguments. His Thoughts are far fetch'd, and ſometimes lofty enough; the Turn which he gives them is high, but not very natural. He oftentimes ſtretches things too far. He is warm, and tranſported almoſt upon every thing. He is full of Figures and Hyperboles. He was very well furniſhed with Knowledge and Learning, which he ſufficiently knew how to make uſe of to good purpoſe. His Excellency conſiſted in Satyr, his Jeſts are very ingenious and biting. He attack'd his Adverſaries very cunningly, and overthrew them by a multitude of Reaſons; which are interwoven, and, as it were, linked one within another. Laſtly, if he does not perſuade by his Reaſonings, he at leaſt forces Conſent by that pompous way of Expreſſion whereby he ſets them out. His Style is Conciſe, his Expreſſions Emphatical, and there are in his Writings almoſt as many Sentences as Words. Yet *Lactantius* had reaſon to take notice of three conſiderable Defects in him. 'Tertullian, *ſays he*, was very well vers'd 'in the fine Learning, but his Style is neither fluent nor polite, but very obſcure. *In loquendo parum facilis, parum comtus, & multum obſcurus.* Theſe three Faults in Style are common to him, with the greateſt part of the *African* Writers (*k*), but we may ſay, that they are in a very high Degree in *Tertullian*, and that there is not any Writer, whoſe Style is more harſh, leſs polite, and more obſcure than his. All his Works are ſubject to theſe Defects, ſome more, and ſome leſs. He is more clear and conciſe in his Polemical Diſcourſes, more obſcure and harder in his common Places; as in the Book *De Pallio*, which is one of the obſcureſt Pieces of Antiquity. His Book of *Penance* is the moſt Polite of all. The moſt excellent, and the uſefulleſt of his Works, are, his *Apology*, the *Præſcriptions*, his Books of *Penance*, of *Baptiſm*, of *Prayer*, and his *Exhortations to Patience, and to Martyrdom.*

After what we have ſaid already, it is an eaſie matter to judge the true Character of *Tertullian*; But it is not ſo eaſie to determine, whether he be more to be Commended, or Blamed: For firſt of all, if we were to make a Judgment, in relation to the Service which he did the Church, it would be difficult to ſay, whether he has done more Hurt or Good. For on the one hand, he vigorouſly defended its Doctrin againſt ſeveral Hereticks, he maintained in ſome of his Works very conſiderable Points

(*k*) *Theſe three Faults in Style are indeed to be found in the greateſt part of the African Writers.* We muſt except *Minutius*, S. *Cyprian* and *Lactantius*, they had quite worn off that way of Writing, tho' S. *Cyprian* ſtill retains ſome reliſh of it.

relating

Tertullian. relating to Diſcipline; and laſtly, he all along Eſtabliſhed an excellent Morality: But on the other hand, beſides that he always had ſeveral Errors, he formerly oppoſed the Diſcipline of the Church after he ſeparated from it. And if we judge in the ſecond Place by the Temper of the Man, there is ſo much of Good and Ill in it, that we cannot tell which of the two ought to carry it. Laſtly, If we make a Judgment of him by his Style, we cannot tell whether he is to be Commended for what he has that is Great and Surprizing, or to be Blamed, becauſe of its other Defects and Imperfections. And thus Learned Men have always been, and are ſtill extreamly divided (*l*) in the Judgments which

(*l*) *And thus Learned Men have always been, and are ſtill extreamly divided.*] We ſhall here ſet down ſome Judgments made by the Ancients and Moderns concerning *Tertullian*: S. *Cyprian*, by the Relation of S. *Jerome*, who was told it by a Prieſt that had heard it from a Secretary of S. *Cyprian*'s, uſed every Day to read ſomething of his Works; and when he called for his Book, he ſaid, *Give me my Maſter*. And in truth S. *Cyprian* has imitated him, and has borrowed a great many things from him. He has likewiſe compoſed the greateſt parts of his Works with the ſame deſign as *Tertullian*, as his Book of Idolatry, in imitation of *Tertullian*'s Apology. His Books *De Diſciplina & habitu muliebri, de zelo & livore, de Oratione Dominica, de opere & eleemoſynis*, were written in imitation of thoſe of *Tertullian* upon the ſame Subject. *Euſebius* ſays of *Tertullian*, That he was one of the ableſt of the Latin Writers, and that he has obtained a great Reputation in all the Churches.

Lactantius paſſes the Judgment which we have already related, which is not very advantageous to him. S. *Hilary* ſays in his Commentary upon S. *Matthew*, That the Error into which he fell, has taken away the Authority of his Books, which deſerved Approbation. *Conſequens error hominis detraxit ſcriptis probabilibus Authoritatem.*

S. *Jerome* ſpeaks ſometimes very advantageouſly of him, as in *his Catalogue*, where he calls him a Man of a quick and ſharp Wit; and in his Epiſtle to *Magnus*, he ſays, That there was not any Author, who had more Learning and Subtilty; but in other places he reprehends his Errors and Defects. In his Apology againſt *Ruffinus*, he ſays, *I commend his Wit, but condemn his Hereſies*; and in his Book againſt *Helvidius*, who oppoſed to him *Tertullian*'s Authority, he makes this Anſwer, *What I have to ſay to you concerning* Tertullian, *is, that he is not of the Church. Eccleſiæ hominem non eſſe.*

S. *Auſtin* commends *Tertullian*'s Style, and always condemns his Error; in his Book *De Geneſi ad Literam*, he ſays, That *Tertullian* having an excellent Apprehenſion, did ſometime diſcover the Truth, and that he could not forbear ſometimes to eſtabliſh it even againſt his own Opinion.

Vincentius Lirinenſis gives a Character of *Tertullian* in theſe words; 'Tertullian, *ſays he*, was among the *Latins* what *Origen* was among the *Greeks*, that is to ſay, 'the firſt and the moſt conſiderable Man they had. In 'word, Is there any Author more knowing and better 'verſed, both in Eccleſiaſtical and Prophane Learning? 'Has he not compriz'd in his vaſt and prodigious Memory 'all the *Philoſophy* of the Sages, the *Maxims* of the different 'Sects, with their Hiſtories, and what elſe appertained 'to them? Did he ever undertake to attack any thing 'which he has not almoſt always, either pierced by the 'Vivacity of his Wit, or overthrown by the Force and 'Weight of his Reaſonings? And who can ſufficiently 'extol the Beauties of his Diſcourſe, which is ſo well 'guarded and linked together by a continual Chain of 'Arguments, that he even forces the Conſent of thoſe 'whom he cannot perſuade? His Words are as ſo many 'Sentences. His Anſwers are almoſt ſo many Victories, 'as has been ſufficiently experienced by the *Marcions*, 'the *Apelles*'s, the *Praxeas*'s, the *Hermogenes*'s, the *Jews*, 'the *Gentiles*, the *Gnoſticks*, and a great many others, 'whoſe Blaſphemies he has ſilenced by great numbers 'of Books that have been as ſo many Thunderbolts 'which have reduced them to Aſhes. And yet tho' 'he has had all theſe Advantages, he did not continue 'in the ancient and univerſal Faith of the Church, and 'he has proved himſelf leſs Faithful than Eloquent. 'At laſt he altered his Judgment and his Error, as has 'been obſerved by that bleſſed Confeſſor S. *Hilary*, by 'which means he has taken away that Authority from 'his Writings, which otherwiſe they would have deſerv'd.

I ſhall take no notice of the Judgment of *Tritkemius*, *Rhenanus*, *Politian*, *Pamelius*, *Rigaltius*, and ſome other Moderns, which every Body may conſult upon occaſion, and I ſhall conclude with the Judgments given by two of our French Authors, who have both given us Characters of *Tertullian*, but in a different way.

The firſt is the famous M. *Balſac*, in a Letter written to *Rigaltius*, which is the Second of the Fifth Book. 'I expect (*ſays he*) the *Tertullian* which you are pub'liſhing, that he may learn me that Patience, for 'which he gives ſuch admirable Inſtructions; He is 'an Author to whom your Preface would have recon'ciled me, if I had had an Averſion for him, and if 'the Harſhneſs of his Expreſſions, and the Vices of 'his Age had diſſuaded me from reading him; but I 'have had an Eſteem for him for a long time, and as 'hard and crabbed as he is, yet he is not at all un'pleaſant to me. I have found in his Writings, 'that Black Light which is mentioned in one of the 'ancient Poets, and I look upon his Obſcurity with the 'ſame Pleaſure, as that of Ebony which is very bright 'and neatly wrought. This has always been my Opi'nion; for as the Beauties of *Africa* are not leſs ami'able, though they are not like ours; and as *Sophoniſba* 'has eclipſed ſeveral *Italian* Ladies, ſo the Wits of 'that Country are not leſs pleaſing with this foreign 'ſort of Eloquence, and I ſhall prefer him before a 'great many affected Imitators of *Cicero*: And 'though we ſhould grant to the niceſt Criticks, that 'his Style is of Iron, yet they muſt likewiſe own to 'us, that out of this Iron he has forged moſt excellent 'Weapons; and that he has defended the Honour and 'Innocence of Chriſtianity; that he has quite 'routed the *Valentinians*, and ſtruck *Marcion* to the 'very Heart.

The ſecond Character of *Tertullian*, *Recherche de la Verite.* is that which Father *Mallebranche* gives us in his *Search after Truth*, in his Second Book. Chap. 3. 'Tertullian, *ſays he*, was with'out doubt a Man of extraordinary Learning, but he 'had more Memory than Judgment. He excelled more 'in his Fancy and Imagination, than in Judgment and 'true extent of Thought. There is no doubt to be 'made, but that at laſt he was an *Enthuſiaſt*, in that 'ſenſe which I have explained it, and that he had al'moſt all the Qualities which I have attributed to 'theſe Fanaticks. That Reſpect which he had for the 'Viſions of *Montanus*, and for his Propheteſſes, is an 'unqueſtionable Proof of the Weakneſs of his Judg'ment. That Fire, thoſe Heats, thoſe Enthuſiaſms 'upon little Subjects, do evidently diſcover the Extra'vagancy of his Fancy: How many Irregular Tran'ſports are there in his Hyperboles and Figures? How 'many Pompous and Magnificent Reaſons, which 'prove only by their glittering, and which perſuade 'only by ſtunning and dazling of the Underſtanding! He afterwards endeavours to ſhew that this is a true Picture, by making ſome Excerptions out of his Book *De Pallio*, which he thinks to be the moſt proper Book to juſtifie what he affirms.

they

they have given, and which they ſtill give of this Author; which makes me believe that it is better to commend the Good, and to blame what is amiſs, than to pretend to make an abſolute Judgment, which would be always ſubject to a thouſand Diſputes. *Tertullian.*

In the laſt place, to ſpeak briefly of the Editions of *Tertullian*, there has hardly been any Author oftner Printed, and upon whom more Perſons have beſtowed their Pains. For which, two Reaſons may be given, the Corruption of the Manuſcripts, and his Obſcurity, and theſe two Reaſons are likewiſe the cauſe one of the other; for his Obſcurity induced the Tranſcribers, who did not underſtand him, to alter ſome Words, that they might make ſuch a Senſe as they themſelves underſtood: And the Corruptions of theſe Tranſcribers have been ſo far from clearing his Meaning, that they have rendred it ſtill more obſcure; which has been the occaſion that this Author has given ſo much Trouble to all thoſe that have hitherto ſet out any Editions of any part of his Works.

Rhenanus was the firſt who publiſhed *Tertullian*'s Works, which were firſt Printed at *Baſil* in the year 1521. from two Manuſcripts which he had got out of two Abbeys in *Germany*; and the ſecond time in the year 1528. I have a great Eſteem for the Arguments and Notes, which this excellent Perſon, who was very well vers'd in all parts of Learning, and in Eccleſiaſtical Antiquity, has put at the beginning of the greateſt part of *Tertullian*'s Works: And I think that no Man has laboured more ſucceſsfully than he in the Explication of this Author; and that *Rigaltius* has very well obſerved, that *Rhenanus* wanted nothing to have made his Work compleat, but more Manuſcripts. Yet his Notes have been Cenſured by the Spaniſh Inquiſition, and they have been put at *Rome* in the *Index Expurgatorius*, becauſe of ſome Remarks which were a little too free upon the Abuſes that were common in his time: But this ought not to diminiſh the Eſteem we ought to have for him. We likewiſe find Editions of *Tertullian*, printed at *Baſil* in the years 1525, 1536, 1539. But they are plainly Copies of the firſt Edition, wherein nothing is altered but the year. The third Edition of *Rhenanus* is the beſt, it was Printed at *Baſil* in Folio in the year 1550. In this Edition, there are ſome Books corrected by *Gelenius* out of a Manuſcript from *England*. The fourth was likewiſe Printed at *Baſil* in 1562. The fifth is of *Paris*, Printed by *Guillard* in 1545. The ſixth was Printed upon a very curious Letter in the year 1566, Printed at *Paris* in two Volumes in Octavo, for *Volchelus*, and *Audoenus Parvus*. *Laurentius de la Barre* ſet forth a new Edition of *Tertullian*, Printed at *Paris* in 1580. Then *Pamelius* Publiſhed *Tertullian* with new Commentaries: His firſt Edition was in the year 1579, Printed at *Antwerp*. It was followed afterwards by that of 1583, Printed at *Paris* for *Sonnius*; and it was afterwards Printed at *Antwerp* by *Plantin*, in 1584; at *Heydelberg* for *Commelin* in 1596, and 1599; at *Cologne* in 1617; at *Geneva* in 1597, 1601, 1607; at *Zurich* by *Belley* in 1657; at *Paris* in 1608, in 1616, in 1634, in 1658, in 1664; and at *Roan* in 1662. The Commentaries of this Author are both Learned and Uſeful, but he digreſſes too much from his Subject, and he often brings in things which are of no uſe for the underſtanding of his Author. *Tertullian*'s Works have been likewiſe Printed according to *Pamelius*'s Edition with *Junius*'s Notes, at *Franeker* in 1597. In the year 1627, *Rigaltius* Printed nine Treatiſes of *Tertullian* at *Paris* in Octavo, more Correct, from a Manuſcript preſented by *Agobardus*, who lived in the Ninth Century, to the Church of *Lions*, whereof he was Biſhop, and he collated it with the various Readings of a Manuſcript of Monſieur *Montchal*. In 1584, *Latinus* publiſhed his Conjectures to reſtore ſome Places of *Tertullian*, which he pretended were corrupted. *Pancirollus* alſo had taken Pains upon *Tertullian*, but he publiſhed nothing. *Fulvius Urſinus* Collected ſeveral various Readings from Manuſcripts, and put them in the Margin of one of *Pamelius*'s Editions of *Tertullian* which *Rigaltius* uſed. *Johannes Woerus* has likewiſe made ſome Notes upon *Tertullian*, as well as *Albaſpinæus*, who wrote ſeveral upon ſome Paſſages relating to Diſcipline and Penance. *Pithæus*, *Mercerus*, *Junius*, *Salmaſius*, *Richerius*, *Theodorus Marſilius* and ſome others, have made Remarks upon his Book *De Pallio*, Printed ſeparately at *Paris* in 1576, and 1594, with *Junius*'s Notes; In 1600, with thoſe of *Salmaſius*; in 1625, *Jacobus Gothofredus* publiſhed from the Manuſcript of *Agobardus* the two Books to the Nations, which were never Printed before. They were Printed at *Geneva* for *Chouet*, together with the Commentaries of that Learned Lawyer.

La Cerda the Jeſuit undertook to make a *Continued Commentary* upon *Tertullian*'s Works, more ample than thoſe which had been hitherto made: He began this Work, and cauſed two Volumes of it to be Printed at *Paris* in 1624, in 1630, and in 1641; but he never finiſhed it, and his Commentaries are only upon part of *Tertullian*'s Book; and beſides they are long and tedious, becauſe he explains ſeveral things which need no Explication, and he very-often leaves his Subject.

After all theſe, the Learned *Rigaltius* having Reviſed *Tertullian*'s Works from the Manuſcript of *Agobardus*, and making uſe of the various Readings Collected by *Urſinus*, *Pithæus*, and *Junius*, publiſhed the Text of *Tertullian* more Correct in very many Places, and added ſome ſhort Notes, to examine which of the two Readings is the trueſt, to reject or confirm ſome Conjectures, and to explain the moſt Difficult and Uncommon Words; and he has annexed at the end longer Obſervations, to explain the difficult Paſſages, or to clear ſome ancient Practices; or laſtly, to diſcover ſome Point of Learning which was more difficult to be cleared. 'Where, if, *ſays he*, you find any Opinions that are 'a little too free, as about the Confeſſion of Secret Sins, about the Face of *Jeſus* (which he believes 'was not at all Comely, grounding it upon the Teſtimony of *Tertullian*, and ſome others of the Ancients) and upon the Wax-Tapers which are lighted up in the Churches in the Day-time, you muſt 'not think that I have taken notice of them any otherwiſe, than as they were neceſſary to explain 'Tertullian's Notions, and not any ways to reprehend the Doctrin of the Catholick Church, or to 'diſapprove of the Opinions of thoſe Fathers, who lived after his time. Words by which *Rigaltius* endeavours to excuſe thoſe Opinions, which were too freely inſerted ſometimes by him in his Notes,

Tertullian. as well upon S. *Cyprian* as *Tertullian*; but I do not know whether this Excuſe will ſatisfie every Body, for it muſt be confeſſed, that there are ſome Places, wherein he ſufficiently ſhews, that he ſpeaks according to his own Opinion, rather than according to that of his Author, and in which he even digreſſes from his Subject, to make Obſervations which are ſometimes not very agreeable to the preſent Practice of the Church: But though we might have ſome reaſon to tax ſome of his Notes as to what relates to Divinity; yet we muſt confeſs on the other ſide, that the Notes and Remarks which he has made relating to Criticiſm, Grammar, and the Explication of ſome difficult Paſſages of *Tertullian*, are very excellent. However he is generally blamed for being too bold in his Conjectures, and that he has not been exact enough in Reviſing his Author from ancient Manuſcripts; and laſtly, that he has inſerted his Conjectures, and other Men's into the Text, without the Authority of any Manuſcripts.

The Bookſeller, who printed the *Tertullian* of *Rigaltius* in 1634, being willing to make the Work as Compleat as he could, Printed in 1635, in a Volume by it ſelf, the Notes and Commentaries of thoſe who had taken Pains upon *Tertullian* before him, that ſo we might have all that had been done upon this Author, excepting the Commentaries of *La Cerda*. This Volume joyned to the Edition of *Rigaltius*'s *Tertullian* of 1634, which was afterwards Reprinted in 1641, is the perfecteſt Edition of this Author.

It has been ſince Printed in 1664, which is not ſo large, but more Commodious, wherein they have put in the Margin the entire Notes and Obſervations of *Rigaltius*, together with others ſelected from thoſe of *Rhenanus*, *Pamelius*, *Albaſpinæus*, *La Cerda*, and *Salmaſius*, &c. together with the Corrections of *Mercerus*. *Priorius*, who had the Care of this Edition, has put at the beginning a Preface, which he calls, *A Diſcourſe concerning the Life and Errors of* Tertullian, that is not exactly done, any more than this Author's Notes; which have not found a general Eſteem among the Learned.

I do not ſpeak of the Edition of *Tertullian* publiſhed by Father *George*, which he cauſed to be Printed at *Paris* in 1648, and 1650, in three great Volumes, which he has Entituled *Tertullianus Redivivus*, becauſe there is nothing in this Edition worth taking notice of; and thoſe long and tedious Commentaries which this Capuchin has made, can be of no Advantage to the Ignorant, nor of any Uſe to the Learned.

It would be a deſirable thing to have a new Edition of *Tertullian* Printed, the Text whereof ſhould be exactly agreeable to the beſt Manuſcripts, without inſerting the Conjectures of particular Perſons. And they ought likewiſe to add a Choice Collection of thoſe Notes which are the moſt uſeful, taken from all the Commentators; And laſtly, they ſhould not range the Books according to the Order of Time, but according to the Order of the Matters, as we have done in giving an Abridgment of the Books, and to prefix at the beginning, the Life of *Tertullian*, and a Criticiſm upon his Writings; like that which we have done here in *French*, but larger, and more exact.

CAIUS.

Caius. CAIUS a Prieſt of the Church of *Rome* (*a*), lived in the time of the Popes *Zephirin* and *Victor*, that is to ſay under the Emperors *Severus* and *Antoninus*. He wrote a Treatiſe by way of Dialogue (*b*) againſt a famous Montaniſt called *Proclus* or *Proculus* (*c*), wherein he reprehended, and accuſed this Heretick for giving Credit too raſhly to thoſe new Prophecies, and at the ſame time confuted his Reaſons. *Euſebius* ſpeaks of this Treatiſe in three Places: The firſt is in Chap. 25. of the Second Book of his Hiſtory, where he quotes a Fragment of it relating to the Sepulchers of S. *Peter* and S. *Paul*, which were to be ſeen at *Rome* in this Author's Time. The ſecond is in Chap. 28. of the third Book, where he ſpeaks of the Heretick *Cerinthus* in theſe Terms. 'Cerinthus 'tells us in ſome Revelations which he had written, as if he had been a great Apoſtle, prodigious 'Things, which, as he ſaid, he had learnt from the Angels, aſſuring us, That after the Reſurrection, 'Chriſt ſhould have an Earthly Kingdom, and that Men ſhould live in *Jeruſalem*, where they ſhould 'enjoy Carnal and Senſual Pleaſures, and ſpend a Thouſand Years in continual Marriages and Jollity. The third place wherein *Euſebius* ſpeaks of *Caius* is in his Sixth Book, Chap. 20. where he ſays, that *Caius* condemning the Boldneſs by which the Enemies of the Church do counterfeit ſome Books of Scripture, reckons but 13 Epiſtles of S. *Paul*, not counting that which was written to the *Hebrews* among the number of this Apoſtle's Writings. Laſtly the ſame *Euſebius* in his Third Book, Chap. 21. recites ſome Words relating to the Daughters of *Philip* the Deacon, taken from this Author's Dialogue.

(*a*) *A Prieſt of the Church of* Rome.] *Euſebius* and S. *Jerom* tell us plainly, that he was a Prieſt, and that he lived in *Zephyrin*'s time; but they do not ſay that he was a Roman. His Treatiſe was Compoſed in Greek; *Photius* is the Firſt, who affirms expreſly, that he was a Prieſt of the Church of *Rome*; and he adds, that he was ordained Biſhop of the *Gentiles*.

(*b*) *By way of Dialogue.*] *Euſebius* calls it, βιβλίον διαλέξεως, that is to ſay, *a Book of Dialogues*; and *Caius* and *Proclus*, ſeem to have been the Perſons who ſpake therein, for *Euſebius* in his Third Book, relates the Words of *Proclus* taken from this Dialogue.

(*c*) Proclus *or* Proculus.] The Sect of the Montaniſts was divided into two Parties, the one were κατὰ φρύγιλον, and the others κατὰ Ασκηλω, as it is obſerved in that ſmall Abridgment of Hereſies, at the end of *Tertullian*'s Præſcriptions. It is thought that this *Proclus* was the ſame with *Proculus* the *African*, who was likewiſe a Montaniſt, and of whom *Tertullian* ſpeaks; but this is not likely; for he, againſt whom *Caius* writes was a Greek, and was called *Proclus*, and not *Proculus*.

Euſebius

Euſebius and S. *Jerome* make no mention of the other Works of *Caius*, but the Learned *Photius* tells us, That he had likewiſe compoſed a Treatiſe againſt the Hereſie of *Artemon*, who believed that Jeſus Chriſt was only a meer Man, and that he was the Author of a Book Entituled, *The little Labyrinth* (*d*), from whence *Euſebius* has taken the Paſſage concerning the Penance of *Natalis*. *Photius* likewiſe attributes to him a Treatiſe *Of the Univerſe*, or *Of the Nature of the Univerſe*, or of the Cauſes thereof, which went in his Time under the Name of *Joſephus*; Let us ſee what he ſays of it. 'This Work con-'tains two little Books, wherein he ſhews that *Plato* contradicts himſelf; he convinces the Philoſopher 'Alcinous (*e*) of ſeveral Falſities and Abſurdities concerning Matter and the Reſurrection; he oppoſes 'his own Opinions to thoſe of this Philoſopher, and ſhews that the *Jews* are a much more ancient Peo-'ple than the *Greeks*; he believes that Man was compounded of Fire, Earth, and Water, and of a 'Spirit which is called the Soul, of which he ſpeaks in theſe Terms: God has formed this Spirit to-'gether with the Body, and taking the principal part from thence, he has cauſed it to penetrate and 'fill up all it's Members; ſo that extending it ſelf throughout the whole Body, he has taken the form 'from thence; but it is of a colder Nature than Matter, of which the Body is compounded. This 'Opinion which ſuppoſes that the Soul is Corporeal, (if nevertheleſs he acknowledges no other Soul 'in a Man than his Spirit) this Opinion, *I ſay*, is quite different from the Doctrin of the *Hebrews*, 'and does not agree with the Greatneſs of his other Notions. To conclude, as the ſame *Photius* adds, '(from whom we have only tranſlated his Words) he ſpeaks of Jeſus after a very Orthodox Manner. For he calls him Chriſt, and ſpeaks of his ineffable Generation from the Father, after ſuch a manner as is no ways to be reprehended; which gives us occaſion to doubt whether this be the Work of *Joſephus* or not; though the Style very much reſembles that of this Hiſtorian. He adds alſo afterwards, that he has found and obſerved that this Book was written by *Caius* Author of the *Labyrinth*; but that not bearing the Name of it's Author, ſome have attributed it to *Juſtin Martyr*, others to *Irenæus*; though in reality it was compoſed by *Caius*. The Proof he brings for it, is, That the Author of the *Labyrinth*, whom he believes to be *Caius*, ſays, towards the End, that he was the Author of the Book *concerning the Nature of the Univerſe*; but this Argument is not abſolutely convincing. For it is not certain, that *Caius* was the Author of the Book *of the Labyrinth*, which ſome have attributed to *Origen*, and 'tis likely enough, that there might be two ſeveral Books of different Authors, which might have very near the ſame Title.

Caius.

(*d*) *The little* Labyrinth] We have obſerved, that *Euſebius* does not Name the Author of this Fragment, but that *Theodoret* aſcribes it to the Author of the *Labyrinth*, and on the other hand, *Photius* informs us, that *Caius* was the Author of that Book, and proves it, becauſe the Author of the *Labyrinth* ſays, That he wrote a Treatiſe *concerning the Univerſe*, whence it would follow, that it was *Caius* who was the Author of this Fragment; but I ſhould rather believe it to be taken out of the Book, which he Compoſed againſt *Artemon*. *Euſebius* ſays, That the Book from whence he produces this Fragment, was written againſt his Hereſie, and the Paſſages which he brings from thence do clearly ſhew it.

(*e*) *The Philoſopher* Alcinous.] He wrote a Treatiſe, wherein he makes a Compariſon between *Ariſtotle* and *Plato*.

HIPPOLITUS.

HIPPOLITUS, who was according to the Relation of ſome, Biſhop of *Oſtia* in *Italy* (*a*), and according to others Metropolitan of *Arabia*, ſuffered Martyrdom (*b*), under the Reign of the Emperor *Alexander*. He made himſelf conſiderable by the Commentaries which he Compoſed upon the Holy Scripture (*c*). *Euſebius* and S. *Jerom* aſſure us, that he had written upon the Six days Work, upon *Geneſis*, *Exodus*, the *Canticles*, the *Pſalms*, the Prophet *Zachary*, the Prophet *Iſaiah*, upon ſome Places of *Ezekiel*, upon *Daniel*, the *Proverbs*, *Eccleſiaſticus*, and *Apocalypſe*; and that he Compoſed Two Treatiſes, the One *concerning* Saul, and the other *concerning the Witch of* Endor. Beſides theſe Works upon the Scripture, he likewiſe wrote a Treatiſe *con-*

Hippolitus.

(*a*) *Biſhop of* Oſtia *in* Italy.] S. *Jerom*, in his Catalogue, ſays, that he does not know of what City he was Biſhop. *Gelaſius*, in his Book *De duabus Naturis*, citing *Hippolitus*, ſays, That he was Metropolitan of *Arabia*. *Nicephorus* makes him Biſhop of *Pontus*: It is more likely that he was a Biſhop of *Arabia*, than of *Italy*: For it is certain that he was of the *Eaſt*, and S. *Jerom* obſerves in one of his Homilies, that *Origen* was his Scholar; ſome have ſaid, that he was the Diſciple of S. *Clemens*, and this is very probable.

[Monſieur *le Moyne*'s Conjecture, that *Hippolitus* was Biſhop of *Portus Romanus*, now called *Aden* in *Arabia*, is moſt probable; for it was an eaſie Miſtake for thoſe who knew nothing of this *Arabian Portus*, to imagine, that he was called *Portuenſis* from the *Portus Romanus*, by *Oſtia* in *Italy*, eſpecially ſince there has been ſo current a Tradition of his ſuffering Martyrdom in *Italy*.]

(*b*) *Suffered Martyrdom.*] S. *Jerom*, in the Preface to his Commentaries upon S. *Matthew*, calls him a Martyr, and in the Martyrologies, he is rank'd in the Number of Martyrs. It is certain, that he ſuffered Martyrdom in *Italy*, and perhaps at *Oſtia*: His Acts are forged and counterfeit. It is affirmed herein, that he ſuffered Mertyrdom under *Claudius*, it ſhould have been under *Alexander*; and *Ulpianus*, who is mentioned in theſe Acts, perhaps may be *Ulpius*, who was Governour of *Rome* in the Time of this laſt Emperor.

(*c*) *Which he compoſed upon the Holy Scripture.*] S. *Jerom* ſays, that *Origen* being excited by his Friend *Ambroſius*, undertook to write Commentaries upon the Sacred Scripture, in imitation of *Hippolitus*.

Hippolitus. cerning *Antichriſt*, a Diſcourſe *concerning the Reſurrection*, a Work *againſt all the Hereſies*, and one in particular *againſt that of* Marcion; a Diſcourſe *concerning* Eaſter, wherein he has given a kind of Chronicle, to the Firſt Year of the Emperor *Alexander*; and a Paſchal Cycle for Sixteen Years. He likewiſe made one or two more Homilies in the Praiſe of our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, which he recited in the Preſence of *Origen*, who followed and imitated him in the Works, which he compoſed upon the Holy Scripture. There is a Catalogue of his Works upon the Side of a Statue found near *Rome*, where his Paſchal Cycle was affixt; ſeveral Books are here omitted, mentioned by *Euſebius* and S. *Jerom*; but there are others (*d*) of which they have not ſpoken: The Catalogue is this. The Works of *Hippolitus, upon the Penitential Pſalms, concerning the Witch of* Endor, *upon the Goſpel of S.* John, *and the* Apocalypſe, *concerning the Gifts of God, Apoſtolical Tradition, a Chronicle, a Book written to the Grecks, another upon* Plato, *or concerning the World, an Exhortation to* Severina, *a Demonſtration of the Time of* Eaſter *in a Table, Odes upon the whole Scripture, a Diſcourſe of God, of the Reſurrection of the Fleſh, of Good, and from whence Evil proceeds.* This Catalogue does not appear to me, to be ſo faithful and exact, as that of *Euſebius* and S. *Jerom*, who own beſides, as well as *Honorius Auguſtodunenſis* after them, that *Hippolitus* writ ſeveral other Treatiſes, whereof they had not any Knowledge And we have now almoſt entirely loſt, even thoſe of which *Euſebius* and S. *Jerom* have given the Catalogue.

There goes indeed under his Name, a ſmall Diſcourſe, Printed at *Paris* in Greek, with the Verſion of *Picus Mirundala*, in the Year 1557, and afterward in 1660, and inſerted in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, with this Title; *Of the end of the World, Antichriſt, and the Second Coming of Jeſus Chriſt.* But it is very uncertain, whether this be the Treatiſe of Antichriſt (*e*) attributed to *Hippolitus*, and mentioned by *Euſebius*; The Title being different from that related by *Euſebius*; the Style mean and Childiſh: And Laſtly, The Fables and Falſhoods which it contains, give us ſufficient Ground to doubt it. There is another Treatiſe of Chriſt and Antichriſt, which bears the Name of *Hippolitus*, publiſh'd in Greek by *Gudius*, which Father *Combefis* has cauſed to be Printed in Greek and Latin, in the laſt Volume of the Supplement to the *Bibliotheca Patrum*. Though this Treatiſe be more ancient than that which was publiſhed before under *Hippolitus*'s Name, yet does it not appear to me worthy of this Author. Thoſe that read the Commentary upon the Hiſtory of *Suſanna*, and the Greek Fragment upon *Daniel*, which are Printed in the ſame Place, will paſs the ſame Judgment upon them.

The Demonſtration againſt the Jews, publiſht in Latin by *Turrianus*, and inſerted by *Poſſevinus* into his *Apparatus*, is a Fragment of ſome Homily, or of ſome other Book of that Nature. It is not certain, whether it be written by *Hippolitus*. There was found at *Baſil*, a Treatiſe *upon the Apocalypſe*, attributed to *Hippolitus*; but it is doubted whether it be his, becauſe of the meanneſs of the Style, and the little Learning there is in it, as *Sixtus Senenſis* has obſerved. The Collections, or rather the Extracts taken by *Anaſtaſius* the Library-Keeper, out of the Sermons of *Hippolitus*, upon ſome Points of Divinity, and upon the Incarnation, againſt *Bero* and *Helix*, Hereticks of the Sect of the *Valentinians*, publiſhed by *Turrianus* and *Caniſius*, and related in Greek by *Anaſtaſius*, in his Collections ſet forth by *Sirmondus*, ſeem to be very ancient; but it is not certain whether they belong to *Hippolitus*. We muſt make the ſame Judgment of the Homily, Entituled, *Of One Only God in Three Perſons, and of the Incarnation, againſt the Hereſie of* Noetus, which is publiſhed by *Veſſius*, with the Works of *Gregorius Thaumaturgus*; but though it was not really written by *Hippolitus*, yet it contains the Principles of the Ancients concerning the Trinity (*f*).

That Little Work, *Of the Lives of the Twelve Apoſtles*, which Father *Combefis* cauſed to be printed from a Manuſcript in the King's Library, in his Supplement to the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, is not *Hippolitus*'s, and contains ſeveral Fictions of the Modern Greeks (*g*), relating to the Deaths of the Apoſtles.

(*d*) *But there are other Works.*] 'Tis very like that it is a Collection of Homilies, which was extant in *Theodoret*'s time, who cites ſeveral of them, which perhaps might make a part of his Commentaries upon the Scripture.

(*e*) *It is very uncertain whether this be the Treatiſe of Antichriſt.*] The Books of *Hippolitus* were Entituled, *Of the Reſurrection*, and *of Antichriſt*, according to the Relation of *Euſebius*, and S. *Jerom*: This is Entituled, *Of the End of the World*, &c. This Style is mean and Childiſh, whereas that of *Hippolitus* was grave and lofty. This Treatiſe begins with ἐπειδὴ γάρ. There are a great many triffling Conjectures concerning the Birth, and the Life of Antichriſt; he believes that he is to be a Devil; he ſays that S. *John* is not dead, which is contrary to the ancient Tradition: He cites the *Apocalypſe* inſtead of *Daniel*; he holds that the Souls of Men have been from all Eternity, which agrees with *Origen*'s Opinion: In a Word, this Treatiſe is worth very little.

(*f*) *The Principles of the Ancients concerning the Trinity.*] Theſe Principles are, that the WORD was from all Eternity in the Father, as being his Wiſdom, his Power, and his Counſel; that when he deſigned to create the World, he did, if I may ſo ſay, put him without him; and this is that which they call Generation: That it is by him that he created the World; and that he governs it; that it is he who made himſelf viſible to Men; who ſpake to the Patriarchs and the Prophets; who gave the Law; and who at laſt became Incarnate; that conformable to this Oeconomy, we acknowledge Three Perſons in God, which nevertheleſs make but one only God; that the WORD before he took Fleſh had not perfectly the Quality of the WORD, and that we may ſay, that he was begotten of the Father; That we ought to believe that the WORD deſcending from Heaven into the Womb of the Virgin *Mary*, took therein a Reaſonable Soul, and every thing belonging to human Nature, Sin only excepted, and all this in order to ſave Man, who fell by the Sin of *Adam*, and to render him Immortal, &c.

(*g*) *Several Fictions of the modern Greeks.*] Such as theſe following, that S. *Andrew* was Crucified upon an Olive Tree: That the Relicks of S. *John* were not found in his Sepulchre; that S. *Bartholomew* was Crucified with his Head downwards; that S. *Thomas* Preached among the *Magi*; that he was run through in four places with a Launce made of Deal in the City of *Salamis*, that *Thaddæus* preached the Goſpel in *Meſopotamia*; Things which are taken from the Fictions of the Modern Greeks, as from *Sophronius* and others.

We

We muſt ſay the ſame of a Book written much upon the like Subject, concerning the Seventy two Diſciples (*b*) of Jeſus Chriſt, which was in the Library of Cardinal *Sirletus*, which *Baronius* mentions in his Notes upon the Martyrology upon the Ninth Day of *April*. *Hippolitus.*

Photius had read *Hippolitus*'s Book againſt the Hereticks, and gives us this Account of it. 'I have 'read the little Book of *Hippolitus*, who was Diſciple of S. *Irenæus*, againſt Two and Thirty Here- 'ſies: He begins with the *Doſitheans*, and he goes on as far as *Noetus* and the *Noetians*. He ſays that 'all theſe Hereſies have been confuted by S. *Irenæus*, and that he has Collected in this little Book, the 'Reaſonings and Arguments of this Father. His Diſcourſe is clear and ſerious, and he ſays nothing but 'what is to the purpoſe, though he has not all the Beauties of the *Attick* Style. He affirms ſome things 'which are not true, and among others, that the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews* was not written by S. *Paul*. 'It is ſaid, that he made ſeveral Homilies to the People, as well as *Origen*, who was his Friend, and 'that he wrote ſeveral other Books. The ſame Author, in another Place, mentions the Commentary of *Hippolitus* upon *Daniel*. 'He ſays, That though he does not literally explain this Propher, 'yet he does not let ſlip any part of his Senſe, that is conſiderable, that he interprets things according to 'the manner of the Ancients, and not with that Exactneſs which has been ſince obſerved; but that he 'is not to be cenſured for that, becauſe it is not reaſonable to expect from thoſe who lay the Foun- 'dation of any Science, that they ſhould omit nothing that might be ſaid upon it; but on the contra- 'ry, we ought to commend them, becauſe they were the firſt Diſcoverers, for thoſe things which 'they firſt found out: That as for the reſt, *Hippolitus* was miſtaken, in pretending to fix the time of 'the End of the World, and of the coming of Antichriſt, which Chriſt would not diſcover to his 'Diſciples, even then when they deſired it of him very earneſtly. He pretended, *ſays he*, to fix it five 'hundred years after the Death of Chriſt, as if the World was to laſt but Six thouſand Years; which 'is too nice a Subtilty. His way of Writing is clear and plain, and very proper for a Commentary, 'though he departs from the Rules, and the Purity of the *Attick* Dialect. We have likewiſe a Ho- 'mily which he made concerning Jeſus Chriſt and Antichriſt, wherein, though he follows the ſame 'way of Writing, yet he is more plain, and favours more of Antiquity. And theſe Paſſages of *Photius*, do not only diſcover the Subject of thoſe Works of *Hippolitus* which he had read, but alſo the Style and Character of the Author.

The Paſchal Cycle for Sixteen Years, compoſed by *Hippolitus*, whereof *Anatolius*, *Euſebius*, S. *Jerom* and *Victorius* have made mention, was found round about a Marble Statue that was dug out of the Ground in the Year 1551, near *Rome* (*i*), and carried into the *Vatican* Library; and afterwards it there are two Cycles, for Eight Years each; on the Right ſide is that of the 14 Days of the Moons, and on the Left, that for the Sundays. On the ſide of this Cycle, there is a Catalogue of *Hippolitus*'s Works, which we have already ſet down. This Canon is the moſt ancient Paſchal Cycle that we have.

(*b*) *Concerning the Seventy two Diſciples.*] This is manifeſtly the ſame with the falſe *Dorotheus*.

(*i*) *Near* Rome.] Near the Church of S. *Laurence*, in a Place where there was in all probability a Chappel to *Hippolitus*. The Statue is of Marble, repreſenting *Hippolitus* ſitting in a Chair, on the Sides of which,

[The Catalogue of *Hippolitus*'s Works, taken from the Roman Marble, is ſo very uncorrect in Monſieur *Du Pin*, that I ſhall tranſlate it anew from the Greek Copy, with ſome few Notes upon it to explain it.]

Commentaries upon the Pſalms.
Of the Witch of Endor.
Commentaries upon the Goſpel according to S. John, *and the Revelations.*
Of Spiritual Gifts.
Apoſtolical Tradition.
Chronicles; or Chronological Accounts of Time (a).
Againſt the Greeks, *and againſt* Plato, *or concerning the Univerſe.*
An Exhortation to Severina (b).
A Demonſtration of the Time of Eaſter, *as it is in the Table.*
Odes upon all the Scriptures (c).
Of God and the Reſurrection of the Fleſh.
Of Good, and whence cometh Evil.

(a) *Accounts of Time.*] This Dr. *Cave* joyns with the next Line, and ſo makes but one Title thus, *Chronicles to the Greeks*: But as the Marble lies in *Gruter*, (from whom Dr. *Cave* tranſcribed it) Χρονικῶν, makes one Line, and πρὸς Ἕλληνας another; now for the moſt part one Line makes a whole Title, where the Conjugation καὶ does not connect more together, eſpecially where a compleat Senſe can be made by ſuch a Diviſion: But here the καὶ πρὸς Πλάτωνα muſt be joyned with πρὸς Ἕλληνας, and a Diſcourſe upon a Philoſophical Subject, concerning the Univerſe againſt *Plato* and other Greek Philoſophers, has no great Coherence with a Chronology.

(b) Severina.] This according to Monſieur *le Moyne* is faulty, and ſhould be read πρὸς Σεβῆρον Αὐ, *to* Severa Auguſta; and his Reaſon is, becauſe *Theodoret* ſpeaks of a Letter written by this *Hippolitus to a certain Queen* Πρὸς βασιλίδα τινα. This Reaſon is not ſufficient to me, for Inſcriptions upon Marbles, when drawn by skilful Men, are Copyed by the Graver with more Care than ordinary Books by Tranſcribers: And becauſe we cannot tell who this *Severina* was, therefore it does not follow, either that *Hippolitus* did not write ſuch a Letter to her; or that he might not write another to the Empreſs, which *Theodoret* might have ſeen and quoted.

(c) *All the Scriptures.*] This *Du Pin* has rightly tranſlated; *Le Moyne* tells us, that it ſhould be πάσας τὰς αἱρέσεις, *upon all Hereſies*. Hereſies ſeem to be as improper things to write Hymns upon, as one would wiſh. But the Hiſtorical Parts of Scripture will afford Matter enough for the loftieſt Genius to work upon. Dr. *Cave* does deſervedly throw aſide *Le Moyne*'s Conjecture, though it ſeems ſtrange that he ſhould not diſcern that the received Reading was true.

Scaliger's Conjecture of the two firſt Lines, which are almoſt all eaten away, is too raſh; he takes the Letters ιας and νιας to be parts of the Words ψαλμος μετανοιας, from whence he concludes, that *Hippolitus* wrote Commentaries upon the Seven Penitential Pſalms; but (as Dr. *Cave* obſerves, that Word applied to thoſe Pſalms was unknown in that Age, and what to put in the room of it, is hard to aſſign, and ſo I left it out.

was

Hippolitus. was publiſhed by *Gruter*, by *Scaliger*, and by *Bucherius*; who cauſed it to be Printed, together with the Cycle of *Victorius* of *Aquitain*, in the Year 1633. *Mabillon* obſerves in his *Voyage into* Italy, that he ſaw at *Rome* in Cardinal *Chigy*'s Library, an Ancient Greek Manuſcript, containing the four great Prophets, wherein there is a Commentary of *Hippolitus* upon the Dream of *Nebuchadnezor*.

Iter Italicum.

Laſtly, *Theodoret* quotes and produces ſome conſiderable Fragments of *Hippolitus*, (*k*) concerning the Incarnation of Jeſus Chriſt, taken from ſeveral of his Homilies, and from his other Treatiſes upon the Holy Scriptures.

(*k*) *Laſtly*, Theodoret *relates ſome conſiderable Fragments of* Hippolitus.] He cites ſome from an Oration upon theſe Words of *Iſaiah*, *Dominus paſcit me*, &c. from his Sermon upon *Hannah* and *Elkanah*, from a Homily upon the beginning of *Iſaiah*, from a Book concerning the Diſtribution of Talents; and laſtly, From a Letter to a Queen (which ſome believe to be *Mammea*, the Mother of *Alexander*, others, one called *Severa*) whoſe Name is mentioned in a Catalogue of this Author's Works, which was on the ſide of his Statue; from an Oration upon *Canticles*, from an Interpretation of the Second *Pſalm*, and from the Three and twentieth Oration upon the Two Thieves. See the Tradition related by *Theodoret* at the end of his Three Dialogues.

GEMINIANUS *or* GEMINUS.

Gemminianus or *Geminus.*

WE joyn *Geminianus*, or *Geminus* (*a*), a Prieſt of *Antioch* to *Hippolitus* the Martyr, becauſe they both flouriſht under the Reign of *Alexander*, and becauſe he is ſpoken of in *Euſebius*'s *Chronicon* in the ſame Place, where *Hippolitus* is mentioned. We know nothing of the Works of this Author. Only S. *Jerom* aſſures us, that he left behind him ſome Pieces, which were Monuments of his Parts.

(*a*) Geminianus *or* Geminus] He is called by *Euſebius* in his *Chronicon Geminianus*; and by S. *Jerom*, in his Catalogue of Eccleſiaſtical Writers, *Geminus*.

ALEXANDER.

Alexander.

A *Lexander*, a Biſhop in *Cappadocia*, being come to *Jeruſalem*, to viſit the Holy Places that are there, when *Narciſſus*, who governed that Church, was not capable himſelf alone, by reaſon of his great Age, to diſcharge all the Duties of the Epiſcopal Office; the *Chriſtians* of that City retained *Alexander*, and made him his Coadjutor, by the Conſent of the Biſhops of the neighbouring Churches. It is ſaid that they had a Revelation, and heard a Voice, adviſing them to chuſe him Biſhop; and indeed there needed nothing leſs than a Miracle, to authorize an Election ſo extraordinary as this (*a*) and for which there had yet been no Precedent. He governed this Church joyntly with *Narciſſus*, as his Collegue. See what he ſays of it at the Concluſion of a Letter, written to the *Antinoites*. 'Narciſſus, who held before me the Epiſcopal See, and who is now united '(*b*), with me in Prayers, being a Hundred and ſixteen Years old, ſends you Greeting, and exhorts 'you to be all of one and the ſame Mind.

Alexander being in Priſon in the Time of the Perſecution under *Severus*, wrote likewiſe a Letter to thoſe of *Antioch*, wherein he Congratulates them upon the Ordination of *Aſclepiades*, who ſucceeded *Serapion* in that See: He ſent this Letter by *Clemens*, as it is believed of *Alexandria* (*c*). Beſides, he wrote a Letter to *Origen*, of which *Euſebius* recites a Fragment in the 14th Chapter of the 6th Book of his Hiſtory, where he ſays, that he was a Friend of *Pantænus*, and of *Clement* of *Alexandria*, and that theſe Men made him acquainted with *Origen*. And laſt of all, he ſent a Letter to *Demetrius*, Biſhop of *Alexandria*, which he wrote along with *Theoctriſtus*, Biſhop of *Cæſarea*, in favour of *Origen*, wherein he proves by ſeveral Examples, that Biſhops may invite thoſe that are proper for inſtructing the People, to Preach in their Preſence: He wrote beſides ſeveral other Letters, of which we have nothing remaining. He ſuffered Martyrdom at *Cæſarea* in the time of the Perſecution, under the Emperor *Decius*.

(*a*) *An Election ſo extraordinary as this.*] There were two things in this Ordination which were New, and contrary to the Laws of the Church. The firſt was the Tranſlation of a Biſhop to another See: The Second, the making a Coadjutor to a Biſhop whilſt living.

(*b*) *Who is now united.*] It appears by this, that *Alexander* was not only Coadjutor, but that he alone had the Care of the Church, that *Narciſſus* did not concern himſelf with any thing, and that he had no more than barely the Honour.

(*c*) *As it is believed of* Alexandria.] S. *Jerom* believes that it was S. *Clement* of *Alexandria*, and this may very well be; For he lived 'till this time, and he was intimately acquainted with *Alexander*, to whom he Dedicated a Book concerning the Eccleſiaſtical Rule. *Euſebius*, Lib. 6. cap. 13.

JULIUS AFRICANUS.

Julius A-fricanus.

Julius Africanus, who was of *Paleſtine* (*a*), tho' older than *Origen* (*b*), is believed to have been the Diſciple of *Heraclas*, becauſe being drawn by his Reputation, he came to *Alexandria* to confer with him (*c*). He was deputed by the Emperor *Alexander* (*d*), to cauſe the City of *Emmanus* to be repaired, which was afterwards called *Nicopolis*. He particularly applied himſelf to Chronology and Hiſtory, and compoſed an exact Chronicle (*e*), divided into five Books, from the Beginning of the World, to the Third Year of the Reign of *Heliogabalus* (*f*), wherein he gave a brief Account of the moſt remarkable Accidents from the beginning of the World, to the time of Jeſus Chriſt, and related in few Words all that had happened ſince Chriſt's Time, to that wherein he wrote. We have not this famous Work at preſent under *Africanus*'s Name. But *Euſebius* has inſerted it almoſt entire in his *Chronicon*, altering and adding ſome few things, and Correcting ſome of his Miſtakes. We have ſtill ſome of his Fragments in two Works, publiſht by *Scaliger*, of which one is Latin, and is called *Chronological Extracts*, taken out of *Euſebius* and *Africanus*; and the other is Greek, and Entituled, *A Collection of Hiſtories*.

Beſides this Chronicle, he wrote two Letters upon two important Queſtions relating to the Scripture: The firſt directed to *Ariſtides*, was written to reconcile that ſeeming Contradiction which is found in the Account given of the Genealogy of Jeſus Chriſt by S. *Luke* and S. *Matthew*. *Euſebius* gives us a conſiderable part of this Letter, in the Firſt Chapter of the Seventh Book of his Hiſtory. And in order to reconcile this Difference, he has recourſe to that Law of Adoption, that took Place among the Jews, and which obliged the Brothers to Marry their Brothers Wives who died without Children. He ſays then, that *Matthan*, who deſcended from *David* by *Solomon*, married a Wife named *Eſtha*, by whom he had *Jacob*: But that after the Death of *Matthan*, this ſame Woman married *Melchi* (he ſhould have ſaid *Matthat*) who deſcended from *David* by *Nathan*, of whom ſhe had a Son named *Heli*, and that ſo *Heli* and *Jacob* were Brothers by the Mother's-ſide; and that *Heli* dying without Children, *Jacob* was obliged to marry his Widow, of whom he had *Joſeph* the Huſband of *Mary*, who was by conſequence natural Son to *Jacob*, and the Son of *Heli* according to the Law; and deſcended from *Solomon* by *Jacob*, and from *Nathan* by *Heli*. This way of reconciling the Evangeliſts, as to the Genealogy of Jeſus Chriſt, is very eaſie, and has hardly any Difficulty in it; but that every Body may readily comprehend it, we ſhall repreſent it in the following Table.

(*a*) *Who was of* Paleſtine.] Some have confounded him with *Sextus Africanus* of *Lybia*; but this is an Error: For our Author was of *Paleſtine*, and lived there, whereas the other was only of *Lybia*.

(*b*) *Older than* Origen.] In the Letter which he wrote to *Origen*, he calls him his Son, and he continues his Chronicle no farther than to the Time of *Heliogabalus*, which ſhews that he was older than *Origen*.

(*c*) *To confer with him.*] *Heraclas* was undoubtedly Biſhop of *Alexandria*, when he came into this City. He ſays as much himſelf in his Chronicle, according to the Relation of *Euſebius*, Lib. 6. Cap. 3. and of *Bede de Sex. æt.* P. 86. of *Ado*, and others.

(*d*) *By the Emperor* Alexander.] This Embaſſy was under *Alexander* the Son of *Mammea*, and not under *Heliogabalus*. That which made *Euſebius* miſtake, is becauſe *Africanus*'s Chronicle went no farther than the time of *Heliogabalus*.

(*e*) *And compoſed an exact Chronicle.*] *Euſebius* gives it the Name of *a Chronography*, and S. *Jerom* ſtyles it *a Hiſtory of the Times*: *Photius* and *Bede* call it a *Chronicle*. It contained the Origin and Succeſſion of all the Monarchies and Commonwealths, and he annext to the end thereof, a kind of Table, called a *Canon*, wherein he diſpoſed under every Year, what he had before obſerved Succeſſively. S. *Baſil* cites a Paſſage from thence, relating to the Divinity of the Holy Ghoſt, in the 29th Chapter of his Book, *de Spiritu Sancto*.

(*f*) *The Reign of* Heliogabalus.] *Photius*, who had ſeen it, ſays that his Chronicle went no farther than the Reign of *Macrinus*. But the Computation of Years, and a Fragment related by *Scaliger*, clearly ſhew, that he continued it to the Time of *Heliogabalus*.

Julius Africanus.

DAVID

SOLOMON, *And his Deſcendents, related by S.* Matthew.		NATHAN, *And his Deſcendents, related by S.* Luke.
MATTHAN, *The firſt Husband.*	ESTHA, *The Wife of both.*	MELCHI, *Or rather* MATTHAT, *The Second Husband.*
JACOB, *The Son of* Matthan, *the firſt Husband.*	THEIR COMMON WIFE, *Whoſe Name we do not know, Firſt married to* Heli, *of whom ſhe had no Children, and afterwards to* Jacob, *his Brother.*	HELI.
The Natural Son of Jacob.	JOSEPH.	*The Son of* Heli, *according to the Law.*

The Second Letter of *Africanus*, relating to the Hiſtory of *Suſanna*, was written to *Origen*, who had in a Conference cited the Prophet *Daniel*, to vindicate the Innocence of *Suſanna*. *Africanus* writes to him, that he admires that he does not look upon this Part of *Daniel* as Fictitious, and that this whole Hiſtory is no more than a Fable. The Reaſons which he brings for this Opinion, are very Learned and Ingenious, and there was a Neceſſity for ſo great a Man as *Origen* to anſwer him; and yet it ſeems as if *Africanus* wrote to him, rather to be inſtructed in the Truth, than with any Deſign of Diſputing againſt him.

There is likewiſe attributed to this Author, a Work Entituled, *The Ceſti*, which is cited under his Name, not only by *Suidas*, and *Sincellus*; but likewiſe by *Photius*, and even by *Euſebius*, in the Sixth Book, Chap. 31, of his Hiſtory: If that Paſſage, which is not to be found in *Ruffinus*'s Verſion, nor in S. *Jerom*, be not foiſted in. But it is more likely that this is the Work of another *Africanus* (*g*). We do not know whether he, of whom we ſpeak, wrote any thing elſe, nor when he died.

(*g*) *Is the Work of another* Africanus.] Theſe Books, Entituled *Ceſti*, were Diſcourſes containing nothing but Prophane Learning, they were ſo called *à Ceſto Veneris*: They treated of Herbs, and particularly of thoſe that had any Faculty in procuring Love. The Author of this Book was of *Lybia*; he called himſelf *Sextus Africanus*, or rather *Africanus Ceſtus*. He was probably a Heathen, as the Title, and the Subject of this Work ſufficiently ſhew. There is a Book attributed to one *Africanus*, cited by *Politian*, under the Name of *Ceſtus*, being a Manuſcript in the King's Library, but not the ſame which *Photius* ſpeaks of: It was lately publiſhed.

MINUTIUS FELIX.

Minutius Felix.

Minutius Felix, a famous Lawyer at *Rome*, (*a*) who lived in the beginning of the Third Century (*b*), wrote an excellent Dialogue, Entituled *Octavius*, in defence of the Chriſtian Religion. 'Tis a Conference between a Chriſtian, whom he calls *Octavius*, (*c*) and a Heathen named *Cecilius*, where *Minutius* ſits at Judge. *Cecilius* ſpeaks firſt againſt the Chriſtian Religion, and begins by laying down this Maxim, That every thing is uncertain and doubt-

(*a*) *A Lawyer at* Rome.] Not only *Lactantius* and S. *Hierom* aſſure us that he was of this Profeſſion; but this likewiſe appears by the beginning of his Dialogue, where he ſays, That it being Vacation Time, he had no Buſineſs at the Hall.

(*b*) *In the beginning of the Third Century.*] The Ancients do not fix preciſely the time wherein he lived. S. *Hierom*, in his Catalogue, wherein he keeps the Order of Time, places him between *Tertullian* and S. *Cyprian*. It is evident that *Minutius* has taken ſeveral Thoughts from *Tertullian*, and that S. *Cyprian*, in his Book *Of the Vanity of Idols*, has tranſcribed in ſeveral Places the Words of *Minutius*. This makes it probable that he was an *African*, and his Style ſavours a little of *Africa*.

(*c*) *Octavius.*] He is alſo called *Januarius*, and *Cecilius* is named *Natalis*; and *Minutius Felix*, *Marcus*. It would be rather to divine, than to believe, that theſe were the *Januarius* and *Natalis*, Biſhops of *Africa*, who lived in S. *Cyprian*'s time: It would have been more likely that *Octavius* and *Cecilius* were imaginary Names in the Dialogue, if we had not been told that they are their proper Names.

ful,

ful, and that therefore it is a great piece of Rashness, especially in the Christians, who are an ignorant and stupid sort of People, to pretend to establish their Opinions as certain and infallible Truths: That there being no Providence that governs the World, and all things being dubious, it is the best way to stick to the Religion of our Ancestors. That the *Roman Empire* was first established, and afterwards arrived to its present Height by the Religion of the Gods; that they never contemned the Omens and Presages of the Sooth-sayers, without repenting of it; and that their Oracles certainly foretold things that were really to come to pass. Afterwards he attacks the Religion of the Christians, and in particular, he accuses them of worshipping an Asses Head, adoring Crosses, and other things which were yet more dishonourable. He upbraids them for those Crimes of which the Heathens themselves were justly accused; to wit, the Murthering of Children, the Committing of Incests. He reprehends in them as a Crime, that excessive Love which they had for one another. He finds fault with them, because they had no Temples, Altars nor Statues. He tells them, that they can neither see themselves, nor shew to others that God whom they adore; that they feign that he sees all things, but that it is impossible that he should be able to take care of every particular thing, if he has the Charge of the whole Universe lying upon him. He pretends that it was to no purpose that the Jews adored and honoured this God: He scoffs at the Hopes of the Christians. He looks upon the Resurrection, Hell and Heaven to be Fables, like those of the Poets. He says, that Men being necessarily Good or Evil, 'tis ridiculous to believe that God will punish or reward them for their Actions. He examines the Condition of the Christians in this Life, which is to be Poor, Ignorant, subject to Diseases, Persecuted, exposed continually to Racks and Tortures: 'Which shews, *says he*, that their God 'either cannot, or will not relieve them, and by consequence that he is Impotent or Malicious. That on the contrary, the *Romans*, who do not adore the God of the *Christians*, are not only Powerful, and Lords of the whole World; but they likewise enjoy all those Pleasures, from which the Christians are forced to abstain. He concludes by advising the *Christians* not to seek any more after Heavenly Things, and not to flatter themselves vainly with the Knowledge of them; maintaining that all things being uncertain and doubtful, it is better to suspend our Judgments, than to judge rashly, for fear of falling into Superstition, or utterly destroying all Religion. After some Reflexions of *Minutius Felix*, *Octavius* answering *Cecilius*'s Discourse, observes how he has argued after a very inconstant manner, sometimes admitting a Deity, and sometimes seeming to doubt thereof. 'Which he has not 'done, *says he*, out of any Craft or Cunning, this sort of Artifice not suiting with his Candid and Frank 'Temper; but that has happened to him which usually happens to a Man who is Ignorant of the 'Way, when he sees several Paths, he stands in suspence, not daring to chuse any, and not being able 'to follow them all. In like manner, as he adds, he who has no certain Knowledge of the Truth, is 'always in doubt, and suffers himself to be led by the first Suspicion, without being able to stop him-'self. He afterwards reprehends all the Reasonings of *Cecilius*, and he answers every one in particular. After having shewn that Poverty and Ignorance, which was upbraided to the *Christians*, could be no ways prejudicial to the Truth; he proves the Divine Providence, by the Order and Beauty which is seen in the Universe, and by the admirable Perfections of all the Creatures. And he shews, that it could be no other than God, who has created all things, governing them by his WORD, ruling them by his Wisdom, and bringing them to perfection by his Power: That he is not to be seen, because he is more subtil than the Sight: That he is not to be comprehended, because he is greater than all the Senses: That he is infinite and immense: That the Bounds of our Understanding are by much too shallow to have a perfect Knowledge of him: That it is only he who comprehends himself; that it is impossible to give him a Name suitable to his Perfections: And yet that all Men do naturally know him: That the People stretching out their Hands to Heaven, invoke only this God, and that the Prophets and Philosophers have acknowledged him. He afterwards shews, that the Antiquity of their Fables ought not to give them any Authority: That they have not only so much as the least appearance of Truth, but that they are Impertinent and Ridiculous, and that he must be void of common Sense, who gives any Credit to them: That we are not to attribute the Establishment nor Encrease of the Empire, to the Religion of the *Romans*, since it was founded at first by Parricide, and by the Rapes of strange Women, and that it afterwards grew to its Greatness by Uncleanness, by Sacriledge, and by unjust Wars: That very often their Commanders contemned the Auguries; and that nevertheless they were successful in what they undertook: That the Answers of their Oracles were very often false and ambiguous, and that we are not to wonder, if by a great Chance they sometimes hit: That the Dæmons, who are impure Spirits, made use of these Superstitions to destroy Mankind; and to set them at a greater Distance from God, after they were already lost by their Vices and disorderly Desires: That 'tis these Spirits who answer in their Statues, who possess Men, and agitate them so furiously; but being conjured by the Name of the only true God, they are obliged to go out of the Bodies of those whom they have tormented. He afterwards confutes the Calumnies wherewith they asperst the *Christians*: He says, That if it were true, they ought not to be compelled to deny their Religion, but rather to own those Incests, Impieties and Murders wherewith they were accused: That the *Christians* are too well instructed, to adore an Asses Head, and too Chast, to commit Uncleanness in the Celebration of their Mysteries: But that there is a Religion among the Heathens, in which they worshipped Beasts, and committed execrable Villanies without Punishment; that they are not the *Christians*, but the Heathens, who place their Hopes in mortal Men, and in inanimate Statues, and who were frequently guilty of Murders and Incests: That the *Christians* do neither adore nor desire Crosses, and that they are so far from shedding Man's Blood, that they dare not so much as to eat that of Beasts: That they are modest and reserved, not only in Body but in Mind: That they com-

Minutius Felix.

Minutius Felix.

monly Marry but once, and that they have no other Deſign in their Marriage, but the having of Children: That their Repaſts are not only very Chaſt, but alſo very Sober: That there are ſeveral *Chriſtians* who preſerve a perpetual Continency, and yet without any Vanity upon that Account: That though they refuſe to bear any Offices, yet they are not for all that of the Scum of the People: That their Number encreaſes continually, which is a certain ſign of their Virtue: That they do not diſtinguiſh themſelves from others by any outward Mark, but by their Innocence and Modeſty: That they love one another, and call one another Brethren, becauſe they have all one and the ſame God for their Father: That they have neither Statues, nor Altars, nor Temples, becauſe the Majeſty of God cannot be repreſented by Images, nor encloſed in Houſes built by the Hands of Men, and that it is better to conſecrate our Mind, and our Heart as his Temple. *Nonne melius in noſtra dedicandus eſt mente, in noſtro Conſecrandus Corpore?* That the Sacrifices and Victims which he requires, and which we ought to offer up to him, are Juſtice, Purity and Innocence: That though God be inviſible, yet he is diſcovered by his Omnipotence: That he knows all things, and nothing can be concealed from him: That he protected the Jews ſo long as they honoured him; and 'twas only for their Sins that they have drawn upon themſelves his Anger and Vengeance. After having thus diſcourſed of the Object of the Chriſtian Worſhip, he goes on to the Proof of the other Points of their Doctrin. He ſhews, That the Learned do agree, That the World ſhall have an End: That *Pythagoras* and *Plato* believed one part of the Reſurrection when they taught the Immortality of the Soul, and the *Metempſychoſis*: That it is not more difficult for God to raiſe up Men after their Death, than it was for him to produce them out of nothing: That all the Revolutions of Nature are as ſo many Images of the Reſurrection: That ſeveral had rather be annihilated for ever, than to riſe again to endure Eternal Torments; and that they were confirmed in their Opinion by the Impunity which they enjoyed in this Life: But that the Judgment of God will be by ſo much the more Rigorous, as it is ſlower in Puniſhing: That theſe Torments ſhall be exceſſive, and ſhall have neither End nor Bounds: That the Fire which ſhall burn the Body without conſuming it, ſhall nouriſh it (if I may ſo ſay) and make it to ſubſiſt to all Eternity: That it is ſufficient not to know God, to be Condemned to ſuffer theſe Pains, becauſe it is not a leſs Sin to be ignorant of him, than to offend him: But that the Heathens ſhall not be Puniſhed only for this Ignorance of God, they being guilty of ſeveral Crimes; that they cannot excuſe themſelves by alledging Deſtiny, ſince Man is a free Agent, and that Deſtiny is nothing elſe but the Execution of God's Decrees, which are regulated according to Men's Actions: That that Poverty which is ſo frequent among the Chriſtians, makes for their Glory; that the Evils and Perſecutions which they ſuffered, are no Proof that God has forſaken them, but that he tries and purifies them: That it is a Spectacle well becoming God, to behold a Chriſtian ſtoutly contending with Pain, ſtanding firm and ſtedfaſt in the midſt of Torments, inſulting over his Executioners and Judges, freely reſiſting even Princes and Emperors, and yielding only to God. 'You exalt, *ſays he*, to the Skies, a '*Scevola*, who after having miſſed of his Aim in killing a King, voluntarily loſt his Hand, and ſaved 'his Life by this couragious Action. But how many Perſons are there among us, who have ſuffered 'without Complaining, not only their Hand, but their whole Body to be burnt, though they could 'have delivered themſelves from theſe Torments, had they pleaſed? What do I ſay? Even our Sons 'and our Daughters laugh at your Gibbets, at your wild Beaſts, and at all your Puniſhments. And 'ought not this to convince you, that it is impoſſible that they would have endured theſe Pains to no 'purpoſe; or that they could be able to ſuffer them without God's Aſſiſtance? And do not think 'that thoſe Perſons are happy, who being utterly ignorant of God, are loaded with Honours and 'Riches. Theſe are unfortunate Men, who are raiſed up, that their Downfal might be the greater, 'theſe are Victims which are fatened for the Sacrifice. For what ſolid Good can be had without 'God, ſince Death ſhews that all the reſt is no more than a Dream? This being ſo, a Chriſtian may 'indeed ſeem to be miſerable, but can never be really ſo: *Chriſtianus videri poteſt miſer, non poteſt eſſe.* He adds, that they abſtain from Pleaſures, from publick Sights, and from the Pomps of the World, becauſe all theſe things are contrary to good Manners, and that their Life is more unblameable than that of the Philoſophers, who ſeem to be wiſe by their Diſcourſes, and by their outward Appearance, but were by no means ſound at the Bottom.

After *Octavius* had thus anſwered all the Objections of *Cecilius*, the laſt acknowledges himſelf convinced by his Arguments: *I do not expect*, ſays he, *the Determination of our Arbitrator; we are equally victorious*, Octavius *triumphs over me, and I triumph over Error. I ſubmit my ſelf therefore to God, I acknowledge his Providence, and I do publickly declare, that the Religion of the Chriſtians, among the Number of whom I place my ſelf from this preſent, is the only way that diſcovers the Truth.*

This Dialogue is Elegant, the Expreſſions are Select, the Words proper, the Turn agreeable, the Reaſons are ſet forth to advantage, and beautified with a great deal of Learning. In a word, this ſmall Treatiſe ſhews, as *Lactantius* has obſerved, that *Minutius* had been a very excellent Defender of Religion, and of the Truth, had he entirely applied himſelf to this Study. But this is rather the Production of one who would divert himſelf from Buſineſs, than a Book written with great Aſſiduity and Diligence. He flouriſhes upon his Subject without treating of it thoroughly. He takes more pains in ſhewing how ridiculous the Opinions of the Heathens are, and in confuting them by their own Authors, than in explaining and proving the Doctrin of the Chriſtians. Beſides, he does not appear to be very well ſkilled in the Myſteries of Religion, and he ſeems to have believed, that the Soul ſhould die with the Body *(d)*.

(d) That the Soul ſhould die with the Body.] He ſays, That there is nothing after Death, as there was nothing before the Production; and that being made of nothing, it ſhall likewiſe be renewed of nothing.

This

This Discourse passed a long time for the Eighth Book of *Arnobius*; for it being found together with the seven Books of *Arnobius* in an ancient Manuscript of the *Vatican* Library, it was printed four times (*e*) under his Name, before any Body knew its true Author. The Learned Lawyer *Balduinus* was the first that found out this vulgar Error, and caused this little Treatise to be printed by it self in the Year 1560, at *Heidelberg*, with a learned Preface, wherein he restores it to its true Author. But though we owe to this famous Lawyer the Honour of having first made this Discovery; yet 23 Years after, *Ursinus* caused *Arnobius*'s Works to be printed at *Rome*, whether he had not seen *Balduinus*'s Edition, or whether he had a mind to attribute all the Honour of this Observation to himself, separated this Book of *Minutius* from those of *Arnobius*, without taking any notice that it had been done before, ascribing to himself by this means the whole Credit of the Discovery. Some time after, in the Year 1603. *Wowerius* caused it to be printed at *Basil* by *Frobenius*, with very useful Notes, for the understanding of this Author. In 1610, it was printed at *Francfort* in *Octavo*, according to *Balduinus*'s Edition. Afterwards *Elmenhorstius* caused it to be printed at *Hambourg* with some new Observations in the Year 1612. adjoining thereunto the Preface of *Balduinus*. The Year following, *Heraldus* the Lawyer published at *Paris* an Edition of *Minutius* in *Quarto*, which was more correct than the others. Lastly, *Rigaltius* reviling it very diligently from a Manuscript in the King's Library, being the same which was in the *Vatican*, put it forth in the Year 1643, with very learned and curious Notes; and it was re-printed at *Amsterdam* in 1645, together with *Julius Firmicus*. This Edition of *Rigaltius* was followed in the Edition of S. *Cyprian* of 1666. to whose Notes they have added part of those of *Wowerius*, *Elmenhorstius*, *Oizelius*, and those lately made by *Priorius*. Lastly, All these Notes were printed together with the Text, after the manner which they call *Variorum*, in the Year 1672. *Minutius Felix.*

S. *Hierom* says, That in his time there was a Book *concerning Destiny* attributed to *Minutius Felix*: But though this might be the Work of an elegant Author, yet it was not written with the same Style with this Dialogue. It is true, that *Cecilius* promises in this Dialogue, to treat more largely of Destiny upon another occasion: But to tell whether he did it or no, or whether this Treatise that was extant in S. *Hierom*'s Time, was the same which he promised, or rather, whether this Promise gave occasion to some other Author to forge a Discourse thereof under *Minutius*'s Name, are things which we cannot positively determine.

(*e*) *Four times.*] The first by *Sabeus*, according to the Manuscript of *Rome*, in the Year 1542. The second in *Germany* by *Gelenius*. The third in *Holland*, at *Leyden*, in the Year 1552. The fourth at *Basil*, by *Erasmus*, in 1560.

AMMONIUS.

AMmonius, a Christian Philosopher, the Master of *Plotinus* and *Origen* (*a*), flourished in *Alexandria* (*b*), where he publickly taught Philosopy in *Alexander Severus*'s Reign. *Porphyry* falsly accuses him for having quitted the Christian Religion, in which he had been educated: For it is certain, as *Eusebius* and S. *Hierom* observe, That he always continued stedfast in the Doctrin and Precepts of Christianity. 'Witness, says *Eusebius*, those excellent Works that he has left behind 'him, which are so many authentick Monuments of his Faith and his Ability; as the Book intituled, 'The *Agreement between* Moses *and* Jesus Christ, and all the other Pieces which may be found in the 'Hands of studious Persons. In the Number of these Works we may reckon a Gospel composed out of all the Four: Which was a kind of Harmony and Concord which he had drawn up with a great deal of Pains and Study, as is testified by *Eusebius* in his Epistle to *Carpianus*, placed at the beginning of his Canons upon the Evangelists. Which has given occasion to S. *Hierom* to affirm, That *Ammonius* writ Canons like those of *Eusebius*. But they were not, properly speaking, Canons which *Ammonius* composed; for the Canons were no more than *Indices* of the Places of the Gospels, which are contained in One, Two, Three or Four of the Evangelists; whereas *Ammonius*'s Harmony or Concord contained the entire Text of the Four Evangelists, which *Eusebius* made use of in making his Canons, which referred to this Concord, and were a Table to it. *Trithemius* likewise attributes Canons to *Ammonius*, but they are those of *Eusebius*. We have at present in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* an Harmony of the Four Evangelists, falsly attributed to *Tatianus* by *Victor* of *Capua*; which Cardinal *Baronius*, Father *Labbe*, and several other Learned Men do ascribe to *Ammonius*. It is certain, that this was not written by *Tatianus*, who retrenched the Genealogies of Jesus Christ, which are to be found in this Concord. It bears the Name of *An Harmony*, and it is ascribed in the Title to an *Alexandrian*, which made *Baronius* conjecture that it was written by this *Ammonius*, who was of *Alexandria*, and whose Works bore the Title of *An Harmony*. *Zacharias*, Bishop of *Chrysopolis*, who lived in the Twelfth Century, and made Commentaries upon *Ammonius*'s Harmony, has followed this Word for Word, which confirms *Baronius*'s Conjecture. *Ammonius.*

(*a*) *Master of* Plotinus *and* Origen.] *Porphyry* says, in *Plotinus*'s Life, That this Philosopher, when he was twenty years old, came to hear *Ammonius*; that he was his Disciple for eleven Years; and that he had another Disciple named *Origen*. But, as we shall observe elsewhere, this is a different Person from the famous *Origen*. Nevertheless, *Eusebius* assures us, That our *Origen* was likewise his Scholar, and it seems undeniable, and we must needs confess, that there were two *Origens*, who were Disciples to *Ammonius*.

(*b*) *Flourished in* Alexandria.] There was another *Ammonius*, a Philosopher likewise, who lived after the Council of *Chalcedon*. He was somewhat older than *Origen*, and a *Platonist*.

ORIGEN.

Origen.

ORigen (*a*) was born in the City of *Alexandria*, about the Year 185, from the Birth of *Chriſt*. (*b*) Beſides the Name of *Origen*, he had moreover that of *Adamantius*. (*c*) His Father, who was called *Leonidas*, educated him in the Faith of Jeſus Chriſt, and did not only cauſe him in his Youth to learn the politer Learning, with all the profane Sciences, but he particularly ordered him to apply himſelf to the underſtanding of the Holy Scripture, before any other kind of Learning, giving him every day ſome Portions thereof to learn and repeat. And it hapned very luckily, that the Son's Inclination exactly anſwered the Father's Deſign; for he purſued his Study with a moſt extraordinary Zeal and Fervency; and as he was endowed with a quick Apprehenſion, and very great Sagacity, he did not content himſelf with that Senſe which at firſt view preſented it ſelf, but he afterwards endeavoured to dive into the myſterious and allegorical Explication of the Sacred Books, and ſometimes would even puzzle his Father by asking him the meaning of ſome Paſſages of Scripture, which obliged this good Man ſeemingly to reprehend him, and to adviſe him not to ſoar above the reach of his Underſtanding, and to content himſelf with the moſt clear and natural ſenſe of the Scripture; though inwardly he was extreamly joyful, and returned Thanks unto God with all his Heart, for his great Mercy, in beſtowing on him ſuch a Son. But that theſe Opinions may not be attributed either to the blind Love of a Father for his Child, or to that Affection which *Euſebius*, who relates theſe things, had for *Origen*, it may be ſufficient to obſerve, That S. *Hierom*, even then when he wrote againſt *Origen*, with the greateſt Earneſtneſs, was obliged to acknowledge, that he had been an extraordinary Perſon from his very Infancy. *Magnus vir ab infantia*, Ep. 65. *ad Pammachium de erroribus Origenis.* When he was a little more advanced in Years, he had for his Maſter in Philoſophy, the famous *Ammonius* (*d*), the Chriſtian Philoſopher; and in Divinity, the learned S. *Clemens* of *Alexandria*. He was not above ſixteen or ſeventeen years of Age, when the Perſecution began at *Alexandria*, in the 10th Year of the Reign of *Severus*, and the 202d from the Birth of Chriſt. His Father being ſeized and impriſoned upon the account of the Chriſtian Faith, he would alſo have offered himſelf to the Perſecutors, out of the great Zeal he had to ſuffer Martyrdom; but his Mother oppoſed it very ſtiffly, and was even forced to hide his Cloaths, to prevent him from going abroad to put his Deſign in Execution: And being thus detained againſt his Will, he wrote a Letter to his Father to exhort him to Martyrdom, wherein he expreſſes himſelf thus: *Stand ſtedfaſt, my Father, and take care not to alter your Opinion upon our Account.* *Leonidas* being animated by his Son's Exhortation, couragiouſly ſuffered Martyrdom, and was beheaded within a little while after. His Goods having been confiſcated, *Origen* remaining with his Mother and Brethren, was reduced to extream Poverty; but a certain Lady of *Alexandria*, who was very rich, whether out of Compaſſion to his Miſery, or out of the reſpect ſhe had for him, afforded him all kind of Aſſiſtance, and even took him into her Houſe. There lived with her at the ſame time a famous Heretick of *Antioch*, whom ſhe had adopted for her Son, who held Conferences in her Houſe, where a great Number, not only of Hereticks, but alſo of Catholicks, were preſent. But though *Origen* was obliged of neceſſity to converſe with this Man, yet he would never hold Communion with him in Prayer, keeping exactly to the Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitutions, and teſtifying the Abhorrence that he had for the Doctrin of the Hereticks. However, in a little time he put himſelf into ſuch a Condition, as not to ſtand any longer in need of his Ladies Aſſiſtance; for applying himſelf entirely, after his Father's Death, to the Study of Human Learning, he taught Grammar, and by his Employment he got a ſufficient Competency to maintain himſelf.

(*a*) *Origen.*] There is not any Eccleſiaſtical Author, whoſe Life we have more exactly. *Euſebius*, who was his great Admirer, has deſcribed it very particularly. 'Tis from him that we have taken, without citing him, almoſt all that we have related concerning him. We muſt add thereunto S. *Hierom* in his Catalogue, and in ſeveral other Places. *Ruffinus* againſt S. *Hierom*; S. *Epiphanius* in the 64th Hereſie; *Photius* in the 118th Volume, where he has given an Abridgment of the Apology of *Pamphilus*, and what *Origen* ſays of himſelf, *Tom 6. in Matth. & alibi.* We have alſo made uſe of the Aſſiſtance of the Moderns, and particularly of that famous Work of *Huetius*, intituled *Origeniana*; of the Life of *Tertullian* and *Origen*, written in French by a worthy Man; which we ſay as much to do them Juſtice, as to take off from our ſelves the Imputation of being a Plagiary. [Our Author means Dr. *Allix*, Treaſurer of the Church of *Sarum*, who had a great Eſteem paid to him in his own Country for his extraordinary Learning, till the late Perſecution forced him hither for Relief.

(*b*) *Was born in the City of* Alexandria, *about the Year* 185 *from the Birth of Chriſt.*] S. *Epiphanius* ſays, That he was an *Alexandrian*. *Euſebius* ſays, That he was ſeventeen Years old at the time of the Perſecution of *Severus*, which was in the Year 202 from the Birth of Chriſt, and by conſequence he was born in 185.

(*c*) *He had moreover that of* Adamantius.] *Photius* believes that he had this Name by reaſon of the ſtrength of his Reaſonings. S. *Hierom* ſays, That he had it becauſe he reſiſted Errors like a Diamond. But this is only gueſſing: We may ſay the ſame of thoſe who ſeek for the Etymology of the Name of *Origen*, out of a needleſs Curioſity.

(*d*) *He had for his Maſter in Philoſophy, the famous* Ammonius.] There were two *Origens* Diſciples to *Ammonius*: The firſt of whom, *Porphyry* ſpeaks of in the Life of *Plotinus* and *Longinus*, who wrote nothing but a ſmall Treatiſe of Dæmons, and lived but to the Reign of *Gallienus*, and who was *Porphyry*'s Diſciple and Friend, which does not agree with our *Origen*, as has been obſerved by *Valeſius* and *Huetius*.

Whilſt

Whilst he followed this Profession, the Chair of the School at *Alexandria* becoming vacant by the Retreat of S. *Clement*, and by the Flight of all those who were dispersed by the Persecution, some of the Heathens, who were willing to be converted, made their Application to him, though he was not then above eighteen years old. The two first of his Disciples were *Plutarch*, and *Heraclas* his Brother, who succeeded *Demetrius* in the See of *Alexandria*. At length, the Reputation and Number of those that were converted by him increasing every Day more and more, *Demetrius*, Bishop of *Alexandria*, confirmed him in the Employment of *Catechist*, or *Professor of Sacred Learning* in the Church of *Alexandria*. When he saw himself setled in this Charge, he left off teaching Grammar, not being willing to depend upon any other Profession for his Subsistence: He sold all his Books that treated of human Learning, contenting himself with four *Oboli* a Day, which were allowed him by the Person who purchased them. *Origen.*

And then it was that he began to lead a very strict and severe Life, which contributed no less than his Learning to attract to him a great number of Disciples, notwithstanding the Fury of the Persecution, which being then begun at *Alexandria*, under the Government of *Lætus*, continued still with greater Violence under *Aquila* his Successor. He had several of his Disciples there, who suffered Martyrdom in the same Place; among others, *Plutarch*, *Serenus*, *Heraclides*, *Hero*, &c. And he was himself very often exposed to the Rage of the Heathens, when he went to the Assistance and Encouragement of the Martyrs. He then carried his Austerities so far, as to commit an Act of that Excess, as to be blamed even by those who have been his greatest Defenders, and which he himself afterwards condemned, though he might do it upon a good Motive (*e*), and out of an excessive Zeal for Charity. For as his Employment obliges him to be often with Women, whom he instructed as well as Men, that he might take away from the Heathens all pretence of Suspicion of any ill Conduct by reason of his Youth, he resolved with himself to execute to the Letter that Perfection which he was persuaded was proposed by Jesus Christ in these Words of the Gospel; *That there are some who make themselves Eunuchs for the Kingdom of Heaven.* He was willing to keep this Action private, and did all he could to conceal it from his Friends: But it was presently discovered; and being come to the Knowledge of *Demetrius*, Bishop of *Alexandria*, he commended his Zeal, and the Fervency of his Faith, and bad him not be discouraged upon that Account, but to continue more earnestly in the Instruction of the *Catechumens*.

In the mean time, *Origen*'s Reputation increased daily more and more, and procured him so great a Number of Disciples, that he himself alone was not able to manage it: And therefore he committed to his Friend *Heraclas* the Care of those who were to be instructed in the first Principles of Religion, reserving to himself such as were advanced to a higher Degree of Knowledge. It was about this time, in the beginning of the Reign of *Antoninus*, that he went to *Rome* (*f*), under the Pontificate of *Zephirinus*; and much about the same time, he likewise composed that great and famous Work, called the *Tetrapla*; which was a Bible, wherein by the side of the Hebrew Text, he had transcribed in different Columns, the Translation of the *Septuagint*; that of *Aquila*, that of *Symmachus*, and that of *Theodosion*, distinguished by Verses; and he added thereunto afterwards two other Versions without any Authors Name, and a Seventh only upon the *Psalms*, which he found at *Jerico* in a Barrel: And these Versions, with the *Hebrew*, written both in *Hebrew* and *Greek* Characters, make up that Book which is called the *Hexapla* (*g*). These Works mightily increased his Reputation, and drew from all Parts into *Alexandria* a great Number of learned Persons to converse with *Origen*, and to be instructed by him. *Ambrose* was one of this Number: He anathematized the Heresie of *Valentinus*, in which he had been engaged, to embrace the Orthodox Faith. *Origen* was afterwards obliged several times to leave *Alexandria*: For first he was sent for by an *Arabian* Prince, who wrote to *Demetrius*, Bishop of *Alexandria*, and to the Governour thereof, to send him to him to be instructed by him; and a little while after, this City being cruelly harrass'd by the War which the Emperor *Antoninus Caracalla* made against its Inhabitants for having affronted him by their Jears and Scoffs, *Origen* retired into *Palestine*; and being come to settle in the City of *Cæsarea*, the Bishops of that Province desired him to expound publickly the Scripture in that Church, and to instruct the People in their Presence, though he was not yet a Priest; to which Request of theirs he complied. Now whether *Demetrius* envied him this Honour, or whether he was persuaded that they had violated the Rules of the Church, he wrote to these Prelates, telling them, That it was a thing unheard of, and that it had been never practised till then, that Lay-men should Preach in the Presence of Bishops. But *Alexander* of *Jerusalem*, and *Theoctistus* of *Cæsarea*, writing back to him, proved by several Instances, That this had been often put in Practice. In the mean time, *Demetrius* had written to *Origen* to come home; and having also sent some Deacons to press his Return, he was obliged to betake himself again to his first

(*e*) *And which he himself afterwards condemned, though he might do it upon a good Motive.*] *Eusebius*, his great Advocate, speaks of it in such a manner as shews he was ashamed of it. The Passages where *Origen* himself has condemned it, are in the 15th Sermon upon S. *Matthew*, Chap. 19. Ver 12. and against *Celsus*, Book 7. We do not know whether he made use of Iron, or of some particular Simple; nor is it any great matter if we did know it.

(*f*) *In the beginning of the Reign of* Antoninus, *that he went to* Rome.] *Baronius* places this Voyage under *Heliogabalus*, and says that *Origen* was sent for to *Rome* by *Mammæa*; but he is mistaken, for *Mammæa* caused him to come to *Antioch*, and not to *Rome*.

(*g*) *That Work which is called the* Hexapla.] See *Valesius* upon *Eusebius*, where he proves that the *Hexapla* do comprehend six entire Versions, and that the seventh was only upon the *Psalms*. *Eusebius* writes, that they were composed at this time. S. *Epiphanius* believes that they were made at *Tyre*. As they are great Works, and tedious to compose, 'tis likely that he began them then, and finished them afterwards.

Employ-

Origen.

Employment. Some time after, he was again diverted from it by Order of the Princess *Mammæa*, who caused him to come to *Antioch*, that she might see, and discourse with him: But staying with her but a little while, he returned to *Alexandria*, and fell again to work upon the Holy Scripture, with the Assistance of his Friend *Ambrose*, who furnished him with Copyers. He continued there till the Year 228, when he departed from thence with Letters of Recommendation from his Bishop, to go into *Achaia* about some Ecclesiastical Affairs (*b*). It was in this Voyage, as he passed through *Palestine*, that he was ordained Priest by the Bishops of this Province, being 42 years old. This Ordination of *Origen* by Foreign Bishops extreamly incensed his Diocesan *Demetrius* against him, it having been done without his Permission. He wrote every where Letters against him, upbraiding him for the Action which he had committed in his Youth. However, *Origen* returned to *Alexandria*, where he continued to write his Commentaries upon the Sacred Scripture. It was then that he published his five Books of Commentaries upon the Gospel of S. *John*, eight Books upon *Genesis*, Commentaries upon the first *Five and twenty Psalms*, and upon the *Lamentations of Jeremiah*; his Books *de Principiis*, and his *Stromata*.

All this while the Bishop of *Alexandria* was not at all appeased, but continued to persecute him: And in a Council which he assembled in the Year 231. it was ordained, That *Origen* should go out of *Alexandria*; that he should not be permitted to teach there any longer, nor so much as to live there; but that nevertheless he should not be deprived of his Dignity of Priesthood. *Origen* being banished from *Alexandria*, retired to *Cæsarea*, his ordinary Place of Refuge, where he was very well received by *Theoctistus*, Bishop of that City, and by *Alexander*, Bishop of *Jerusalem*, who undertook to defend him, and commissioned him to expound publickly the Scripture, hearing him as if he had been their Master. But *Demetrius* not being satisfied with the first Judgment given against *Origen*, accused him in a Council of the Bishops of *Egypt* (*i*), and having caused him to be Deposed, and even to be Excommunicated, according to S. *Hierom*, wrote at the same time to all Parts against him, to procure his being thrust out of the Communion of the Catholick Church. For when once a Priest was Excommunicated, and deposed by his Bishop by the Consent of the Bishops of the Province, he could not be any longer received in any Church. There was no need of examining whether it was justly or unjustly that he had been condemned in his Province. So that it is no wonder if all the Bishops of the World, excepting those of *Palestine*, *Arabia*, *Phœnicia* and *Achaia*, who were particularly acquainted with *Origen*, and with whom he had a most familiar Intimacy, should consent to his Condemnation; and if *Rome* it self, *having assembled its Senate against him*, says S. *Hierom*, that is to say, its Clergy, did condemn him after the Example of his own Bishop. *We believe*, says S. *Augustin*, upon a Subject almost like this, *whatsoever we are informed of by Letters from a Council, and we must not do otherwise.* For those who had not any particular Knowledge of *Origen*, ought to believe him guilty; and those who knew him, that they might not violate that Order of Discipline, ought to consent to his Excommunication, after it was once signified to them by his own Bishop. And so it was that *Marcion* being excommunicated by his Father, and his Bishop, and being come to *Rome*, desiring to be received there into Communion, received this Answer from the Clergy of that Church: *We cannot receive you, without the Consent of your Father; for as there is in the Church but one and the same Faith, so there ought to be therein but one and the same Spirit, and one and the same Discipline.* Therefore, by a great Number of Canons and Ecclesiastical Constitutions, it was absolutely prohibited to any Bishop whatever, *and even to the Bishop of* Rome *himself*, to receive into Communion those Priests who had been Excommunicated by their Bishops upon any Pretence whatever. Nevertheless *Origen* found, as we have said, some Protectors, especially in *Palestine*, where he continued to explain the Scripture at *Cæsarea* with great Reputation, both in the Life-time, and after the Death of *Demetrius*, who lived not long after he had condemned *Origen*. All sorts of Persons, not only from that Province, but even from remote Countries, came to be his Disciples. The most famous were, *Gregory*, Sirnamed afterwards *Thaumaturgus*, who was Bishop of *Neocæsarea*, and his Brother *Athenodorus*. But though after *Demetrius*'s Death, the Persecution which he had raised against *Origen* abated a little, yet he was always looked upon as a Person Excommunicated by all the *Egyptians*, and the Sentence which was given against him by *Demetrius* continued under his Successors (*l*), *Heraclas* and *Dionysius*, though the first had been *Origen*'s Disciple, and the second had a great Esteem for him. In this time he went on with his Commentaries upon S. *John*, and began to compose some upon *Ezekiel* and *Isaiah*.

(*b*) *About some Ecclesiastical Affairs.*] This Business was without doubt to confute Heresies which were at that time very numerous in *Achaia*, as S. *Hierom* and *Ruffinus* relate. 'Tis probable it was in this Voyage that he wrote, whilst he was at *Nicomedia*, (as he himself observes) his Letter to *Africanus* concerning the History of *Susanna*. It was likewise at this time that he convinced two Hereticks of falsifying the Conferences which he had with them, and of making him say what he never said. *Ruffinus* relates this in the Book *de Adul. lib. Orig.*

(*i*) *Accused him in a Council of the Bishops of* Egypt.] *Photius*, Cod. 118. makes mention of these two Councils, and S. *Hierom. lib. 2. in Ruff. c. 5.*

(*l*) *The Sentence which was given against him by* Demetrius *continued under his Successors.*] *Gennadius* says, That *Theophilus* reports that *Heraclas* drave *Origen* out of the Church; and the Author of the Life of S. *Pachomius*, says the same thing, as well as *Peter* of *Alexandria*, cited by *Justinian* in his Letter against *Origen*. It is most certain that the Sentence given against him was not revoked, and that not one of the *Egyptians* would have any thing to do with them.

After

After the Death of *Alexander*, under whoſe Reign all this hapned, his Succeſſor *Maximinus* ſtirred up a Perſecution againſt the Church in the Year 235. *Ambroſe*, *Origen*'s Friend, and *Theoctiſtus*, Prieſts of *Cæſarea*, having been taken and brought before this Emperor, upon the account of the Chriſtian Religion, *Origen* ſent them an Exhortation to Martyrdom. Nevertheleſs, he concealed himſelf during this Perſecution, and retired for ſome time to the City of *Athens*, where he finiſhed his Commentaries upon *Ezekiel*, and went on with the Commentaries upon the *Song of Solomon*, which he finiſhed when he returned to *Cæſarea* in *Paleſtine*, from whence he went afterwards to *Cæſarea* in *Cappadocia*, where he remained ſome time with *Firmilian*, who invited him thither. *Origen.*

Under the Reign of *Gordianus*, which began in the Year 238, *Beryllus*, Biſhop of *Boſtra*, in *Arabia*, fell into a very groſs Error, affirming, That our Lord, before his Incarnation, was not a Perſon ſubſiſting. Some Biſhops being aſſembled to convince him of this Error, they cauſed *Origen* to come thither alſo. After that ſeveral Biſhops had had Conferences and Diſputes with this Biſhop, *Origen* being deſired to enter the Liſts with him, diſcourſed him at firſt familiarly, being willing to be throughly informed of his Opinion; and after having perfectly underſtood his Error, and the Grounds upon which he pretended to maintain it, he convinced him by ſeveral Reaſons, and ſet him again in the right Way, forcing him to acknowledge his Error. The Records of all that paſſed in this Affair were preſerved for a long time after, wherein were to be ſeen the Sentiments of *Beryllus*, the Opinions of the Biſhops who met there, the Queſtions propoſed to him by *Origen*, and the whole Conference which they had together in his Church. S. *Hierom* takes notice, That in his Time, *Origen*'s Dialogue with *Beryllus* was extant. This Biſhop having acknowledged his Error, preſerved the Purity of his Faith even to his Death, and had an extraordinary Kindneſs for *Origen*, to whom he wrote ſeveral Letters. S. *Hierom* places him among the Number of the Eccleſiaſtical Writers.

Afterwards *Origen* was called, under the Reign of *Philip*, to another Aſſembly of Biſhops, which was held againſt ſome *Arabians*, who maintained, That the Souls of Men died, and were raiſed again with their Bodies. After having ſpoke in the Preſence of them all, upon the Queſtion which was in agitation, he defended the Truth, and attacked this Error with that Force of Argument, that he cauſed all thoſe to change their Opinion, who had fallen into the Miſtake.

He was then Threeſcore Years old, or thereabouts, and yet this did not hinder him from carrying on his Works with the ſame, or rather with greater Diligence; for he did not only compoſe ſeveral Books in his Study, but he made almoſt every Day Diſcourſes to the People, and for the moſt part without any time allowed to prepare them, which were nevertheleſs ſo well eſteemed, that the Tranſcribers took them after him as he delivered them, and publiſhed them afterwards. This Employment did not take him off from compoſing ſeveral conſiderable Books; as his Eight Books againſt *Celſus*, Twenty five Volumes upon S. *Matthew*, Twenty five Volumes of Commentaries upon the Minor Prophets, a Letter to the Emperor *Philip*, and one to *Severa* his Wife *(m)*. S. *Hierom* ſays, That he wrote alſo a Letter to Pope *Fabianus*, wherein he ſets forth his Recanting of the Errors which he had written, and laid the Blame of them upon *Ambroſe*. If this be ſo, he did it to make this Pope favourable to him, that he might get again into the Communion of the *Roman* Church. He wrote alſo at this time againſt the Hereticks called *Helceſaitæ*.

Afterwards, in the Perſecution of *Decius*, which was about the ſame time, *Origen* ſuffered with great Conſtancy for the Faith. He was ſeized, put into Priſon, loaded with Irons; he had for ſeveral Days his Feet in the Stocks, where they were cruelly extended, even to the greateſt Extremity: They threatned him to burn him alive, and they rack'd him with ſeveral ſorts of Tortures, to try his Patience to the utmoſt; but he endured all with an undaunted Reſolution *(n)*. Being come out of Priſon, he held ſeveral Conferences, and wrote Letters worthy of a Holy Confeſſor of Jeſus Chriſt. Laſtly, After having laboured ſo much, and ſuffered with ſuch great Credit and Glory, he died in the beginning of the Reign of *Gallus*,

(*m*) *A Letter to the Emperor* Philip, *and one to* Severa *his Wife*] Some have believed that this Emperor was a Chriſtian, and ſay that *Babylas* deprived him from the Communion of the Church till he had repented for the Murthers which he had committed; but this Story is very uncertain.

(*n*) *But he endured all with an undaunted Reſolution.*] S. *Epiphanius* accuſes him for approaching to the Heathen Altars, and for making as if he would offer Incenſe to the Gods: But this Story, and almoſt every thing that *Epiphanius* ſays concerning *Origen*, is fabulous, and invented by ſome Enemy to *Origen*, who deceived S. *Epiphanius*, a Man eaſily impoſed upon. To ſhew that this Story is falſe, 'tis ſufficient to obſerve, that even *Origen*'s greateſt Enemies, as *Theophilus*, S. *Hierom*, *Juſtinian*, &c. who have omitted nothing to cry him down, have taken no notice at all of it; and that his Defenders, *Euſebius* and *Pamphilius*, are ſo far from excuſing him from this Crime, that they have on the contrary commended his Conſtancy and Reſolution. 'Tis true, S. *Epiphanius* does not ſay that this hapned in the Perſecution of *Decius*, as *Nicephorus* does; but in what time ſoever they fix this Accident, it is equally overthrown by the Obſervation we juſt now made. It is alſo leſs probable, when it is referred to the time of *Maximinus*'s Perſecution; for what likelihood is there that *Origen*, after having committed ſo groſs a Fault, ſhould be honoured, as he was, by the Biſhops of *Paleſtine*?

in

Origen. in the Year Two hundred fifty two, from the Birth of Chriſt, and in the ſixty ſixth Year of his Age (*p*).

Though what we have remaining at preſent of the Works of *Origen*, makes up ſeveral conſiderable Volumes, yet they are nothing in compariſon to what he has wrote (*q*). *Euſebius* had made an exact Catalogue of his Works, in the Apology which he made for him, under the Name of the Martyr *Pamphilus*; and S. *Hierom* did the ſame in one of his Letters. But both of theſe Catalogues being loſt, we have no knowledge of any, but thoſe that have been cited by the Ancients; which ſtill are much more in number than thoſe which we have now remaining.

We may diſtinguiſh Two kinds of Works written by *Origen*. The One are upon the Sacred Scriptures, and the Others are ſeparate Treatiſes upon different Subjects. He had compoſed three ſorts of Books upon the Scripture, not to mention his *Hexapla* and *Tetrapla*, which were rather a Collection than a Work; to wit, *Commentaries*, *Scholia*, and *Homilies*. In his *Commentaries*, he wholly gave up himſelf to that Heat and Fire which was natural to him, to penetrate the height and depth of the Scripture, and the moſt myſterious Interpretation thereof, the better. His *Scholia* were, on the contrary, only ſhort Notes to explain the difficult Places. Theſe two kinds of Works were more for the Learned, than for the uſe of the People; whereas the *Homilies*, which the *Latins* call *Treatiſes*, and which we call *Sermons*, were Moral Inſtructions upon the Holy Scripture. We have none of the *Scholia* remaining, nor have we hardly any of the *Homilies* in *Greek*; and thoſe which we have in *Latin*, are tranſlated by *Ruffinus* and others with ſo much Liberty (*r*), that it is a difficult matter to diſcern what is *Origen*'s own, from what has been foiſted in by the Interpreter. A great part likewiſe of his *Commentaries* are entirely loſt. The following Table will preſent you in one View thoſe Works which we know to have been compoſed by *Origen* upon the Scripture, what we have left of them in *Greek*, and what we have only remaining of them in *Latin*.

(*p*) *He died in the Year* 252 *from the Birth of Chriſt, and in the* 66*th Year of his Age.*] According to *Euſebius*, Lib. 7. cap. 11. he died in the firſt Year of the Reign of *Gallus*; and S. *Hierom*, in his 65th Epiſtle, written 400 Years after Chriſt, ſays, That it was 150 Years after *Origen*'s Death. It is certain, according to *Euſebius*, that in the Year 202 *Origen* was ſeventeen Years old, and that in the third Year of the Emperor *Philip* he was above ſixty Years old. So that if we ſuppoſe him to have lived but ſixty ſix years, as S. *Hierom* aſſures us in his Book of Eccleſiaſtical Writers, he muſt have died in the beginning of the Reign of *Gallus*, in the Year 252; but if he lived ſixty nine Years, as *Euſebius* writes, he muſt have lived to the end of the Reign of *Gallus*; that is to ſay, till the Year 254 or 255.

(*q*) *Yet they are nothing in compariſon to what he has written.*] It is certain that he compoſed a very great Number of Books; and he made them with that eaſe, that he could hardly find Scribes enough, as both his Friends and Enemies agree. S. *Hierom* in his 65th Letter to *Pammachius*, ſpeaking of *Origen*, ſays, *Who is there of you that can read as many Books as he has compoſed?* And in another place, he ſays, That he compiled an innumerable Company of Books. *Theophilus* ſays the ſame thing. *Euſtathius* ſays, That he filled the World with his Works. *Vincentius Lyrinenſis* affirms, That none has written more than him; and it is upon this Account that he had the Name given him of *Chalcenterus* and *Syntaſticus*. S. *Epiphanius* and *Ruffinus* ſay, That he writ 6000 Volumes. S. *Hierom* ſeems to diſpute it, telling us, That there is not the third part of them in *Euſebius*'s Catalogue. By the Word *Volumes*, we muſt not underſtand ſuch Tomes as are now adays, but only ſmall Works; ſo every Homily, every part of a Book, is in this ſenſe a Volume; ſo that we need not admire, though he had written 6000 Volumes.

(*r*) *Are tranſlated by* Ruffinus *and others with ſo much Liberty.*] *Ruffinus* ſays it himſelf in the Concluſion to his Verſion of the Commentaries upon the *Romans*; and S. *Hierom* alſo ſomewhere upbraids him with it. And beſides, this appears by the Tranſlation it ſelf, which is full of Figures and Alluſions to Latin Words, of Terms taken in another ſenſe than what they were in *Origen*'s Time, where the Trinity and other Myſteries are expreſſed in ſuch Terms as were not uſed till after the Council of *Nice*, and where there are Points of Diſcipline more modern than *Origen*'s Age; which has given occaſion to thoſe who have not conſidered the Liberty that *Ruffinus* took of adding or leaving out what he pleaſed, to doubt whether the greateſt part of theſe Works were *Origen*'s or no. The Liberty which *Ruffinus* has given himſelf is ſtill more evident, by what he has written in the Prologue to his Verſion of the Commentary upon the Epiſtle to *Romans*, which he ſays he has Abridged by above the half. S. *Hierom*'s Verſions are not more exact; and the moſt faulty of all is that of an ancient Tranſlator, who has interpreted the *Commentaries* upon S. *Mathew*.

The Books of Origen, *of which we have any knowledge, and by whom they are cited.*	*The Books or Fragments of* Origen, *which we have in* Greek, *and whence they are taken.*	*The Latin Books of* Origen, *and their Translators.*	*Proofs and Notes upon the Table.* Origen.

S. *Epiphanius*, and after him *Cedrenus* and *Suidas*, say, That *Origen* writ upon all the Books of the Holy Scripture. We shall here give the several Books in order, of which there remains now any knoweldge.

Thirteen Tomes of Commentaries. and two Books of Mystical Homilies upon *Genesis*. S. *Hierom apud Rufinum invect* 2. & *Ep. ad Damasum. Euseb. lib.* 6. *cap* 24. But these thirteen Tomes went no farther than Ver. 15. of the 4th Chap. where it is written, *Omnis qui occiderit Cain*, &c. S. *Hierom ibidem ad Damasum*, q. 1.

Two Books of Mystical Homilies upon *Genesis*. *Idem Ibid.*

Pamphilus in his *Apology* produces a small Fragment of his Preface upon *Genesis*.

Commentaries upon *Exodus* in the *Philocalia*, cap. 26.

Item. Some Scholia.

And twelve Homilies.

Scholia's upon *Leviticus*, and sixteen Homilies. *Ruffin. invect.* 2. & *in Prologo Homil. in Num.*

Commentaries upon *Deuteronomy*, which he cites himself, *Tom.* 32. *in Joan.* and in the 8th Homily upon S. *Luke. Cassiodorus* had seen eight Books of them, *de Inst Divin. c.* 7.

Some Homilies. *Ruffin. Prolog. ad Ursat.*

Six and twenty Homilies upon *Joshuah.*

Nine Homilies upon the Books of *Judges.*

Two Homilies upon the *Kings*: One upon the first Chapter of the first Book;

And the 9th Intituled, *De Engastrimytho*

Cassiodorus had seen another upon the first Book of *Kings*, one upon the Second, and a very long one upon the second Book of *Chronicles. Lib. Decretal. Div.* cap. 2.

He composed several Homilies upon *Job*; witness *Eustathius in Diagnestico de Engastrimytho*; and S. *Hierom* Ep. 75. The first of whom tells us, That he had said some things very childish concerning the Names of *Job*'s Daughters: And the second, that he had said some things concerning the Stars, and against the Devil, which the Church does not receive.

He was the first that made Commentaries upon all the Psalms, as S. *Hierom* tells us, *Ep.* 89. S. *Hilary* has copied

Three Fragments of Tomes, some Commentaries upon *Genesis*, related by *Eusebius* in his Books *de Præparatione.*

The first upon Ver. 12. of the first Chapter of *Genesis*, taken from the 7th Book.

The second taken out of the Third Tome, upon Ver. 14. taken from the 6th Book, and in the 22d Chapter of the *Philocalia.*

The third, which is in the *Philocalia*, cap. 14. is extracted out of the same Tome upon the 16th Verse.

Some Fragments taken from the *Philocalia*, cap. 16 & 17.

Some Commentaries upon *Exodus*, and upon *Leviticus*, (2).

A Fragment of the 20th Homily upon *Joshuah*, in his *Philocalia*, cap. 12.

The Homily *de Engastrimytho* was taken from a Manuscript of the *Vatican* Library, and published by *Leo Allatius* in 1629. with *Eustathius in Hexameron*, who wrote against this Homily of *Origen*'s. The Subject of this Discourse is, to enquire whether the Witch of *Endor* did really raise the Soul of *Samuel*, or whether the Devil only appeared in his shape. *Origen* maintains the first Opinion, and *Eustathius* the second, Authors are divided hereupon.

A Fragment upon the first Psalm, taken from S. *Epiphanius*, *Hæres.* 64. Three others taken from the *Philocalia*, cap. 2 & 3.

Another Fragment containing the Catalogue of the Sacred Books, taken from *Eusebius*'s History, *lib.* 6. *cap.* 25.

Another from S. *Epiphanius*, Ibid.

Seventeen Latin Homilies upon *Genesis*, translated by *Ruffinus* (1). It is doubted whether they be not extracted from the two Books of Mystical Homilies, because they seem to be of the number of those which were made *ex tempore*, and transcribed by the Writers. The last Homily is imperfect.

Twelve Homilies upon *Exodus*, translated by *Ruffinus.*

Sixteen upon *Leviticus*, attributed falsly to S. *Cyril*, translated also by *Ruffinus.*

Eight and twenty Homilies upon *Numbers*, which are doubtful, because they were translated by *Ruffinus* with great liberty (3).

Six and twenty Homilies upon *Joshuah*; to which there is a Preface attributed to S. *Hierom*; but 'tis more likely to be by *Ruffinus*, as well as the Translation of this Work, both because of the conformity of Style in the Prologue and in the Version, as because he owns them in the conclusion of the Commentaries upon the Epistle to the *Romans*.

Nine Homilies upon *Judges*, all translated by *Ruffinus* for the same Reasons.

The first Homily upon the *Kings*, which is in all probability done by the same Interpreter.

Nine Homilies upon the Psalms, translated by *Ruffinus.*

(1) In the Prologue to *Ursatius*, which is written by *Ruffinus*. he says, That he has collected and translated into *Latin*, the Homilies of *Origen* upon the whole *Pentateuch*; so that though this Version in *Merlin*'s Edition bears S. *Hierom*'s Name, yet it was made by *Ruffinus*, as *Erasmus* and *Genebrard* acknowledge. The Author of the Conclusion to the Version of the Commentaries upon the Epistle to the *Romans*, which is also *Ruffinus*, says positively, That he had translated *Origen*'s Homilies upon *Genesis*, *Exodus* and *Leviticus*: They are those that follow.

(2) There is in the *Philocalia*, cap. 1. a Passage taken from the second Homily upon *Leviticus*, which is not to be found in those Latin Homilies which we have. He must therefore necessarily have written more than sixteen. Besides, in those which we have, *Hom.* 4 & 6. he cites more of them.

(3) The Style is *Ruffinus*'s, who has made a Preface thereto; in which he affirms, and also in his Prologue to *Ursatius*, That he has collected in this Work, and disposed in order, all that he could find of *Origens* upon *Numbers*, whether they were written in *Homilies* or *Scholia* so that this Work is more *Ruffinus*'s than *Origen*'s; and we must not wonder, if we therein find some Explications which appear to be of a Latin Author, and later than *Origen*.

Origen.

Works of Origen.

and imitated them in ſeveral places. *Trithemius* ſays that he had ſeen them.

He alſo wrote Homilies and Scholia upon the Pſalms, as the Author of the Commentaries upon the Pſalms, attributed to S. *Hierom*, aſſures us.

A Commentary upon the *Proverbs*, cited by *Pamphilus*.

Two Commentaries upon the *Song of Songs*: One was made when he was young;

The other, which he Compoſed when he was older, divided into Ten Tomes, in which he has out-done himſelf; upon which account, S. *Gregory Niſſen* ſays, That he has taken extraordinary pains upon this Book of Scripture, *In Proœmio lib. Canticorum.*

Thirty Books of Commentaries upon *Iſaiah*.

Five and Twenty Homilies.

And ſome Scholia. *Hier. lib.* 1. *Apol. adverſus Ruffin. cap.* 3. & *in Proœmio Comment MSS Euſebius* Book 6. chap. 32. ſays, That the Thirty Tomes went as far as the Viſion of the four-footed Beaſts.

Several Homilies upon *Jeremy*: *Caſſiodorus* and *Rabanus Maurus* tell us, That there were 45 of them.

Five Tomes of Commentaries upon the *Lamentations of Jeremiah*; *Euſebius*.

Five and twenty Books of Commentaries, and ſome Homilies upon *Ezekil*; *Euſebius* Book 6. chap. 32.

Some Commentaries upon *Daniel*; *Orig. Tract.* 24. *in Matth.*

Five and twenty Volumes of Commentaries upon the leſſer Prophets. S. *Hierom. de Scriptorib. Eccleſiaſt.* lib. 6. cap. 35. The Commentaries upon *Hoſea* and *Zachary* are a part of them. S. *Hierom* makes mention of two little Books of *Origen* upon *Hoſea*, in the Preface to his Commentary upon the Prophets: but he did not explain it entirely, as it appears by S. *Hierom*, and by the *Philocalia*.

Greek Works or Fragments of Origen.

Item. One upon the 4th Pſalm, taken from the *Philocalia*, cap. 25.

One upon the 40th Pſalm, *Ibid.*

And laſtly, one upon the 82d Pſalm, taken from a Homily; *Euſebius Hiſt. lib.* 6. *cap.* 38.

A Fragment taken from his firſt Commentary upon the *Canticles*, in the *Philocalia*, chap. 27. And one taken from his ſecond, chap. 26.

Nineteen Homilies upon *Jeremiah*, falſly attributed to S. *Cyril*, and publiſhed by *Corderius*, twelve whereof are tranſlated by S. *Hierom*.

A Fragment of the 39th taken from the *Philocalia*, chap. 1.

A Fragment extracted from the 20th Tome, taken from the *Philocalia*, chap. 11.

A Fragment of the Commentary upon *Hoſea*, in the *Philocalia*, chap. 8.

Latin Works of Origen.

Two paſſages taken from the Commentary upon the *Canticles*, in the Apology of *Pamphilus*, tranſlated by *Ruffinus*, in S. *Hierom* Tom. 4.

Huetius believes, that the Latin Book upon the *Canticles* ought not to be divided into Homilies, ſince it is a continued Commentary, and that it is the very Commentary of *Origen* tranſlated by *Ruffinus*.

Sixtus Senenſis, and ſeveral others, think that it is by a Latin Author. See the Remark here at the ſide (4)

Two Homilies tranſlated by S. *Hierom* word for word.

Two paſſages taken from his Commentary upon *Iſaiah*. One upon the 1 Chap. and the other upon the 28th chap. in the Apology attributed to *Pamphilus* in the 4th Tome of S. *Hierom*.

Nine Homilies tranſlated by S. *Hierom* (as the ſame S. *Hierom* in his *Catalogue*, and the conformity of the Style, makes it appear.) The 9th is imperfect, to which there is added the end of the 9th Homily upon *Jeremiah*.

Fourteen Homilies upon *Jeremiah*, tranſlated by S. *Hierom*, twelve whereof are alſo in *Greek*; but the Tranſlation differs very much from the *Greek*, and the Homilies are diſpoſed without any order.

Fourteen Homilies upon *Ezekiel*, tranſlated by S. *Jerome*, as the Prologue, Style, S. *Jerome's* own Teſtimony in *Catalogo* aſſures us, and *Ruffinus Invect.* 2.

S. *Jerome* inſerted into his Commentaries upon *Daniel*, *Origen's Scholia*, taken out of his 10th Book of *Stromata*.

Proofs and Notes upon the Table.

(4) Not only the Proteſtant Criticks, as *Perkins*, *Coke*, *Rivet*, and others, do reject this Work after *Eraſmus* and *Amerbachius*, but likewiſe *Sixtus Senenſis*, and ſeveral Papiſts. In ſome Editions it is attributed to S. *Ambroſe*, in others to *Peter Lombard*, others, as *Merlin*, *Genebrard*, and *Huetius*, believe it to be that of *Origen*; and even *Blondel* in his Apology is of this Opinion, as well as *Aubertin*. The Reaſons againſt it are, That it appears to be by a Latin Author, 1. Becauſe in his Prologue he cites the *Greeks* as ſtrangers to him. 'Tis anſwered, That he oppoſes the *Greeks*, not to the *Latins*, but to the *Chriſtians*. 2. 'Tis ſaid, That the Author ſpeaks as if he had Written in Latin; for he explains the three *Greek* Names of the three parts of Philoſophy; *Generales Diſciplinæ*, ſays he, *quibus ad ſcientiam perveniturtres ſunt, quas Græci Ethicam, Phyſicam, & Theoriam appellaverunt, (nos has dicere poſſumus Moralem, Naturalem, & Inſpectivam) nonnulli ſane etiam Logicam, quam nos rationalem poſſumus dicere.* And in another place he ſays, That the Greek word ἀγαπᾶν ought to be Tranſlated by *diligere*, and ἀγαπη by *dilectio*. 'Tis anſwer'd, That theſe Explications are by the Interpreter. A third Reaſon, which is more conſiderable, is, That S. *Hierom* in his Prologue upon *Origen's* two Homilies upon the *Canticles*, which he Tranſlated, ſaith, That *Origen* in the ten Tomes explain'd the Tranſlations of the *Septuagint*, of *Aquila*, *Symmachus*, *Theodoſion*, and the fifth Verſion; which is not to be found in this Work; But this perhaps was left out by *Ruffinus*; beſides, it may be ſaid that this Commentary here may be accommodated to all theſe Verſions; ſo the Reaſons which are for the Negative are but weak, whereas thoſe which are for the Affirmative are very ſtrong. *Firſt*, It is certain that *Origen* did write upon the *Canticles*. *Secondly*, This Commentary has the Character and Style of *Origen*, which gives an allegorical and figurative ſenſe to every thing. *Thirdly*, There are ſome Sentences and Thoughts exactly like thoſe which are in the Homilies Tranſlated by S. *Hierom*. *Fourthly*, It explains the Hebrew words, and draws from thence a myſtical ſenſe, after *Origen's* way. *Fifthly*, He here cites his other Works. *Sixthly*, He has peculiar Notions concerning the Soul and the Angels. And *laſtly*, That which is a convincing Proof, is, That the Greek Fragment of *Origen* upon the *Canticles*, cited in the *Philocalia*, is found here, though interpreted with a great deal of liberty. That it is a continued Commentary, and not Homilies, is proved by the Style, becauſe there is a Preface written by the Author; and beſides, all *Origen's* Homilies have a like form of Concluſion, whereas this Commentary is continued without this Concluſion. *Ruffinus* is the Author of this Tranſlation; and it is certain that it was not S. *Hierom*, who ſays in the Prologue of the two Homilies, That this Tranſlation would require too much leiſure, pains, and expence, and that he durſt not undertake it. *Gennadius* ſays, That all *Origen's* Works which were not tranſlated by S. *Hierom*, were done by *Ruffinus*; and indeed the Style of it is very like *Ruffinus's*.

(5) Five

Works of Origen.	*Greek Works or Fragments of* Origen.	*Latin Works of* Origen.	*Proofs and Notes upon the Table.*
(5) Five and twenty Tomes of Commentaries upon S. *Matthew*, with Homilies and Scholia. *Euseb. lib. 6. cap* 36. and S *Hierom in Proæmio Comment. in Matth.*	A Fragment of the first Tome upon S. *Matthew*, in *Eusebius* lib. 5. Hist. cap. 25. Another taken from the first Tome in the *Philocalia*, chap. 6. The Commentaries from the 13th Chap. Ver. 36. to th 22d Chap. Ver. 33. are published by *Huetius*, who has copied them from a Manuscript in the Queen of *Sweeden*'s Library; and from another in the King's Library, from the 11th to the 16th Tome, and comprizing the 17th.	A Fragment of the first Tome upon S. *Matthew*, in the Apology of *Pamphilus*. Another of the 7th Tome, *ibid.* *Bullinger* cites some passages thereof, *in Disput. contra Casaubonum*, p. 2. *Decamb.* 3. p. 19. taken out of the Commentary upon the 6th Chap. and the 23d. The Translation of the Commentaries upon S. *Matthew*, from the 13th Chap. Ver. 16. to the 27th, Ver. 66. is improperly divided into 36. Homilies, made by *Erasmus* from the 13th Chap. Ver. 36. to the 16th Chap. Ver. 20. The remainder is an Ancient Version, of which we do not know the Author (5).	(5) In the Preface attributed to S. *Hierom* upon the Homilies on S. *Luke*, there are 36. *Ruffinus* in his *second Invective* reckons 26 of them. We had better keep to the Account of *Eusebius* and S. *Hierom*. (6) Some have attributed it to S. *Hierom*; but he himself says in his Prologue upon S. *Luke* that he would not undertake it. In his 65th Epistle, he says, That no Person dar'd till his time to interpret the Books *de Principiis*, and the Tomes of *Origen*, therefore it is not ancienter than S. *Hierom*. Neither was it done by *Ruffinus*, who in his Version of the Apology of *Pamphilus*, translates some passages of this Commentary, and relates them after a different manner than what is to be found in this Version, which differs very much from the Text; and and it is quite another Style from that of S. *Hierom*, and of *Ruffinus*. 'Tis probably later than *Gennadius*, who says that all that we have of *Origen* in his time was Translated by S. *Hierom*, or *Ruffinus*. *Aquinas* relates some passages of them word for word, in his *Catena aurea*: So that this Author is between *Gennadius* and *Aquinas*, and nearer the first than the last, because he cites a passage of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, *Tract* 8. which was not quoted by *Origen*; which shews its Antiquity, besides the Style and the Terms are old. *Huetius*, from whose Observations we have taken all this, believes that it was made in *Cassiodorus*'s time, and that it might be ascribed to *Epiphanius Scholasticus*, the Author of the Tripartite History, were not the Style quite different: Therefore he attributes it to one *Bellator*, a Friend of *Cassiodorus*, who had Translated several Greek Books, and particularly some of *Origen*'s Homilies at the desire of *Cassiodorus*.
Commentaries upon S. *Luke*. 5 Tomes. S. *Hierom. Prol. Hom. in Lucam. Origen T.* 13. *in Matt.* Nine and Thirty Homilies upon S. *Luke. Id. ibid & in Catalogo.* Two and Thirty Tomes of Commentaries upon S. *John. Ruffin. Invect.* 2. Some Homilies upon the *Acts*.	There are but 9 Tomes upon S. *John* extant, 1.2.6.10.13. 19.20.28.32. *Ferrarius* published a Version divided into 32 Tomes, taken from a Venetian MS. *Huetius* published the Greek from a MS. in the Kings Library. A Fragment of the 4th Tome. *Philocal. c.* 4. Another of the 5th Tome. *Ibid. c.* 4. A Fragment of the Comments upon the *Acts*. *Ib.* c. 7.	Nine and thirty Homilies upon S. *Luke*, Translated by S. *Hierom* (7).	(7) He mentions it in the Catalogue of his Works, and in his Prologue to *Paula & Eustochium*; and it is quoted by *Ruffinus* in his *Invective*. *Ruffinus* upbraids him for having omitted and alter'd, in Translating *Origen*'s Homilies upon S. *Luke*, those Passages which were against the Divinity of the Son; and that when he quoted this Passage, *Ecce enim ut facta est vox*, &c. he observes that he added, *Principium substantiæ ejus*; which is to be found in the 4th of those Homilies that we have still extant. Lastly, according to the report of *Ruffinus*, S. *Hierom* Translated seventy of *Origen*'s Homilies. Now he had Translated 14 upon *Jeremiah*, 14 upon *Ezekiel*, and 9 upon *Isaiah*, as appears by his Prologue upon *Ezekiel*; and there remains, to make up the 70, these 39 upon S. *Luke*; besides that those which we have under his Name, are written according to the Style and manner of *Origen*. It is objected in the *first* place, That there are therein several Greek words turn'd into Latin: for example, it is observed, That κεχαριτωμένη, that is to say, *gratia plena*; That ἄλογος, that is, *sine ratione*, That *cadaver* comes *a casu*; That in the Greek there is an Article. *Homily* 22. and *Homily* 25. *Answ.* These Explications are put in by the Interpreter. There are the like in those Books which we have at present in Greek, and which are undoubtedly his, and in the ancient Translators, as in him that interpreted S. *Irenæus*, &c. *Secondly*, It is objected, That the Holy Ghost is there called *the Third Person*. *Ans. Origen* often said, That the Father, and the Son and the Holy Ghost were 3 *Hypostases*, and the Latins have Translated the word *Hypostasis* by that of *Person*: for example, *Ferrarius* Translated that Passage of the second Tome *in Joan.* after the same manner. *Third* Objection: He makes a Dialogue between the Devil and Jesus Christ, and makes them hold long Discourses together. *Ans.* This is exactly *Origen*'s way. *Fourth* Objection: He makes use of the Authority of *Isaiah* and the *Psalms* against the *Sadducees*, in the 39th Homily; whereas *Origen* said that the *Sadducees* admitted only the *Law*, and by consequence he would not have made use of any other Books against them. *Answ. Origen* never said that the *Sadducees* did not admit the Prophets, but only that they did not make use of them to prove the Doctrins of Faith.
Commentaries upon the Epistle to the *Romans*, which were to the Number of 15 Tomes, according to *Ruffinus* in the Preface to his Version; or twenty according to *Cassiodorus*. Some Commentaries upon the first Epistle to the *Corinthians*; *Hom.* 17. *in Luc. & Hier. Ep* 52. Some Commentaries, Homilies and Scholia upon the Epistle to the *Galatians*. S. *Hierom* in *Proæmio Commentar. Ep. ad Galat. & Ep.* 89 *ad August.* Three Tomes upon the Epistle to the *Ephesians*. *Lib.* 1. *Apol. ad Ruf.* 4, 5.	A Fragment of the first Tome of the Commentary upon the Epistle to the *Romans*, chap. 24. of the *Philocalia*. Another taken from the 9th Tome, in the 9th chap. of the *Philocalia*.	*Ruffinus* Translated 15 or 20 Tomes of *Origen*'s Commentaries upon the Epistle to the *Romans* (8).	(8) *Ruffinus* abridg'd them into half the Compass, as he acknowledges in his Preface. Some attribute this Version to S. *Hierom*; but unjustly: for in the conclusion he strikes at S. *Hierom* in these Words: *Some perhaps may ask me why I put my Name, and may enquire why I have not set down, for example, The Commentaries of* Hierom *upon the Epistle to the* Romans. And he adds, That he Translated the Books of S. *Clement*; and that we should not think that it was done by *Hierom*, he puts the Name of *Clement* in the Title, which shews that this Translation was done by *Ruffinus*. We have also two Latin Passages taken from the Apology of *Pamphilus*.

Origen.

Works of Origen.	*Greek Works or Fragments of* Origen.	*Latin Works of* Origen.	*Proofs and Notes upon the Table.*
A Commentary upon the Epiſtle to the *Coloſſians*. *Apolog. de Pamphilo.*		Fragments of Commentaries upon the Epiſtles to the *Coloſſians* and to *Titus*, in the Apology of *Pamphilus*.	
One upon the Epiſtle to the *Theſſalonians*. *Hier. Ep.* 52.		S. *Hierom*, in the Epiſtle to *Minerius* & *Alexander*, relates a Fragment of the Commentaries of *Origen* upon the Epiſtle to the *Theſſalonians*.	
One upon the Epiſtle to *Titus*. *Apolog. Pamph.*		Laſtly there are ſome Fragments of a Commentary upon the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, in the Apology of *Pamphilus*.	
Some Commentaries and Homilies upon the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*.	*Euſebius* lib. 6. cap. 25. relates a Fragment upon the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*.		
He promiſed a Commentary upon the *Apocalypſe*, Tom. 3 in Matth.	All theſe Greek Fragments are exactly collected by *Huetius* in the two Volumes which he has publiſhed, containing all that remains in Greek of *Origen*'s Works upon the Scripture; and tis to him that we are indebted for almoſt all the Remarks that are here. He has not inſerted the Fragments which are in the *Catenæ*, becauſe he believes they are not of any great Authority.		

The other Treatiſes of *Origen* are not near ſo many in Number as his Works upon the Holy Scripture: and yet they were very conſiderable: for not to mention his Commentaries upon the Philoſophers, which *Euſebius* ſpeaks in of in the 6th Book, Chap. 18. of his Hiſtory, he wrote (*s*) 2 Books of the Reſurrection; the Treatiſe *de Principiis*, divided into 4 Books; 10 Books of *Stromata*, (*t*) witneſs the ſame *Euſebius*, Chap. 24. The Book of *Martyrdom*, mentioned in the 28 Chapter. The 8 Books againſt *Celſus* in the 36 Chap. The Letter to *Africanus*, concerning the Hiſtory of *Suſanna*; to which we may add, the Diſpute which he had with *Beryllus*, which was extant in *Euſebius*'s Time, (*u*) and ſome Diſcourſes and Letters which *Euſebius* collected, and divided into three Books, as he declares in the ſame 5th Book, Chap. 36. S. *Hierom* mentions almoſt all his Works; and beſides theſe, two other Dialogues of the Refurrection, and a Treatiſe explaining the Hebrew Names of the New Teſtament, which he added to that of *Philo*, concerning the Explanation of thoſe of the Old. (*x*) And alſo in the Apology of *Pamphilus*, there is mention made of a Treatiſe *concerning Prayer*, compoſed by *Origen*. *Theodoret* often cites our Author againſt divers Heretick: (*y*) but we muſt not therefore think that he compoſed ſo many expreſs Treatiſes againſt theſe Hereticks: they are only ſome Paſſages of his Works, where he confutes ſeveral Errors, whilſt he is writing upon other Subjects.

The Chief of all theſe Books is the Diſcourſe againg *Celſus*, divided into eight Books, which were publiſhed in Greek long ſince, with the Tranſlation of *Gelenius*, and the Notes of *Hæſchelius*, and of one *Chriſtoph. Perſona*, printed at *Rome* in the Year 1471, and afterwards very correctly in *England* in

(*s*) *He wrote two Books of the Reſurrection.*] S. *Hierom in Ruffin. lib.* 2. *Invect.* ſays, That *Origen* compoſed two Books and two Dialogues of the Reſurrection. The ſame in his 6th Epiſtle cites the 4th Book of the Reſurrection. *Methodius* wrote againſt this Work.

(*t*) *The Treatiſe* de Principiis, *divided into four Books, and ten Books of* Stromata.] This laſt Book was compoſed in imitation of that of S. *Clement* of *Alexandria*; witneſs S. *Hierom*, Ep. 84. Who ſays, That *Origen* compared therein the Opinions of the Philoſophers and Chriſtians, and proved our Doctrins from *Plato*, *Ariſtotle*, *Numenius* and *Cornutus*. In the tenth Book he explained the Epiſtle to the *Galatians*, and ſome Paſſages of *Daniel*.

(*u*) *And ſome Diſcourſes and Letters which* Euſebius *had collected.*] *Euſebius* has related a Fragment of that which he wrote to his Father, being then very young, *lib.* 6 *cap.* 2. *Item*, of another againſt thoſe who accuſed him of applying himſelf too much to the Study of Human Learning, *Chap.* 19. He makes mention in the 28th Chapter of the Letters which he wrote in the time of the ſixth Perſecution; afterwards in the 36th Chapter, of a Letter to the Emperor *Philip*, and of one to *Severa* his Wife; and laſtly, of one to *Fabianus*, and of ſeveral others, cited at large in the 39th Chapter. S. *Hierom* in his Catalogue, cites the three laſt, together with a Letter to *Beryllus*. *Ruffinus* cites a Letter to his Friends, *Lib. de Adult. lib. Origenis*; where he complains that ſome had falſified his Writings. In the 13th Chapter of *Philocalia*, there is part of one ſet down to *Gregory Thaumaturgus*; *Cedrenus* and *Suidas* have preſerved a Fragment of another Letter.

(*x*) *Concerning the Explanation of thoſe of the Old.*] S. *Hierom in Præfat. ad lib. Hebr. Nom.* The Author of the Orthodox Queſtions, attributed to S. *Juſtin*, *Queſt.* 82, and 86.

(*y*) Theodoret *often cites our Author againſt divers Hereticks.*] *Lib.* 1. *cap.* 2. He ſays, that he wrote againſt *Menander*. In the 4th Chapter againſt *Baſilides* and *Iſidorus*; in the 7th againſt the *Helceſaites*; *Euſebius* ſays, concerning theſe laſt, That it was in his Homilies. In the 19th Chapter, againſt *Apelles*; in the 3d Book, Chap. 2. againſt the *Nazareans*. He attributes to him in the 5th Chapter, the little Labyrinth againſt *Theodotus*, which is by another Author.

1658. The *Exhortation to Martyrdom* has been lately publiſhed by *Meurſtenius*, the Greek Profeſſor at *Baſil*, together with the Letter to *Africanus*, concerning the Hiſtory of *Suſanna*, which was formerly ſet forth in part by *Heſchelius*, in the Year 1602. We have likewiſe the Verſion of the four Books *de Principiis*, compoſed by *Ruffinus*. But he has taken ſo much Liberty (*aa*), that we cannot diſcern what is *Origen*'s own. There are ſome Latin Fragments of the Books of the Reſurrection, cited in the Apology of *Pamphilus*, which we have only in Latin. The Letter to S. *Gregory Thaumaturgus* is entire in Greek in the *Philocalia*. *Ruffinus* relates a Fragment of a Letter to thoſe of *Alexandria*, where he complains that they had corrupted his Books. S. *Hierom* accuſes him for having omitted, that in this ſame Letter *Origen* railed at *Demetrius*, Biſhop of *Alexandria*, and at thoſe others who had condemned him. *Euſebius* alſo produces, as we have already ſaid, ſome Fragments of two Letters. The Book *of Prayer*, which *Huetius* had promiſed, has been lately publiſhed in Greek and Latin in *England*. This Work was addreſſed to *Ambroſe* and *Tatianus*, and it may be divided into three Parts. In the firſt, he treats of the Neceſſity, the Advantage, and the good Effects of Prayer. In the Second, he diſcourſes of the different kinds of Prayer, and particularly explains the Lord's Prayer. In the Laſt, he ſpeaks of the Circumſtances and Conditions which ought to precede, accompany and follow our Prayers. Laſtly, We may joyn to *Origen*'s Works the *Philocalia*, which is a Collection of ſeveral Paſſages of *Origen*, relating to the Holy Scripture, made by S. *Baſil*, and S. *Gregory Nazianzen*, and publiſhed by *Tarinus* in the Year 1618, and the Book of the Apology of *Pamphilus*, of which we have the Tranſlation done by *Ruffinus*, which is amongſt S. *Hierom*'s Works in the Fourth Tome. *Origen.*

We ought alſo to have reckoned here the Dialogue againſt *Marcion*, which bears his Name, if it was not more probable that it was compoſed by another Author (*bb*), who has introduced *Origen* in this Dialogue defending the Churches Cauſe, and therefore has given it *Origen*'s Name, as *Cicero* gave that of *Lælius* and *Cato* to his Books of *Friendſhip* and *Old Age*.

(*aa*) *But he has taken therein ſo much Liberty.*] He declares it himſelf in his Preface, where he ſays, that he has retrenched and added ſeveral things concerning the Trinity. The Paſſages out of theſe Books, related in the Apology, are quite different from this Verſion, as well as thoſe which are in the *Philocalia*.

(*bb*) *If it was not more probable that it was compoſed by another Author.*] This Dialogue is a Diſpute againſt the *Marcionites*, and the *Valentinians*, wherein he introduces *Origen*, defending the Doctrins of the Church; *Megethius*, and *Marcus* taking the Part of the *Marcionites*; *Droſerius*, *Valens*, and *Maximus*, that of the *Valentinians*, and *Eutropius* as a Judge between them. We have three different Verſions of it, that of *Perionius*, that of *Picus*, printed in 1655, and that of *Humfredus* in 1557, which is much the exacteſt. But it has been lately publiſhed in Greek by a Learned Engliſh-man, who pretends that it is *Origen*'s. *Huetius* after *Halloixius* and *Rivet* believes that it is not *Origen*'s, and this Opinion ſeems the moſt probable. 'Tis indeed cited in the *Philocalia*, as a Work of *Origen*'s: But it is poſſible that S. *Gregory* and S. *Baſil* might have been deceived, becauſe it bears his Name: or that believing that this Book containing nothing but *Origen*'s Opinions, and going under his Name, they might quote it in a Work wherein they made a Collection of his Opinions. Beſides it appears by the Title, that they had taken this Paſſage from *Euſebius*, who relates it word for word as it is in the *Philocalia*, in his 7th Book *de Præparatione Evangelica*, as taken from the Treatiſe of one *Maximus* περὶ ὕλης, that is to ſay, *concerning Matter*; and at the end they add the following Remark: *This is extracted from* Euſebius's *Book*, De Præparatione Evangelica; *the Author thereof is* Maximus, *a famous Writer among the Chriſtians, as* Euſebius *obſerves*; *but it is likewiſe found almoſt in the ſame Terms in* Origen's *Dialogue againſt the* Marcionites *and other Hereticks, in which* Megethius *is the Diſputant, and* Eutropius *the Judge*. This Obſervation makes it appear, that the Authors of the *Philocalia* believed that this Paſſage did really belong to *Maximus*, relying upon *Euſebius*'s Authority; but having alſo found it in a Dialogue which bears *Origen*'s Name, they believed that they might cite it as his, without examining whether he was the Author of it; for 'tis a thing very unlikely to affirm, that *Origen* had taken this Paſſage from *Maximus*, to inſert it into his Dialogue, ſince it is already in *Euſebius* in form of a Dialogue, though the Names be ſuppreſſed. So it ſeems that we may ſay that *Maximus* was the Author of this Dialogue, wherein he introduces *Origen*, diſputing, againſt the Hereticks, and *Eutropius* as Judge. But there are conſiderable Difficulties raiſed againſt this *Hypotheſis*. The firſt, That *Maximus* was more ancient than *Origen*, as appears by *Euſebius*, who in the firſt Book of his Hiſtory, Chap. 27, places him amongſt the Authors, who flouriſhed under the Emperours *Commodus* and *Severus*. The Second is, That it is not likely the Treatiſe of *Maximus* ſhould be this Dialogue, becauſe it was Entitled concerning Matter, and he only proved therein, that Matter was a created Subſtance, whereas this Dialogue contains ſeveral other Points of Religion. We may anſwer to the firſt Reaſon, That *Euſebius* was not exact in ſetting down the Times of Authors, and eſpecially of thoſe about whoſe Lives he was not particular. The ſecond Objection is more difficult; though we may ſay, that *Euſebius* having extracted out of this Book of *Maximus*, only what relates to the Original of Evil, and the Creation of Matter, he gave it the Title of περὶ ὕλης, *& unde ſit malum*, though it treated of other Subjects; beſides that, this Dialogue was chiefly deſigned to confute the Error of the *Marcionites*, who admitted of ſeveral Principles for the Explaining the Cauſe of Evil, and that of the *Valentinians*, who made Matter Eternal. Which agrees with what *Euſebius* ſays in his Hiſtory, that *Maximus* compoſed ſeveral Volumes concerning that famous Queſtion among the Hereticks; *From whence comes Evil?* and to prove that Matter is a created Subſtance; for though there are other things diſcourſed of in this Dialogue, yet theſe are the two Principal Heads. Nevertheleſs, as the Paſſage which is related by *Euſebius*, and in the *Philocalia*, does not agree exactly with what is in this Dialogue, and that the Names of *Origen*, and the other Diſputants are not there to be found, 'tis likely they were added after the Death of *Maximus* and *Origen*. There are likewiſe in this Dialogue ſome Things which might,

(*Whom our Author means by this Engliſh-man I know not.* Weſtenius, *the Greek Profeſſor at* Baſil, *was the firſt that publiſhed it at* Baſil, *Gr. Lat. in* 1674. 4°.)

Origen. might give occaſion to conjecture, that it is more Modern than any of theſe Authors. For it having been objected in the Firſt Part, that the God of the Creation, who has the Hearts of Kings in his Power, muſt of neceſſity be a wicked God, ſince he ſuffered the Chriſtians to be perſecuted: He anſwers, *Theſe pitiful Shifts which you make, might have had ſome probability in former times, and there might have been ſome neceſſity then of returning an Anſwer to them, which might have been done very eaſily: But now we have a Religious Prince, what have you to ſay? Will you ſay that it is another God who rules his Heart, ſince this Godly Prince governs us much better than the others, and yet after a quite contrary manner; for he eſtabliſhes what the others would have deſtroyed, he overthrows the Images and Temples which the others honoured.* Which ſhews that this Dialogue was compoſed in *Conſtantine*'s time; for to ſay that this is to be underſtood of *Philip*, is to affirm a thing of which there is no likelihood; becauſe ſuppoſing that he was a Chriſtian, of which we are not aſſured, it was moſt certain that he did not make Profeſſion thereof, and we cannot ſay of any Emperor before *Conſtantine*, that he overthrew Idolatry, and deſtroyed Temples and Idols. So the moſt probable Opinion is, That this Dialogue was compoſed in the beginning of the Fourth Age by one of *Origen*'s Diſciples, who has inſerted *Maximus*'s Dialogue into his Diſcourſe. Beſides, there is another Reaſon not to attribute it to *Origen*, which is taken notice of by *Huetius*; which is, that we find ſome Notions that are very Orthodox, and quite different from *Origen*'s Errors, concerning the State of Innocence, Man's Body, the Soul, and the Reſurrection.

But we muſt reckon amongſt the Suppoſititious Books two different Commentaries upon *Job*, Printed in Latin under *Origen*'s Name; the firſt divided into three Books, which concludes about the middle of the third Chapter of *Job*. We do not certainly know whether it was compoſed in Latin, or whether it was tranſlated from the Greek (*ee*): however, 'tis certain that it was not written by *Origen* (*dd*), but by ſome other Author, who lived ſince the Time of *Arius* (*ee*), and one that was an *Arian* himſelf.

The other Commentary upon the Book of *Job*, tranſlated by *Pericnius* from a Manuſcript of the King's Library, is alſo by an *Arian* (*ff*), but different from the firſt, though he commends the Martyr *Lucian* as well as *Origen*; and ſpeaks of the *Manichees*. The four Homilies upon *Job*, which were publiſhed under *Origen*'s Name in the firſt Edition by *Genebrard*, were left out in the ſecond, becauſe they are not *Origen*'s, no more than S. *Chryſoſtom*'s, to whom they are ſtill attributed. It is obſerved in a Letter prefixed to *Eraſmus*'s Edition, that there were ſtill remaining under *Origen*'s Name, ſome little Notes upon *Job*, which they would not inſert in his Works, becauſe they appeared to be of a quite different Style and Genius.

There is in the King's Library, a Commentary upon S. *Mark*, aſcribed likewiſe to *Origen*, which is certainly none of his (*gg*).

The ten Homilies upon ſeveral Paſſages of the Goſpel, collected by *Merlinus*, are all written by others (*hh*), being written after a quite different manner, and almoſt all of them compoſed by a La-

(*cc*) *Whether it was compoſed in Latin, or whether it was tranſlated from the Greek.*] *Eraſmus*, *Aubertin*, and *Cook* are of Opinion that it was Latin, becauſe the Phraſe and Manner of Expreſſion is Latin; but this might proceed from the Intrepreter. That which makes it believed that the Author was rather a Greek, is the Prologue which is in the Interpreters Name; which *Eraſmus* rejects as Suppoſititious.

(*dd*) *'Tis certain that it was not written by* Origen.] He ſays ſome things contrary to what *Origen* affirms. For Example, in the Second Book, he ſays that Jeſus Chriſt preached three years and a half; and *Origen*, in his Book *De Principiis*, *Cap.* 2. and *Hom.* 32. *in Lucam*, ſays that he preached but a Year and odd Months.

(*ee*) *But by ſome other Author, who lived ſince the time of* Arius.] He calls the Church that believes the Trinity, a Sect and a Hereſie. He rejects the Word Trinity and ὁμοούσιος: He commends the Martyr *Lucian*, who died a long time after *Origen*, and whom the *Arians* extolled as their Patron: Upon which *Arius* calls *Euſebius* of *Nicomedia*, *Colluthianus*: And this ſufficiently ſhews how groſly they are miſtaken, who have attributed theſe Commentaries to S. *Hilary*.

(*ff*) *The other Commentary upon the whole Book of* Job, *is alſo by an Arian.*] He condemns the Term ὁμοούσιος; and calls the Catholicks *Homouſiaſts*; He commends *Lucian* the Martyr; and it is different from the Firſt, becauſe he makes *Moſes* to be the Author of the Book of *Job*, and the Firſt only make him to be the Interpreter. Whereas *Origen*, in his Sixth Book againſt *Celſus*, ſays, that *Moſes* wrote nothing but the *Pentateuch*. It is of a different Style from the Treatiſes of *Origen*, and he confutes thoſe who believe the Stars to be animated, which is *Origen*'s Opinion.

(*gg*) *A Commentary upon S.* Mark, *aſcribed likewiſe to* Origen, *which is none of his.*] It is of a quite different Style. He ſays he will collect the Opinions of the Ancients. In ſome Manuſcripts it is attributed to S. *Cyril*; in others to *Victor* of *Antioch*: It has been Tranſlated, and Publiſhed under this Name by *Pelanus*. He cites *Origen*, *Euſebius*, S. *Chryſoſtom*, *Apollinarius*, and *Theodoret*; and he mentions the *Novatians*.

(*hh*) *The Ten Homilies are all of other Authors than* Origen.] They have been collected in ſeveral Places, and put into order by *Merlinus*. They are all written in a different Style from *Origen*'s; and compoſed by a Latin Author: They have all Deſigns that are quite differing from thoſe of *Origen*'s Homilies; They are full of Quibbles upon Words, and of affected Rhetorical Figures, which is not to be found in *Origen*'s Works. In the Firſt, he ſays, That Jeſus Chriſt was born of the Virgin, without opening of her Womb; The contrary to which is taught by *Origen*, in his 54th Homily upon S. *Luke*. The Second diſcourſes of the *Arians* and the *Manichees*; and therein the Term ὁμοούσιος is defended; therein likewiſe are cited the Books attributed to S. *Dionyſius*. The 3d, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, and 10th Books are all filled with vain Repetitions, Antitheſes, Quibbles upon Words, Synonima's and Alluſions, which prove that it is a Latin Author, they are of the ſame Style of the Firſt. The 9th is compoſed of Three Parts (as *Huetius* has obſerved.) The Firſt is Part of *Origen*'s 34th Diſcourſe upon S. *Mathew*. The Second is taken from S. *Hierom*'s 8th Book upon *Iſaiah*; and the Laſt from the 17th Chapter of St. *Gregory*'s Ninth Book of Morals.

tin. The Book concerning *Sighs*, or *Penance*, attributed to *Origen*, and placed by *Gelaſius* among the Number of the *Apocryphal* Pieces, is without doubt counterfeit, as well as his Preface. *Morellus* cauſed to be printed under *Origen*'s Name, in the year 1601, ſome *Scholia* upon the Lord's Prayer, and upon the Hymn of the Bleſſed Virgin, and of *Zachary*; but the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, &c. (*ii*) informs us, That they were written by *Petrus Laodicenſis*. Beſides, there were found in the *Vatican* Library, ſome Homilies upon *Jeremiah*, ſome whereof were printed by *Chifletius* in the Year 1623, which alſo are none of his. The Book concerning Cœlibacy of the Clergy, which is amongſt S. *Cyprian*'s Works, bears the Name of *Origen* in a Manuſcript of the King's Library (*kk*), but 'tis the Work of a Latin Author. It is ſaid alſo, That there are in Libraries ſome Treatiſes under this Author's Name (*ll*), which are very dubious, they not being cited by the Ancients, and being for the moſt part upon ſuch Subjects, upon which it is not likely that *Origen* ſhould have written. *Origen.*

I ſhall not ſtand to ſet down in particular the ſeveral Editions of *Origen*'s Works, as well in Greek as in Latin, having already taken notice of the greateſt part of them: It ſhall ſuffice me to ſay, That all *Origen*'s Works that are in Latin, have been collected by *Merlinus*, and afterwards by *Eraſmus*, and printed in two Volumes at *Paris* in the Year 1512, and at *Baſil* in the Years 1526, 1545, and 1571. That *Genebrard* has ſince made a larger Collection, printed at *Paris* in 1574, 1604, and 1619; and at *Baſil* in 1620. That all the Greek Fragments of *Origen*'s Books upon the Scripture, are publiſhed with a Tranſlation by the Learned *Huetius*, and printed in *France* in two Volumes, in the Year 1667, but that he has not yet ſet forth the other Works of *Origen*, as he promiſed. That his Books againſt *Celſus*, and the *Philocalia* were printed in *England* in 1658. That *Wetſtenius*, Greek Profeſſor at *Baſil*, cauſed to be printed there, in 1674, the Dialogue againſt *Marcion*, the Exhortation to Martyrdom, and the Letters of *Africanus* and *Origen*, concerning the Hiſtory of *Suſanna*; and laſtly, That the Book concerning Prayer has been lately printed in *England*. So that to have all *Origen*'s Works, as well thoſe which we have only in Latin, as thoſe in Greek, we muſt have *Genebrard*'s Edition, *Huetius*'s two Volumes, the Books againſt *Celſus*, with the *Philocalia*, printed in *England* in Quarto; the Quarto Volume ſet forth by *Wetſtenius*, and the little Treatiſe concerning Prayer, lately printed in *England*.

It would be very tedious, and to little purpoſe, to give here an Abridgment of all *Origen*'s Works, and particularly of his Homilies, and his Commentaries upon the Scripture, which are almoſt all full of Allegories and Morality; beſides, having only the Verſion of the greateſt part of the Homilies, we cannot be certain whether that which relates to Doctrin and Diſcipline, be *Origen*'s own, or *Ruffinus*'s: I ſhall therefore content my ſelf to give a Summary of his Doctrin upon the principal Points of our Religion, examining at the ſame time whether he be guilty of thoſe Errors of which he is accuſed.

If we had had his Books *of Principles* in Greek, we might eaſily have been informed of all his Opinions; for theſe Books contained the Abridgment of Doctrin: But ſince we have only *Ruffinus*'s Tranſlation, in which he himſelf confeſſes that he altered and omitted ſeveral Paſſages, wherein *Origen* diſcourſes concerning the Myſtery of the Trinity, which he believes were corrupted by the Hereticks, we cannot be aſſured of *Origen*'s Doctrin from this Verſion, except it be in thoſe things for which he is condemned: ſo that we muſt have recourſe to thoſe Works of *Origen* which we have in Greek.

Origen's Notions concerning the Nature and the Attributes of God are very Orthodox; he believes that he is a Spiritual, inviſible, Simple, and Eternal Eſſence. He is wrongfully accuſed for believing that God had a Body, ſince he ſays directly contrary in ſeveral places, and proves it by many convincing Arguments. He diſcourſes admirably concerning the Knowledge and the Providence of God. Some have accuſed him of having ſet Bounds to his Power, becauſe he ſays, *That he is called Omnipotent only becauſe he governs all things, and not becauſe he can create any thing new.* *Juſtinian* cites in his Letter to *Mennas*, a Paſſage taken from the ſecond Book of *Origen*'s Principles, where he ſays that the Power of God is finite, and that he made all the Creatures that he can govern. *Ruffinus* alſo taxes him of this Error. He ſeems indeed to have believed that God created that Matter from all Eternity, whereof he has made the World, and of which he will make ſucceſſively ſeveral other Worlds.

Lib. 4. *contra Celſum.* & 6. *Lib.* 3. *contra Celſum. T.* 14. *in Joan* & *de Princip. c.* 1. *q.* 20. *in Exod. Lib.* 4. *contra Celſum.*

The Ancients are extreamly divided as to the Judgment that is to be given of *Origen*'s Doctrin concerning the Trinity.

(*ii*) *But the Bibliotheca Patrum*, &c.] *Michael Chifleri* tells us in the Preface to his Commentary upon *Jeremiah*, Printed in the Year 1623, that he found four and twenty of them, and that the Laſt was the Treatiſe of S. *Clement*, *What Rich Man can be ſaved?* He ſets down Eight.

(*kk*) *Bears* Origen's *Name in a Manuſcript of the King's Library.*] By *Vincentius Bellovacenſis*, and ſome others. *Pamelius* is of this Opinion. In other Manuſcrips it is attributed to S. *Hierom* and S. *Auguſtin*. Some have believed, that it was Tranſlated from Greek, but it is, as we ſhall ſhew hereafter, written by a Latin.

(*ll*) *Laſtly, They ſay that there are in Libraries other Treatiſes under this Author's Name.*] There is a Book concerning the Aſtrolabe, which was ſaid to be in the *Vatican* Library; the Breviary or Abridgment of *Origen*, a Book concerning Preaching or Catechizing, &c. And beſides this, there are ſeveral of *Origen*'s Fragments in the *Catenæ Græcorum Patrum*: But it would be an endleſs Labour to collect them all. *Huetius*, who neglected this Toil, thinking it to be too Great, by reaſon of the Multitude of the *Catenæ*, and to be to no purpoſe, by reaſon of their little Authority; tells us that Father *Combefis*, a Man of indefatigable Pains, having undertaken it, he has referred us to the Collection which he has made of them. 'Tis probable he did not think them worth publiſhing.

S. *Hierom*

Origen.

S. *Hierom*, *John* Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, S. *Epiphanius*, S. *Auſtin*, and after them *Theophilus*, *Juſtinian*, and the fifth Council, have accuſed him of ſeveral Errors about this Myſtery: On the contrary, *Didymus*, S. *Athanaſius*, S. *Baſil*, S. *Gregory Nazianzen*, and an *anonymous* Author, of whom *Photius* ſpeaks in the 117th Volume, S. *Chryſoſtom* and *Ruffinus* have either cited him againſt the *Arians*, as an Author who had Orthodox Notions concerning the Trinity, or defended him againſt the Accuſations of his Enemies; the One by giving a favourable Senſe to his Words, and the Others by maintaining that thoſe Paſſages which were found not to be agreeable to the Faith of the Church were added; and that there were other contrary Expreſſions, which were entirely conformable to the Doctrin of the Church. It is certain that in *Ruffinus*'s Latin Verſions which we have of the Book *de Principiis*, and the Apology of *Pamphilus*, and of his other Works, the Doctrin of the Trinity is explained after a very Orthodox manner. But we muſt confeſs, that we cannot rely upon *Ruffinus*'s Credit, who acknowledges that he added and altered ſeveral Paſſages relating to the Trinity. It is true, he ſays he has taken what he has added from other Places of *Origen*; but S. *Hierom* denies it, and we are not obliged to believe *Ruffinus* upon his own Word. So likewiſe we ought not to give Credit entirely to what S. *Hierom* ſays againſt *Origen*, ſince he was as violent againſt him, as *Ruffinus* was paſſionate for him. Therefore, Neither believing his Enemies, nor his zealous Defenders, let us conſult thoſe Pieces of his Works which we have in Greek. And here ſtill we are in a Labyrinth, from which it will be difficult to extricate our ſelves. Herein we find ſome things which appear no leſs contrary, than the Opinions themſelves of the Authors who have written for and againſt him. He often ſpeaks very excellently of the WORD, which gives us reaſon to believe that he was perſuaded of his Godhead: He ſays, That he was from the beginning in the Father; That he is the Image of the Father; That he was begotten of the Father from all Eternity; That he is a Subſiſtence, and a Perſon diſtinguiſhed from the Father; That he is the Wiſdom of God, and that he is God himſelf; That he never leaves his Father; That thoſe are in an Error, who deny that the Godhead of the Father and the Son is the ſame, though their Subſtance be different; That he is God, Θεὸς, though he be not the Source and Original of the Godhead, as the Father is, whom upon that account he calls Αυτόθεος. That he is above all Creatures; That we may addreſs our Vows and our Prayers to Him, as to God the Father; That he is only known by the Father; That he ought to be honoured as the Father, and that he has the ſame Power. Laſtly, S. *Athanaſius* cites two formal Paſſages for the Eternity of the WORD, and for his Equality with the Father; and S. *Baſil* alſo cites one which is very clear for the Divinity of the Holy Ghoſt.

Tom. 1. Comment. in Joan. p. 17, 19. p. 30. ibid. & Homil. 6. in Jerom p. 28. Tom. 2. 47, 48. ib d. lib 2 cont. Celſum. lib. 6. cont. Celſum, & lib. 8.

But, on the other ſide, in his Books we meet with many Expreſſions which are very harſh, little conformable to the Orthodox Doctrin, and which ſeem to favour the *Arians*. He ſays, That the Word is an *Hypoſtaſis* different from the Father; and he takes the Word *Hypoſtaſis* to ſignifie *Nature* and *Subſtance*. He ſays likewiſe, That the Father and the Son are One in Concord and in Will; and that the laſt is not properly God, ὁ Θεὸς, but only called God, becauſe he is the Image and Reſemblance of the Divinity; That the WORD and the Holy Ghoſt were made by the Father; That we muſt not compare the Father with the Son; and that the Father is greater than the Son, who is inferior to Him, though he be ſuperior to all Creatures, as the Sun-beam is inferior to the Sun; and laſtly, That the WORD is the Miniſter of the Father. Theſe Expreſſions, and ſome others like them, are hard indeed; but when there are Contradictions in Authors, we ought always, in my Opinion, to take the moſt favourable Side. Beſides, That it is more eaſie to put a good Conſtruction on theſe laſt Expreſſions, which were very common before the Council of *Nice*, than to put a bad one upon the Firſt: For, without making uſe of *Ruffinus*'s way of defending him, who ſays that theſe Places are either added or corrupted; and without alledging in his Excuſe, that being to diſpute againſt the *Sabellians*, he was obliged to make uſe of ſome Terms which might ſeem to favour the oppoſite Error; without making uſe, I ſay, of theſe general Defences I believe we may explain in a very Catholick Senſe, thoſe Expreſſions which I have juſt now related. When he ſays, That the Father and the Son were *Two Hypoſtaſes*; he underſtands by the Word *Hypoſtaſis*, all that is oppoſed to nothing; and he had no other Deſign than to maintain againſt the *Sabellians*, That the WORD was not a Vertue or a Quality from the Father, but a Perſon ſubſiſting. It is certain, That in *Origen*'s Time the Word *Hypoſtaſis* and *Subſtance* were ſynonymous Terms; but ſo too by the Word *Subſtance*, was often underſtood a Perſon ſubſiſting; and ſome Catholick Authors, not only before the Council of *Nice*, but even afterwards have affirmed that the Father was a Subſtance, the Son a ſecond Subſtance; underſtanding, as S. *Hilary* obſerves, by *Subſtance*, the *Perſons ſubſiſting*. In the ſecond place, *Origen* does not ſay that the Son is a Creature: He does not deny but that he is God, but he only denies that he is God of himſelf, as the Father is, Αυτόθεος; and this is what he would explain by the Compariſon of the Sun and the Sun-beam, which the Fathers, who lived after the Council of *Nice*, thought to be very proper for the explaining the Myſtery of the Trinity. And thus it is, that going upon this Principle, he ſays, That the Son is inferior to the Father, and that the Father was greater than the Son; not that he believed them to be of a different Nature, ſince he owned that they are One and the ſame Divinity, and One and the ſame Subſtance; That the Son was equal to the Father, and that he was in him from all Eternity; but becauſe the Son derives his Divinity from the Father, who is the Source of the Godhead. As to what he ſays, That the Son is

Lib. de Decretis Concilii Nicani. Baſil. de Sp. Sancto c. 29. lib. 8. cont. Celſum, & Tom. 2. in Joannem, p. 56. & p. 17, & 23. Tom. 2. in Joan. p 49, 56, & 70. Item Tom. 13. p. 218. Item Tom. 32. lib. 8. cont. Celſum, & lib. 5.

the

the Miniſter of the Father; That the Father made uſe of him in making the World; and that the Son was created. Theſe are Expreſſions that are too common among the Ancients, to be particularly objected to *Origen* as a Crime. *Origen.*

S. *Hierom* accuſes *Origen*, for ſaying, That the Son, in compariſon of the Father, was not Goodneſs it ſelf, but only the Image and Repreſentation of Goodneſs; and *Huetius* confirms this to have been *Origen*'s Opinion by ſome of his Greek Paſſages. The ſame S. *Hierom* upbraids him alſo for affirming that the Son in compariſon of the Father, was a leſſer Light; That he was not the Truth, but the Image of the Truth; That he was Viſible, and the Father Inviſible; but we may eaſily diſcern that theſe Expreſſions, as harſh as they may ſeem, being conſidered ſeparatly, were meant by *Origen* in a good ſenſe, he having no other Deſign than to prove that the Father was the Source and Original of Goodneſs and Truth; and that the Son received it from him; and that in this ſenſe he was the Image of the Father's Goodneſs, the Brightneſs of his Godhead: Expreſſions which in this ſenſe are very Orthodox. As to what he ſays, that the Father is Inviſible, and the Son Viſible, we have ſhewn in other Places what the Ancients, meant by this way of Speaking.

Epiſt. ad Avitum.

Tom. 2. in Joan. p. 56. Tom. 6. pl. 130. Lib. 5. contra Celſum. Tom. 15. in Mat.

Laſtly, It is eaſie to anſwer what S. *Epiphanius* and ſeveral others object to *Origen*. That he denied that the Father was Viſible to the Son, and to the Holy Ghoſt: For he affirms ſo expreſly in ſo many Places. That the Father is perfectly known of the Son, and even of the Holy Ghoſt, that he muſt of neceſſity have had ſome meaning, when he ſeems to aſſert the contrary. *Ruffinus* anſwers this Objection, That he denied that the Father was viſible to the Son, as Bodies are viſible to Bodies, that he might confute the Error of the *Valentinians*, who believed that God was Corporeal; and he cites a Paſſage of *Origen*, where he diſtinguiſhes betwixt *Seeing* and *Knowing*, and affirms, That we may ſay that the Son *knows* the Father, but that we cannot ſay that he *ſees* him, becauſe Seeing is the Property of a Body. I ſhall not make any anſwer to other more trivial Objections, becauſe it is eaſie to ſatisfie them, as well by what we have juſt now ſaid as by what we have obſerved upon the other Fathers. (*a*) There are no very conſiderable Objections made againſt *Origen*'s Doctrin concerning the Incarnation; for though he be accuſed of ſeveral Errors, he affirms ſo poſitively, in all his Works, That the WORD had taken a Body and a Soul like ours, in the Womb of a Virgin, by the Operation of the Holy Ghoſt; That Jeſus Chriſt had true Fleſh; That he really ſuffered, That he is altogether God and Man, in that the Human Nature was united with the Divine Nature in one and the ſame Perſon: That it is impoſſible to accuſe him of any Error concerning the Myſtery of the Incarnation. Perhaps, as he was of Opinion, That the Souls were in Heaven before they came down into their Bodies, he might think the ſame thing of the Soul of Jeſus Chriſt. But this was only a particular Error, for which he was not very earneſt.

Tom. 20. in Joh. p. 292.

(a) *Lib. 1, cont. Celſum, lib 2. lib. 3. & lib. 4 Com. in Joan & in Mat. paſſim lib. 1. περὶ ἀρχῶν in Apol. Pamphili.* Vide *Tom. 1 in Joan p. 3. Tom. 20 p. 307. lib. 6. Lib. 1. cont. Celſum. Lib. 2. περὶ ἀρχῶν. Theophil, Ep. 2. Paſchal. Hier. Ep ad Ruffinum. li. 1. cap. 5. & Ep. 61. ad Avitum. c. 4. Sulpit. Severus Dial. 1. c. 3. Bern. Serm. 14. Albert. in Ep 8. Dion. Hom. 40. in Lucam Hom 1. in Levit. Lib. 5. in Ep ad Rom T. 1. in Joh p. 32, 38. T. 2. p 69. t 1. in Mat. p. 313. t. 15. in Matt. 313. 1 περὶ ἀρχῶν c. 3. Lib 5. in Ep. ad Rom. Juſtin Ep. ad Menam. Hier Ep. ad Avitum.* Vide, *Hom. 1. in Levit. in Luc. c. 2. Hom. 12. in Lev. & 8. Hom. 20. in Luc. lib. 2. de Princip. c. 3. Tom. 1. Com. in Johan. Tom. 2. p. 320.*

He is accuſed of believing that the Death of Chriſt was of Advantage to all reaſonable Creatures, as Angels, Devils, and even inſenſible things; and 'tis certain that he does aſſert this wild Notion in ſeveral places of his Works. He has feigned a Spiritual Death of Jeſus Chriſt in the other World, which has given occaſion to tax him for holding that Jeſus Chriſt died ſeveral times. *He believed that Chriſt did not come out of the Virgins Womb by Penetration*; and he accuſes the Virgin *Mary* of Diſtruſt. But theſe are but ſlight Errors, and common among the Ancients.

As he believed that the only Point of Faith relating to the Angels, was, That there were ſuch Beings, and that neither Scripture nor Tradition had determined any thing as to their Nature and their Number; ſo he has taken the Liberty to deliver his own Thoughts hereupon: He imagins that they are Corporeal, though inviſible, having nevertheleſs a Spiritual Soul. He ſays, That the good Angels have a finer, and the Evil ones a groſſer Body. The Principle from whence he has drawn this Concluſion, is, That all intelligent and ſpiritual Creatures having been created in Heaven with a perfect Freedom of Will, they have been afterwards, for a Puniſhment of their Faults, confined to Bodies more or leſs groſs, according to the Quality of their Crimes, and ranked in ſuch and ſuch Orders or Degrees of Creatures inferior one to another: yet ſo, nevertheleſs, as that after having ſuffered this Exile, if I may ſo ſay, for ſome Ages, they may by living vertuouſly, return to the place from whence they were baniſhed. (*b*) And going upon this Principle, he affirms, That men may become Angels, and Angels Men; That the Angels being free, do often commit Faults; That the Devils ſhall one day be delivered; That the Angels are guilty of ſeveral Offences in their Adminiſtration of things here below, for which they are immediately rebuked, and for which they ſhall be judged in the Day of Judgment. All theſe Fancies, and ſeveral others, are the Conſequences of *Plato*'s Doctrin, to which *Origen* was wonderfully addicted. We muſt nevertheleſs acknowledge, that he does not propoſe theſe things as Doctrins of our Religion, but only as his Opinions and Conjectures.

(b) *This is the Principle of the Platoniſts.* Theophilus, Juſtinian, S. Epiphanius, Methodius, *and an anonymous Author in* Photius, *aſcribed it to* Origen. *He plainly aſſerts it in his firſt Book of Principles, C. 6. Tom. 15. & 13. in Matt.*

Origen.

(c) *Hom.* 23. *in Joſ. lib.* 2. *Per. c.* 11. *Tom.* 13. *in Mat. & p.* 310, 311. *Tom.* 14. *p. ſeq. lib.* 1. *in Ep. ad Rom. Hom.* 23. *in Joſ. lib.* 8. *cont. celſum. Hom.* 4. *in Num. Hom.* 2. *in Joſ. lib.* 1. *Per. cap.* 10. *lib.* 8. *cont. Celſum, Hom.* 4. *in Pſal.* 36. *Hom.* 20. *Hom.* 35. *in Luc. lib.* 5. *cont. Celſum. lib.* 8. *Hom. in Ezek. Hom.* 23. *in Lucam.*

(*c*) He ſays in ſeveral Places, That the Angels take care of Men; That every Chuch, every Society; and laſtly, every Man has his Guardian-Angel; and even in ſome places he ſays, That every one has his good and evil Angel; in other Places, That ſeveral Angels have the Care of one particular Perſon; and in others, That they take care of inanimate Things. Though he denies that we ought to addreſs to the Angels the ſame Prayers, and the ſame Adorations as to God, yet he allows that they may be prayed unto, and honoured according as the deſerve.

Concerning the Soul, he ſays in the Preface to his Books *of Principles*, that it is not determined by the Tradition of the Church, whether it be produced by another Soul, or whether it comes from elſewhere; whether it be Eternal, or created at a certain time; whether it animates the Body, or whether it be only confined there. This is what he ſays in the Language of an Eccleſiaſtical Author: But following the Principles of *Plato*'s Philoſophy, he holds, That Souls are intelligent Creatures, which have been from Eternity, which are ſent into Bodies as into a Priſon, for a Puniſhment of their Sins; That they paſs from Body to Body; That they become Angels; and laſtly, That they are in a continual Motion. He aſſerts all theſe things in his ſecond Book *of Principles*, Chap. 6, and 7. and in ſeveral other places of his Works.

(d) *Lib.* 2. *Per. cap.* 2.

(*d*) He ſays in ſome Places, That the Soul is Corporeal, but in others he aſſures us, that it is Spiritual and Incorporeal.

(e) *Hom.* 1. *in Geneſ.. in Exhortat. ad Matt. lib.* 6. *contra Celſum. In Luc. cap.* 41.

(*e*) He holds it as an Article of Faith, That there is a Free-Will in all reaſonable Creatures; from whence it follows, That though a Man may be excited to Good by ſome Cœleſtial Power, and ſpurr'd on to Evil by the Devil, yet he is never conſtrained to do Good or Evil. This is what he ſays agreeably to the Doctrin of the Church; but he extends this Liberty, by following *Plato*'s Principles, to all ſorts of Conditions; and he pretends, That an intelligent Creature is, and will always be free to do Good and Evil, in whatſoever State and Condition he is; for in this he makes Free-Will to conſiſt. (*f*) He does not ſeem to have made any Diſtinction between *Adam*'s State, and that of Mankind after the Fall.

(f) *Lib.* 2. *Per. c.* 3. *& li.* 3. *cap* 1. *& 3. Lib.* 3. *περὶ ἀρχῶν, c.* 1. *& 2. & in Ep. ad Rom. paſſim. Tom.* 11 *in Matt. Item.* 16, *&* 17. *in Joan. lib.* 1. *περὶ ἀρχῶν, c.* 7. *lib.* 3. *c.* 1. *Philocal. cap.* 20. *in Ep. ad Rom. lib.* 7, *&* 9. *& lib.* 2. *de Princip. cap.* 9. *Hom* 10. *in Levit.* 1. *in Ezek. lib* 1. *Per. c.* 5. *Hom.* 35. *in Luc. c* 1. *lib.* 3. *Per. Tract.* 33 *in Matt. Lib.* 4, *&* 9. *in Ep. ad Rom. Supra, & lib in Ep. ad Rom. lib.* 3. *Per. c.* 2. *lib.* 1. *Per. c.* 8. *lib.* 3. *cap.* 2. *in Pſal* 4. *Hom. in Pſal.* 36. *Hom. in Matt. p.* 210. *Tract.* 15. *in Matt.*

He attributes very much to Free-Will, and Nature, and he ſpeaks but very little of Grace, which he believes was infuſed into Souls according to the Merits which they have, before they are confined in Bodies; and afterwards it is augmented according to the Good and Evil which they do in making uſe of their Natural Liberty. He aſcribes in ſeveral Places the Converſion of a Man, and all the Good which he acts, to Free-Will; and allows hardly any thing to Grace, ſo that it was not without Reaſon that S. *Hierom* accuſes him for having furniſhed the *Pelagians* with Principles; though yet in ſome places he ſpeaks very advantagiouſly of Grace, and of the Aſſiſtance of God. He is taxed for holding, That Men may arrive to ſuch a Degree of Perfection, that they ſhall be no more ſubject to Temptation, nor commit any more Sins: And indeed there are ſome Relicks of this Error in his Books.

(g) *Lib.* 5. *in Ep. ad. Rom. Tom.* 13. *in Matt. p.* 328. *T.* 15. *p.* 385. *Tract.* 35. *in Matt. ibid. & Lib.* 1. *in Ep. ad Rom.*

(h) *Lib.* 1 *in Ep ad Rom. & lib.* 7. *ejuſdem operis.*

He has alſo affirmed, that thoſe who have ſinned, after having received the Holy Ghoſt, could obtain no more Pardon for their Sin. (*g*) And upon this account he maintains, that S. *Peter* had not as yet received the Holy Ghoſt, when he denied Chriſt, and that being forſaken by God, it was impoſſible for him not to ſin. (*h*) When he explains that Paſſage of the Fifth Chapter of the Epiſtle of S. *Paul* to the *Romans*, he diſcourſes of Original Sin after a very obſcure manner; as if he doubted of it: And we muſt not wonder after this, that he did not admit of any other Predeſtination, than that which has reſpect to Merits.

(i) *Tom.* 1. *in Joan. p.* 17. *lib.* 1. *Per. c.* 7. *& lib.* 2. *Tom.* 13. *in Matt. lib.* 5. *con. Celſum & in Ep. ad Rom. Cap.* 8. *& lib.* 8. *Juſtin. Ep* 8 *ad. Mennam.*

He believed that the Stars were animated with reaſonable Souls confined to theſe Bodies. (*i*) He owns the Reſurrection of the Body, but by Philoſophizing too nicely upon this Matter, he has, if I may ſo ſay, Spiritualized it.

(k) *Lib.* 5. *Con. Celſ. lib.* 2. *Per. c.* 3. *lib.* 2. *c.* 10. *See* Methodius *in* Epiphanius, *and St.* Jerom *in his Epiſtle* John *of* Jeruſalem. *Tom.* 17. *in Matt. pag.* 454. *&* 495. *lib.* 2. *c.* 3. *&* 10. *& lib.* 3. *Cap.* 6.

He admits of two Reſurrections; That of the Righteous, and that of the Wicked. He acknowledges the laſt Judgment, wherein Men and Angels ſhall be judged: but he ſeems to make a doubt in what Place it ſhould be, if all Men were there to be judged. (*k*) He ſays, That Jeſus Chriſt ſhall appear there, but that we neither know the Place where he will appear, nor the Manner how. He rejects the Opinion of the Millenaries. He confeſſes that Good Men ſhall again be recompenced with Eternal Bleſſedneſs, and the Wicked puniſhed with Eternal Fire; but he deſtroys the Simplicity of this Faith by Reaſoning too much on this Subject. He believes that all Men, even the moſt Holy, ſhall paſs through the Fire: That after Men have paſſed through the Fire, the Wicked ſhall be caſt into Hell, that is to ſay, into the Loweſt Place, and they ſhall be there tormented with Eternal Fire. This

Fire

Fire (as (*l*) he Explains it in other Places) is Remorse of Conscience, and Vexation of Spirit. (*m*) He make Blessedness to consist in an Union with God. He says that Souls come to it by degrees; that after they are separated from their Bodies, they are for some time upon Earth, in order to be purified, that afterwards they are taken up into the Air, and instructed by Angels, that they pass through several Places, where they remain for some time, and that at last they come to the Highest Heaven, in comparison whereof the Firmament is but a Hell; that the more they retain of Earth in them, the longer they are upon this Journey: That the Souls which are arrived at this Sovereign Degree of Bliss, may fall from it, and that they are sent back again into Cœlestial Bodies, or others, and that they afterwards return from whence they were driven: That so Blessedness may have an End, and that Torments shall have a Conclusion likewise. (*n*) He says in his Preface to the Book *de Principiis*, that God Created the World, that it had a Beginning, and that it must have an End; but that it is not determined by Tradition, what it was before, and what it will be after. He imagines that it was made, if I may so express it, to be a Place of Banishment for all Intelligent Creatures. He makes no difficulty of asserting, that there were more Worlds before this, and that there shall be more after it. He says, That God always had the Matter upon which he wrought, which supposes that it is Eternal, since God Created it from all Eternity.

(*o*) He says, That the Earthly Paradise was in Heaven, and he has explained of Souls which were there, that which is said in *Genesis* concerning *Adam* and *Eve*. He understands by the Fig-Leaves, wherewith they covered themselves after the Fall, the Mortal Bodies to which the Souls were chained,

It may be concluded from all, that we have already said concerning *Origen*'s Doctrin upon the Tenents of our Religion, that although he professed to believe the Doctrin of the Church, (*p*) yet he sets up some Philosophical Principles, the Consequences of which were found contrary to what was taught by the Christian Religion; which obliged him, in order to accomodate these things which were so directly opposite one to the other, to invent several Opinions that were very far from the Simplicity of the Faith. So that me must distinguish in *Origen* what he says according to the way of Speaking used by the Church in his Time, and what he says according to the Principles of *Plato*'s Philosophy, and then we need not wonder, if after having acknowledged the Truths of Christianity, he should lose himself by advancing such Platonick Notions as are destructive to them. And this, in my Opinion, is the reason of his principal Errors, which are all of them founded upon three Principles taken from the Platonick Philosophy; which are: First, That Intelligent Creatures have always been, and shall eternally exist. Secondly, That they have always been free to do Good and Evil. And Lastly, That they have been precipitated into the Lower Places, and confined to Bodies for a Punishment of their Sins. Let any one throughly Examine all *Origen*'s Errors, of which we have just now spoken, and he will easily perceive that they all proceed from this, that he was willing to accommodate the Truths of the Christian Religion to these Platonick Principles.

There are besides some other slighter Errors in *Origen*, into the greatest part of which he fell by confining himself too much to the Allegorical Sense of the Scripture; for Example, (*q*) Explaining Christ's Words concerning the Power of Binding and Loosing, which he granted to St. *Peter*, he seems to reserve this Power to those Bishops and Priests who imitate the Virtues of this Apostle; and in the same Sense he says, that all Spiritual Men are this Rock, upon which Jesus Christ has built his Church. So likewise (*r*) explaining that Passage of Scripture, where it is said: *Not that which goeth into the Mouth defileth a Man*, he speaks of the Eucharist after so Obscure and Allegorical a manner, that it is very difficult to comprehend his Meaning. (*s*) He likewise explains Allegorically whas is said of the Eucharist in other Places of the Word of God. It is easie however to defend him against the Protestants upon the Subject of the Real Presence, since he acknowledges in the Eighth Book, that the Loaves which are offered in the Church are made a Holy Body by Prayer, Σῶμα γινομένους διὰ τῆς ἐυχῆς ἁγίου τινός. We might easily bring other Examples of the Oversights that he has committed, endeavouring too much to Spiritualize the Words of the Scripture, but I shall pass them over in Silence.

He speaks of the Sacred Scripture after a very excellent manner, as of a Book written by Persons who were inspired by God. His Passages upon this Subject have been collected by St. *Basil*, and St. *Gregory Nazianzen*, in a Book which they have Entituled *Philocalia*. (*t*) He distinguishes the three Senses of Scripture, but he applies himself particularly to the Allegorical Interpretation, and he affirms that there are some Places which have no literal Meaning. He proves that every Body ought to read the Scripture.

(l) *Tract.* 30, & 34. *in Matt. lib.* 2. *in Ep. ad Rom.* & *lib.* 5. *Hom.* 6. *in Exod Hom.* 3. *in Psal.* 36. *Hom.* 14. *in Luc. lib.* 5. *cont. Cels.* & *lib.* 8 *ad Rom.* *Origen.*

(m) *Lib.* 4. *Per. Cap.* 2. & *lib.* 1 *cap.* 6. *Philocal. cap.* 1.

(n) *Lib.* 2. *de Prin.* & *lib.* 5. *con. Cels. Tract.* 34 *in Joan. Hom.* 26. *in Num.* & 27, 28. & *Pessim Tract.* 30. *in Matt. Lib.* 1. *de Prin. c.*6. *lib.*2. *c.* 3. & 12. *lib.*3. *cap.*6. *lib.*3. *de Prin. c.*3. & *lib.* 2. *Hom.* 7. *in Levit. Hom.* 6. *in Num.* & *in Reg. in Ezech.*5. *c.* 13. *lib.* 1. *Per. c.*6. *Tom.* 15. & *Tract.* 33. *in Matt. Hom.* 8. *in Levit.* 14. *in Luc.*

(o) *Lib.* 2. *cap.* 1. & 8. *Tom.* 19. *in Joan. Justin. Ep. ad Mennam and two Passages from Lib.* 1. & 4. *Hieron. Ep.* 59. *ad Avitum.*

(p) *Lib.* 1. *Per. c.* 2. *Method. apud Photium c* 3. *in Genes. c.*1. *This was objected against him by* Methodius *in* Epiphanius, *by* Photius, *by* Eustathius, *by* John *of* Jerusalem, *by St.* Jerome, *and it may be found in lib.* 4. *de Prin. c.* 2.

(q) *Tom.* 12. *in Matthæum.*

(r) *Tom.* 11. *in Matt.*

(s) *Hom.* 16. *in Num.* & *Tract.* 35. *in Matt. Hom.* 7. *in Levit.* & *Tom.* 32. *in Joan.*

(t) *Hom.* 2. & 6. *in Gen. Hom.* 3. & 5. *in Levit. Hom.* 2. & 3. *in Exod. item* 7. & 11. *in Levit. lib.* 1. *Per. c.* 2. *Hom.* 9. & 2. *in Jos.*

Origen.

Now for ſome Points of Diſcipline which may be obſerved in his Works. The Chriſtians aſſembled together in his Time in the Churches, not only on Sundays, and Feſtivals, but alſo on other Days. (*u*) He often ſpeaks againſt thoſe who neglected to do it, and who did not hear the Word of God with due Reſpect. There were Prieſts and Biſhops in his Time, who were choſen by the People. And their Duty was to teach the People, they inſtructed the Catechumens, and prepared them for Baptiſm for a conſiderable time. They Baptized the Children; and Baptiſm was never reiterated; they anointed thoſe who were Baptized with Oyl. They obſerved Lent; and alſo faſted *Wedneſdays* and *Fridays*. They expelled out of the Church, ſuch as committed Publick Crimes after Baptiſm: And (*x*) he obſerves in his Book againſt *Celſus*, that there were ſome Perſons ſet apart on purpoſe to take care of the Manners of the Faithful. They allowed of Penance but once, and that rarely too. Excommunication was the greateſt Eccleſiaſtical Penalty. Nevertheleſs, It was not doubted but that thoſe who were unjuſtly Excommunicated, might be ſaved. Simony alſo was Prohibited.

(u) *Hom.* 10. 13 & 9 *in Num. Hom.* 6. *in Levit. Hom.* 4. *in Joſ. Hom.* 6. *in Jerem. Hom.* 8. *ibid. Hom.* 10. *in Levit. Hom.* 21. *in Joſ. Hom.* 9, & 11. *in Jerem. Tract.* 35. *in Mat. Hom.* 2. *in Jud.* & *Hom.* 2. *in Pſ.* 37. *Hom.* 15. *in Levit. Hom.* 10. *in Ezech. Tract.* 6. *in Matt. Hom.* 14. *in Levit. in cap.* 14. *Matt. Hom.* 2. *in Levit. item. Hom.* 14.

(x) *Tract.* 11. *in Matt. Tract.* 32. *in Joan. con. Cel. ſ. lib.* 8. *Hom.* 17. *in Levit.*

In his time Sins were confeſs'd to the Prieſts, and they examined thoſe who were to teach in Publick. They believed that one ought to live a very Holy Life, to approach the Bleſſed Sacrament, and that as it was very advantagious to thoſe who received it Worthily, ſo it was Damnation to thoſe who received it Unworthily. They did not admit Perſons that were twice Married to Holy Orders. They concealed the Myſteries, and principally of the Euchariſt from the Infidels and the Catechumens. They Prayed to God on their Knees, and turning towards the Eaſt. They celebrated *Good-Fryday*, *Eaſter*, *Whitſontide*, and *Sundays*, with very great Solemnity.

And theſe were the Principal Points of Diſcipline, that can be obſerved in the Books of *Origen*: It would be too tedious to take notice of Points of Morality that he diſcourſes of in his Homilies, which are filled with them. We ſhall here preſent you only with ſome of them.

He ſays, that we ought not to make uſe of Marriage, but only for the Sake of having Children: that he who does Good out of ſervile Fear, ſhall be leſs rewarded than him who does it out of Love. (*y*) There are in his Homilies upon *Exodus*, a great many curious Allegories upon the Neceſſity of Renouncing the World, and leading a Chriſtian Life. He ſays, that *Pharaoh* repreſents the World, who ſlew the Male Children, that is, the righteous, and preſerved the Females, that is to ſay Vicious and Effeminate Perſons; and he makes a pretty Moral upon the Allegory. He ſays, that *Ægypt* is the Type of the World, from whence we muſt depart, not only in Body, but in Mind, by renouncing it entirely. There are a great many other Allegories and Moral Thoughts of the ſame Nature. He diſtinguiſhes two ſorts of Sin; Great Sins, and Leſſer Sins. He ranks among the number of leſſer Sins, ſuch as may prove Mortal; and by great Sins, he underſtands ſuch, for which we can do no Penance but once. He gives ſeven Remedies for Sins, Baptiſm, Martyrdom, Alms-deeds, Forgiving of our Enemies, the Converſion of our Brethren, Charity, and Labourious Penance, and laſtly, that Repentance and Unction of which S. *James* ſpeaks. (*z*) He ſays, that we muſt not preſently reprehend publickly the Sin of our Brother, but that we ought firſt to rebuke him in Private, afterwards before one or two Witneſſes; and laſtly, if he did not reform, then we are to tell it to the Church. (*a*) He ſhews that true Faſting is an Abſtinence from Sin, and that we ought to Faſt in order to Feed the Poor. His Homilies upon *Numbers*, *Joſhuah*, *Judges*, are more filled with Allegories than Morality. Thoſe which he compoſed upon the *Pſalms* have more Morality in them: He there diſcourſes of Humility, of Prayer, of Patience, of Meekneſs, of the Proſperity of the Wicked, of Repentance, of that Holineſs which is required to Communicate worthily, of the Choice of a Guide. His other Homilies are mixed with Morality and Allegories: His large Commentaries have more Learning in them. He therein handles ſeveral Queſtions very learnedly, and makes very judicious Remarks upon them. He gives ſome Explications upon the Holy Scripture, that are very curious and ingenious: But he goes too far upon the Letter, to find out Allegorical Senſes; and he amuſes himſelf in Explaining too ſcrupulouſly all the Words of Scripture, that he might the better give them a Myſtical Senſe. He is a Great Enemy to Hereticks, he attacks them as often as he diſcourſes of any Subject that has any relation to their Errors. He does not let any of them eſcape; ſometimes he writes againſt *Simon*, *Baſilides*, *Carpocrates*, *Valentinus*, *Marcion*, and *Montanus*: At other times he attacks the *Ebionites*, the *Helceſaites*, the *Encratites*, the *Ophites*, and the *Sabellians*. (*b*) He acknowledged for Canonical Books of the Old Teſtament, only thoſe which were in the Canon of the Hebrews, to the Number of Two and Twenty: (*c*) He ranks the Book of *Eſther*, in this Number, and joyns the Book of *Ruth* with the Book of *Judges*, and *Baruch* with that of *Jeremiah*. As for the Books of *Maccabes*, *Judith*, *Tobit*, *Eccleſiaſticus*, and *Wiſdom*, he commends them as Good Books, profitable for Catechumens, but ſuch as are out of the Canon of the Books of the Sacred Scripture.

(y) *Hom.* 5. *in Exod.* & 23. *Hom.* 3. *in Gen.* & *ibidem. Hom.* 5. *Hom.* 2. *in Jerem. Hom.* 8 *Hom.* 2. *Hom.* 3. & 10. *in Exod. Hom.* 14. *in Levit. Item Hom.* 15. *Tract.* 6. *in Matt. Hom.* 2. *in Levit.*

(z) *Hom.* 3.

(a) *Hom.* 10. *in Levit.*

(b) *In Geneſ. ap. Euſeb.*

(c) *Hom.* 27. *in Num.* & 25. *in Joſ in Frag. in Ep. ad Heb. in Apol. Phamphilio lib.* 3. *con. Celſ. Hom. in Exod.* 8. *lib* 2. *Per.* & *Hom.* 3. *in Cant. in Mat.* & *Hom.* 18. *in Num.*

Scripture. He calls them nevertheless in some places Divine Books. He cites the Book of Wisdom under the Name of the Scripture. He cites likewise the *Maccabees*, and the Book of *Ecclesiasticus*, which he affirms to be among the Books of *Solomon*. We have already taken notice of his Opinion concerning the History of *Susanna*. He receives as Canonical Books of the New Testament, the Four Gospels, the Fourteen Epistles of St. *Paul*; (d) He says however, concerning that to the Hebrews, that the Thoughts of this Epistle are St. *Paul's*; but that it was Composed by some other Person, and that there is none but God who knows the Author of it, though some attribute it to S. *Clemens*, others to S. *Luke*. He says that there is but one Epistle of S. *Peter*, which was received by all the Churches, but that we may grant the Second likewise to have been his. He says the same thing of the Two last Epistles of S. *John*. He cites the Epistles of St. *Jude*, and St. *James* in his Commentary upon the Epistle to the *Romans*. He likewise quotes the *Revelations*, and attributes them to St. *John*. Besides these Books, he often cites Apocryphal Writings, as the Gospels according to the *Ægyptians*, and according to the *Hebrews*; the Book of *Hermas*, the Epistle of S. *Barnabas*, the Book of *Enoch*, and even some Heretical Books, as the *Apocalypse* of S. *Paul*, a Book concerning the Twelve Apostles, the Doctrin of S. *Peter*, the Acts of S. *Paul*, the History of *Isaiah*, and some others.

Origen.

(d) He always cites it under S. Paul's Name. Hom. 8. in Exod. 7. in Levit. in Jerem. Hom. 1. lib. 1. Per. lib. 2. in Matt. c. 13. ap. Euseb. lib. 6. c. 25. lib. 3. Per. c. 1. & lib. 2. Per. in Matt. c. 13. Hom. in Jesum 3. & 10. in cap. 18. Matt. Hom. in Jer. 14. in Ez. in Luc. Hom. 8. in Exod. Hom. 10. in Jos. lib. 1. Per. lib 2. lib. 3. in Luc. Hom. 35. Luc. 3. per.

Origen had very quick Parts, a very strong and Extensive Phancy: but he relied too much on the Vivacity of his Genius; and often lost himself out of too great earnestness to fathom, and subtilize every thing. He had a very happy invention, and a much more happy delivery of what he had invented: But he had not that exactness in his Inventions, nor all that Gracefulness in the Delivery as might be wish'd. He carried on his Work with so great ease, that he is said to have Dictated to Seven or Eight Persons at a time, and he was so ready in Expressing himself, that he made the greatest Part of his Homilies *Extempore*. Upon which account his Style was not very Correct, nor Coherent; He had a vast Memory, but he often trusted too much to it. He was a Person of most profound Learning; and he particularly Studied *Plato's* Philosophy, which he understood to Perfection, and indeed he was too much addicted to it for a Christian. He understood likewise the Maxims of the other Philosophers. He had apply'd himself mightily to the Study of Humane Learning: He was neither Ignorant of History, nor Mythology, and he had as great knowledge in all the Profane Sciences, as those who had Studied nothing else all their whole Lives. But he particularly excell'd in the knowledge of the Holy Scripture, to the Study of which he entirely addicted himself. He had Learned it all by heart, and that he might not neglect any thing which might be of use for the understanding the Letter thereof, he carefully Examined all the Versions of the Bible, which were in his time, and compared them all together with the Hebrew Text, adding thereto a Literal Commentary upon the most difficult Places. He was not very well skill'd in the Hebrew; yet he knew enough of it to understand it, and to observe the Differences of the Text, and the Translations; but he did not keep to the Literal Explication of the Bible. He thought it necessary for the setting off of the Holy Scripture to the best advantage, which appeared but plain and simple to the Heathens, and for the rendring it of greater use to all the World, to give Mystical or Allegorical Interpretations of every thing in it. And herein imitates the way of *Philo* and *Aristobulus*, and followed the Genius and Manner of the Platonists. We have already taken notice, that *Hippolitus* explained the Scripture Allegorically, and that it was in imitation of him that *Origen* undertook this way of Writing. St. *Clement* of *Alexandria* his Master, is also full of Allegories, and 'tis not to be denied but that the Hellenistical Jews, and the Primitive Christians made very frequent use of them: But *Origen* has carried on an Allegory as far as it can possibly go, and he has furnished Matter to all the Greek and Latin Fathers who have imitated him, and have hardly done any thing else than copy him. This way of explaining the Holy Scripture by continual Allegories, seems to me to be very defective. For though it may be good sometimes to awaken, if I may so say, the Auditor, and to direct him by such kind of Allegories, yet they become useless and tedious, when they are perpetual; and the Mind, which requires great Application for the comprehending of them, is tired, and soon loses the Consequence both of Reasoning and Thought: Besides, that by minding only the Allegorical Sense, we neglect the Literal, which is oftentimes more excellent, and of greater Advantage than all the Allegories in the World, that divert the Mind without instructing it, and strike the Imagination without affecting the Heart. Lastly, If in explaining the Holy Scripture, we should only stick to the Allegory, as *Origen* has done, it might give occasion to believe, that the Scripture taken barely in the Literal Sense would be but of very little Advantage, which is a very great Error. 'Tis therefore a very ill way of defending *Origen* in this Point, to say with a modern Author, that he seems to have been excusable in this, because he had learned by Experience, that the Letter of the Scripture was but of little use for instruction. For this is to make him assert a thing which is very false, the Letter of the Scripture being of exceeding use for instruction, and even more profitable than any Allegory, which is not to be us'd, but only now and then to awaken the Auditors.

Origen's Books against *Celsus* an excellent Work, and stored with extraordinary Learning. He answers the Objections of *Celsus*, who of all the Heathens that have written again the Christian Religion, has made the most cunning ones, and proposed them the most maliciously, very solidly. He establishes by convincing Proofs, the History of Jesus Christ, his Miracles, his Divinity and Resurrection. He confutes the Calumnies and Impostures of *Celsus*, and of the other Heathens against the Christians;

ſtians; and Laſtly, he proves the Truth and Excellency of the Doctrin and Religion of Jeſus Chriſt. This Book is written very Politely, and with great Care and Exactneſs. 'Tis not only the beſt of *Origen*'s Works, but alſo the moſt accompliſh'd and beſt Compoſed Apology for the Chriſtians which we have of all the Ancients. The Books of Principles were likewiſe written with great Care, and they had been of very great uſe, if he had contented himſelf to explain the Principles of Religion according to Scripture and Tradition, without mixing therewith his own Philoſophical Notions. His Commentaries upon the Scripture are more Polite than his Homilies, they are full of Learning, but they are not very Exact, and we may obſerve therein a great many Fancies which are uſeleſs, obſcure, and perplexed. Often after having begun one Explication, he paſſes to another, without finiſhing the firſt. His Homilies are plainer and intelligible, but their ſtyle is leſs Elegant.

Origen.

The Treatiſe concerning Prayer is an Excellent Piece of Devotion. It contains a great many Excellent Principles of Morality, and is full of very profitable Inſtructions. We may alſo find there ſeveral Curious Remarks relating to the Diſcipline of that Time. But it is not abſolutely free from the Errors and Defects which we have obſerved in the other Works of *Origen*. As this Diſcourſe is very Inſtructive and not very much known, I have thought it convenient to give a Summary of it.

Origen begins it by a Common Place, to wit, that there are an Infinite Number of Things which we cannot know without being enlightned from Heaven. He applies this Reflection to his Preſent Subject, ſaying, that it would be impoſſible for him, without the Aſſiſtance of Heaven, to explain how we ought to Pray, what we ought to ſay when we Pray, and what are the moſt Proper Times for Prayer. That he who treats of this Matter, muſt be enlightned by the Heavenly Father, inſtructed by the Son, and inſpired by the Holy Ghoſt: That in order to Pray as we ought, 'tis not ſufficient to repeat ſome certain Prayers, but we muſt have Good Diſpoſitions; and that our Prayer may be acceptable to God, it muſt be accompanied with a Conſcience, Pure, and without Blemiſh. Afterwards entring upon his Subject he obſerves that the Greek Word Ευχη, which ſignifies Prayer, is mentioned in Scripture the firſt time, in that Place where it is ſaid that *Jacob* coming from *Meſopotamia*, made a Vow to offer unto God the Tenth of all that he ſhould bring from that Country. He adds that the Word is often taken in this Senſe, to ſignifie a Promiſe or Vow of Performing a Thing, if God grants us what we ask of him in our Prayers. But he obſerves at the ſame time that there are other Places where it is taken for Prayer it ſelf; and he ſets down ſome Examples wherein it is taken in both Senſes.

After having ſpoken of the word *Prayer*, he treats of the neceſſity of the thing it ſelf: He confutes the Arguments of thoſe who pretended to maintain that it was to no purpoſe to pray; he obſerves, that this Error could not be maintained by any but notoriouſly-wicked Perſons, and by Atheiſts, who deny God's Providence: but that the Devil endeavouring by all means to ſpread deteſtable Doctrins among thoſe that bear the Name of Chriſt, had put it into the hearts of ſome perſons to reject every thing that is ſenſible in Religion, to deſpiſe the Holy Euchariſt and Baptiſm, and to neglect Prayer as a uſeleſs thing. Now theſe are the Reaſons which theſe Perſons bring for their Opinion: *Firſt*, God knows every thing, *ſay they*, therefore what need is there of Praying? *Secondly*, He does not only *know* what muſt happen, but he *ordains* it; therefore what neceſſity is there of *asking* that of him, which ſhall infallibly come to paſs? *Thirdly*, If we are Predeſtinated before our Birth, it is to no purpoſe to pray, ſince we ſhall be neceſſarily *Sav'd* or *Damn'd*. *Fourthly*, God being immutable, we do but deceive our ſelves in believing that we are able by our Prayers to make him alter his Decrees. *Origen*, in anſwer to theſe difficulties diſtinguiſhes Three ſorts of Things which are in motion. The *firſt* are thoſe that are moved by a Foreign Power, ſuch as, Inanimate Beings. The *ſecond* are thoſe that are moved by their own Nature, but without Knowledge, as Animals and Plants. The *Third* are thoſe that move themſelves, and determine themſelves, as Intelligent Creatures. He proves, That theſe are free, and that Preſcience and Predeſtination does not at all deſtroy this Liberty, becauſe God ordains nothing relating to free Actions, but what he has foreſeen that intelligent Creatures would do freely: And that ſo Preſcience is not the cauſe of Things, nor of Actions which are done freely; but it only ſuppoſes that theſe things will be, or will not be; and that the knowledge which God has of them, is followed by the Decree, whereby he is reſolved to grant or not to grant his Grace, to hear or not to hear; That he foreſees the Good and Evil which Men ſhall commit; That he knows whether they will repent or no; and that, in conſequence of this knowledge, he Predeſtinates or Reprobates them. He adds, That God has appointed Angels over Men to preſerve them, as long as they deſerve it. One might here take notice of his particular Opinion concerning the Sun, the Moon, and Stars, which he ſays are intelligent and free Agents.

After having confuted the Reaſons of thoſe who reject Prayer, he ſhews the advantage of it. He ſays in the firſt place, That he who prays, puts himſelf in a condition of preſenting himſelf before God, and of converſing with him; That in order to this, he ought to drive away all evil Thoughts, to baniſh all earthly Affections, to raiſe up his mind towards Heaven, to forget Injuries, to pardon his Enemies, and by no means to repine againſt God. From hence he concludes, That Prayer cannot be of any advantage, if it be not preceeded with great preparation. Secondly, He aſſures us, That Chriſt Jeſus, the High-Prieſt of our Offerings, prays with us; That the Angels pray with him, and that the Saints which are departed pray with us, (and this here is one of the moſt ancient and excellent Monuments to prove the Interceſſion of Saints.) His words are theſe: *The Souls of the Saints which ſleep among the number of the Juſt, pray with us, as it is ſaid in the Book of* Macchabees---- *And ſince the imperfect Knowledge which we have in this World is made perfect in the other Life, 'tis a very great Abſurdity not to believe the ſame thing of the other Virtues, and principally Charity towards our Neighbour, which*

we

we ought to believe to be much stronger in the Saints than in mortal Men, who are subject to Weaknesses and Imperfections. He adds, That every faithful Person has his Angel that hears him, and preserves him whilst he prays. *Lastly*, He proves the necessity of continual Prayer, by the Example of Jesus Christ, by that of Just Persons, and by the reckoning up of those Benefits and Graces which have been bestowed upon Men from their Prayers: He exhorts the Faithful to pray for spiritual and heavenly Things, rather than for earthly and sensual Goods, such as Beauty, Nobility, Riches: He shews the meanness and the vanity of these things. *Origen.*

He distinguishes four kinds of Prayers, after the Apostle S. *Paul* in his first Epistle to *Timothy*. The δέησις, that is to say, Supplication, which is to ask any Good of which we stand in need. The second called προσευχή, is according to *Origen*, a request that is made in any danger, with assurance of obtaining what we desire: He observes, that this kind of Prayer is commonly joined with *Doxology*, that is to say, with Praising of God's Holy Name; The third ἔντευξις, is a Prayer made by a Person who has great confidence that he shall obtain what he asks, he being much in God's Favour. The last is, Giving of Thanks for the Benefits which we have received. He gives Examples taken from the Holy Scripture, of each of these kinds of Prayer.

This first Part of his Treatise concerning Prayer, is followed with an Explication of the Lord's Prayer.

He makes two Observations upon these first words, **Our Father,** The first is, That it is only in the New Testament, where there is given to God with assurance the Title of *Our Father*. The second, That if we would say these words as we ought, we must be of the number of the true Children of God, that is to say, *Free from Sin, and in a state of Grace.*

He says upon these words, **Which art in Heaven,** That we must not understand them in a gross sense, as if God was in Heaven after a corporael manner.

Upon these words, **Hallowed be thy Name,** That it is not as if God were not Holy in himself, but only that we desire that men should acknowledg this Holiness in his Conduct. He observes, That this and the following Forms are in the Imperative, but that it is taken for the Optative Mood. And from hence he takes occasion to confute *Tatian*, who affirmed that these Words of God in *Genesis Let there be light*, was not an express Command, but only a simple Wish. By these other Words, **Thy kingdom come,** the faithful Person prays the Lord, That the Kingdom of Jesus Christ, which is in him, may be perfected and compleated by the expectation of the Day of Judgment. By these, **Thy will be done,** we desire of God, That men may fulfil God's Will upon Earth, as it is accomplished in Heaven; or else, That the Wicked, being represented by the Earth, should perform God's Will, as it is already done by Just Persons. *Origen* would not have us understand these following words, **Give us this day our dayly bread,** of bodily Bread; but he understands them of the Doctrin of Jusus Christ, who is our Bread and our Nourishment. He observes, that the word ἐπιούσιος, *Supersubstantialis*, which we render by DAILY, is not to be met with in any Author; and that it is peculiar to the Evangelists. In order to explain it, he tells us, That as bodily Bread is changed into our Substance, so this Bread of the Word Communicates its Nature and Efficacy to our Souls. By *Daily Bread*, he means *Eternity*. Upon these Words, **And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us,** he explains the several Duties of Men. He says, That they owe to themselves the good of their Souls, that they owe very much to their Guardian Angels, but that they are above all things indebted to Jesus Christ, and to the Holy Ghost; that every Condition and every Estate has its peculiar Duties. *There is one Duty*, says he, *of a Wife, another Duty of a Widow, another of a Deacon, another of a Priest, another of a Bishop, whose Charge is much the greater, and he shall render an exact Account to God, who will punish him very severely, if he does not acquit himself well of his Duty.* He adds, That as we are indebted to others, so others are indebted to us; and that if we call to mind those Duties wherein we have been wanting towards others, we shall easily pardon those who have been deficient therein towards us, as God forgives us the faults which we have committed against him; That the Priests forgive in the Name of Jesus Christ the Sins of Men; but that, in imitation of the Priests of the Old Law, they must be instructed by the Holy Ghost who those are for whom they ought to offer up Sacrifices, when, and after what manner they must do it. Wherefore he blames those who not being sensible of what is beyond their Power, *boast of their being able to pardon Idolatry, and to forgive Adultery and Fornication*; which shews, that at that time they refused Communion to Idolaters in some Churches. Upon these words, **And lead us not into temptation,** *Origen* says, That it is impossible to pass through this life without temptations; and he proves it, by giving a Catalogue of those temptations to which we are exposed in all conditions and at all times: from whence he concludes, That we ought not to pray *not to be tempted*, but only *not to sink under temptation*. He observes, That God suffers us to fall therein, for a punishment of our sins. He here delivers his Opinion of those Souls that were always free, which were sent into this world for a punishment of the faults which they had committed in the other life. He afterwards discourses of the advantage of temptations, for the trial and proving of our Vertue. Lastly, Upon these words, **But deliver us from evil,** he says, That God does not deliver us from all the troubles and afflictions of this life, but that he makes us support them with patience.

After having explained the Lord's Prayer, he discourses of the temper and disposition of mind that is requisite for Prayer, of the place where we are to pray, and of the time proper for Prayer. He would have him that is to pray, to recollect and prepare himself, that so he may perform it with the greater attention and fervency; and that after having purified his mind from the thoughts of this World, and banished from his heart all passions and earthly affections, he should reflect upon the excellency of the

Origen. the life to come; That he ſhould drive from his heart all thoughts of hatred and enmity; That he ſhould lift up his hands and eyes towards Heaven, when nothing hinders him; for he allows ſick Perſons to pray ſitting or lying. He obſerves that kneeling is neceſſarily when we ask God pardon for our Sins. Concerning the place of Prayer, he ſays that every place is proper to pray in, but that Cuſtom will have it that we ſhould chuſe the moſt retired part of the Houſe for our Prayers; and that we ſhould prefer the place which is ſet apart for the Aſſemblies of the Faithful, where the Angels are preſent, where we may be ſenſible of the Efficacy of Jeſus Chriſt, of that of the Holy Ghoſt, and of the Suffrages of the Saints departed. He would have us always turn our ſelves towards the Eaſt, whether we be in our Chamber, or in an open place. Laſtly, He diſtinguiſhes four Branches, or Common Places of Prayer; *The Doxology*, which ought to be ſaid, ſays he, at the beginning of Prayer, praiſing and glorifying the Father of Jeſus Chriſt through the Holy Ghoſt; It ought to be followed with *Thankſgiving*; Afterwards we muſt make a *Confeſſion*, or an Accuſation of ourſelves for our Sins; to which we ought to add the craving of *Heavenly Benedictions* for us and our Friends. Laſtly, We muſt conclude our Prayer by *praiſing God* through the Son in the Holy Ghoſt. And this is a great part of what is contained in this Treatiſe of *Origen*'s, which ſufficiently ſhews it to be of great uſe. There is nevertheleſs one paſſage which may create a great deal of difficulty to thoſe that read it: For he therein affirms, That we ought to addreſs our Prayers only to God the Father, and not to Jeſus Chriſt becauſe the Son of God being different from the Father, 'tis abſurd to direct our Prayers to him. This expreſſion is very harſh, and difficult to excuſe: yet we may ſay, That he would have us addreſs our Prayers to the Father alone, for fear we might ſeem to acknowledge ſeveral Gods; and that when he ſays, That Jeſus Chriſt is *an Eſſence different from the Father*, he takes the term *Eſſence* for *Perſon*. And indeed he owns in ſeveral other places, and principally in the fifth and eighth Book againſt *Celſus*, That we may and ought to direct our Prayers to Jeſus Chriſt. Be the thing as it will, it cannot be denied but that he has aſſerted in this place ſeveral Propoſitions favourable to the Opinion of the *Arians*, on which it is difficult to put a good Conſtruction.

There is nothing more for me to do, to compleat all that relates to *Origen*, than to give an Account of the Quarrels and Diſputes which aroſe in the Church after his Death, upon the Account of his Perſon and his Writings: But this not being a Subject which any ways relates to the Deſign which I have propoſed in this Work, I do not think it neceſſary to engage my ſelf in this Relation, which otherwiſe would be but of very little uſe.

AMBROSE *and* TRYPHON, *Diſciples of* ORIGEN.

Ambroſe and Tryphon. AMBROSE would not have deſerved to be reckoned amongſt the Eccleſiaſtical Authors, had he not been *Origen*'s Friend, and contributed very much to the Publiſhing of his Works, both by furniſhing him with Amanuenſes, and by continually preſſing him to his Work. He had been a *Marcionite*, and though he was converted, yet he retained ſome of his Errors, (if we believe St. *Hierom.*) However he was ordained Deacon, and generouſly confeſſed the Faith of Jeſus Chriſt, with *Theoctiſtus* the Prieſt in the time of the Emperor *Maximus*. He was a Perſon of Quality, and wanted not Parts, which he ſhewed in ſome of his Letters to *Origen*, that were extant in St. *Hierom*'s time, but now are all loſt. He died before *Origen*, and S. *Hierom* ſays that he was blamed becauſe, though he died Rich, yet he left nothing to his Friend, who was Poor.

Tryphon who was likewiſe *Origen*'s Diſciple, and who had written ſome Letters to him, was looked upon in St. *Hierom*'s time as a Man very well verſed in the Learning of the Sacred Scripture, which ſtill appears, ſays this Father, *by ſeveral Works which he had compoſed*; but more particularly by a Treatiſe concerning the *Red Heifer* in the 19th Chapter of *Numbers*, and upon the Diviſion of the Sacrifices made by *Abraham* in the 15th Chapter of *Geneſis*: From whence it appears that *Origen*'s Diſciples following their Maſters Genius, applied themſelves wholly to Allegories.

[It is moſt probable, that *Tryphon*'s Commentaries, are, in imitation of his Maſter *Origen*'s, Allegorical; yet it is only probable, at leaſt, for any thing, that M. *Du Pin* has to ſay againſt it: and when things are loſt, to determine concerning them poſitively, is only beating the Air; and though we our ſelves know how little weight can be laid upon our words beyond conjecture, yet it may lead others into miſtakes, who think we can prove what we ſay, though we do not.]

BERYLLUS.

Beryllus. BERYLLUS Biſhop of *Boſtra* in *Arabia*, after he had been, as we have ſaid, undeceived of his Error by the Conference which he had had with *Origen*, wrote ſeveral ſmall Treatiſes, and particularly ſome Letters, wherein he returned *Origen* Thanks for his Converſion: The Conference which *Origen* had with him upon the occaſion of his Error was Extant in Saint *Hierom*'s time; but at preſent we have nothing of his remaining.

Saint

Saint CYPRIAN.

SAint *Cyprian* (*a*) was by Birth an *African*, and taught Rhetorick with great Reputation (*b*) before he was a Christian. (*c*) He was converted by the Persuasion of a Priest called *Cecilius*, from whom he took afterwards his Sirname. From the time that he was a Catechumen, he made a Resolution within himself to live continently, believing, as his Deacon *Pontius* tells us, who has written his Life, that it was almost impossible otherwise to come to the Knowledge of the Truth. Presently after he was Baptized, he sold all his Goods to assist the Poor. He was afterwards ordained Priest, and after the Death of *Donatus* Bishop of *Carthage*, he was elected Bishop in his Place in the Year 248 (*d*), by the Suffrages of the Clergy, and the People of *Carthage*, and the Choice was confirmed by a great number of Bishops, who were then assembled in that City. The Persecution of *Decius* beginning two Years, or thereabouts, after his Ordination; the Heathens being enraged because he encouraged his People to stand firm to the Religion of Jesus Christ, demanded him several times in a full Theatre, to expose him to the Wild Beasts. And this obliged him to retire from *Carthage*, according to the Command which he believed he had received from God in a Vision. In this Retreat he wrote several Letters to his People, his Clergy, the Confessors, and the Clergy of *Rome*, of which we may see a Catalogue, with an Account of their Subjects in the Sequel of this History. When the Fury of the Persecution abated, S. *Cyprian* came back to *Carthage*, and called a Council there the 15th of *May*, in the Year 251, wherein he, with the Bishops his Collegues, regulated whatever related to the Penance of those who had fallen in the time of Persecution, either by taking Tickets or Testimonials from the Magistrates, certifying that they had committed Idolatry; by offering Incense publickly upon the Altars of their Gods, or by eating the Meat which was Sacrificed to them. For the first they ordained that they should be reconciled; but for the Latter, they judged it necessary to leave them still under Penance, and not to allow them Reconciliation till they became dangerously sick, provided also that they had begun to do Penance before they fell sick. As for those who staid till they were seized by some desperate Distemper, before they desired to undergo their Penance, it was thought expedient wholly to refuse them Absolution, because then, says S. *Cyprian*, *'Tis not so much their Sorrow for their Sin, as the Fear of Death that obliges them to desire it. Quia eos non tam Delicti Pœnitentia, quam Mortis Admonitio petere compellit.* As for those Ecclesiasticks, who had fallen into Idolatry, it was ordained that they should for ever be excluded from the Clergy, that they should communicate no more with the Faithful but as Laymen, and that even some of them should be obliged to undergo the Severities of Penance. They Excommunicated *Felicissimus* and those of his Party, who had disturbed the Tranquility of the Church of *Carthage*, in S. *Cyprian*'s Absence. Perhaps it was at this Synod that *Privatus*, a Heretick of the Colony of *Lambesa*, presented himself, who had been already Condemned in a Synod of Ninety Bishops, and seeing himself so far rejected, that they would not so much as hear him make his Defence, embraced the Party of *Felicissimus*. The Council, after they had made these Regulations, wrote a Synodal Letter to *Cornelius*, lately Elected Bishop of *Rome*, who assembled likewise a Synod of Sixty Bishops and several Priests, who followed the Rules of the *African* Council in the ordering of publick Penance, and Excommunicated *Novatian*, who joining himself to *Novatus*, refused the Grace of Reconciliation to those Persons, who had once fallen into any Sin, and caused himself to be ordained Bishop of *Rome*, in opposition to *Cornelius*, by three Bishops, whose Credulity and Easiness he had abused in this Matter. This for a time made a kind of a Schism in *Rome*, for *Novatian* drew to his Party, not only some Priests, but also the Confessors who were ready to suffer Martyrdom. The Heads of both Parties being desirous to obtain the Favour of S. *Cyprian*, and of the other *African* Bishops, wrote Letters to them, and sent their Deputies into *Africk*. But *Novatian*'s were received very ill, and the *African* Bishops, who had for some time suspended their Judgment, and ceased to send Letters of Communion to either of the two Parties, till they were informed of the Matter by two of their own Brethren, whose Names were *Caldonius* and *Fortunatus*, whom they had dispatched to *Rome* on purpose to learn the true State

S. *Cyprian.*

(*a*) *Saint* Cyprian.] His own Name was *Thascius*, as appears by the Letter to *Pipin*, and the Acts of his Passion.

(*b*) *Before he turned Christian*] This is all we are able to say of what concerned him before his Conversion, because *Pontius* the Deacon in his Life, and S. *Jerom* in his Catalogue tells us no more of him. What *Baronius* has cited, taken out of the Oration of S. *Gregory Nazianzen*, concerning one S. *Cyprian* a Martyr, does not belong to our Bishop of *Carthage*: 'Tis commonly believed that S. *Gregory* speaks of another S. *Cyprian*, but 'tis a great deal more probable, that the Greeks, who knew but little of what passed in the West, feigned these Circumstances in the Life of S. *Cyprian* Bishop of *Carthage*, as it was a familiar thing with them to adorn and set off the Lives of Saints, with several uncertain and fabulous Narrations.

(*c*) *He was Converted.*] His Conversion might happen towards the Year 246. Having been Baptized at *Easter* or at *Whitsontide*, he writ his Letter to *Donatus* in *Autumn*. He tells us in his 59th Letter to *Cornelius*, which was written in the Year 252, that it was four Years since he had been made a Bishop. Thus he was Bishop 10 Years. He calls *Donatus* his Predecessor.

(*d*) *The Year* 248.] The Persecution under *Decius* began at the end of the Year 249, or else at the beginning of the Year 250.

S. *Cyprian.* of the whole Affair: After they were fully inſtructed by them, and two other *African* Biſhops, who were preſent at the Ordination of *Cornelius*, after what manner he had been ordained, decided it in Favour of him, and ſent him Letters of Communion, having firſt confirmed the Judgment he had paſſed againſt *Novatian* in *Italy*. The Judgment of the Church in *Africk*, and the Eloquent Letters of S. *Cyprian*, brought the Confeſſors of the Roman Church over to *Cornelius*'s Party. Thus the *Novatians* finding themſelves cried down in *Italy*, to be revenged upon S. *Cyprian*, raiſed Diſturbances in *Africk*, where they cauſed one *Maximus*, a Deputy of *Novatian*, to be choſen Biſhop; and on the other ſide, *Feliciſſimus* the Deacon, an Enemy to S. *Cyprian*, got *Privatus* of *Lambeſa*, whom we have already mentioned, to ordain, in oppoſition to him, one whoſe Name was *Fortunatus*, and afterwards came into *Italy*, to get his Ordination ratified there by *Cornelius*, and by the reſt of the *Italian* Biſhops, pretending that this *Fortunatus* had been ordained by five and twenty Biſhops, and that S. *Cyprian* favoured the Party of the *Novatians*. *Cornelius* immediately rejected *Feliciſſimus*, and thoſe of his Faction, but at laſt being either frighted by their Menaces, or elſe ſhaken by their Diſcourſes, he entertained ſome Suſpicions to the Prejudice of S. *Cyprian*, and writ to him after a very diſobliging manner; to this the Saint returned a vigorous Anſwer, expoſing his Weakneſs, and acquainting him with the Malice of his Enemies.

In the mean time, while *Feliciſſimus* endeavoured to create a Miſunderſtanding between S. *Cyprian* and *Cornelius*, that Holy Man aſſembled a Council of Sixty ſix Biſhops at *Carthage* in *April*, in the Year 252, wherein ſome Eccleſiaſtical Regulations were made concerning a certain Prieſt, whoſe Name was *Victor*, whom his Biſhop had received to Grace contrary to the Deciſion of the Council, and alſo concerning the Baptiſm of Infants. About the ſame time he oppoſed one *Fortunatianus* a Biſhop, who ſtill held his Biſhoprick, though he had Sacrificed to Idols, and offered to reconcile thoſe, who after they had held out for ſome time, at laſt yielded to the violence of Torments, and who had undergone Penance for this their Tranſgreſſion three whole Years.

S. *Cyprian* after this, having had ſeveral Revelations, which inclined him to believe that the Church was to be Perſecuted within a ſhort time, was of Opinion, that in order to prepare the Chriſtians for this new Aſſault, it would be neceſſary to fortifie them with the Euchariſt, and to that Effect, to reconcile them to the Church. So in the Year 253, he aſſembled a Council of ſeveral Biſhops, who were all of the ſame Judgment, and ſignified their Reſolution to Pope *Cornelius*, that he might uſe the ſame Conduct in his own Church. Soon after happened the Perſecution of *Gallus*. Pope *Cornelius* was ſent into Baniſhment, and ſuffered Martyrdom the very ſame Year. *Lucius*, who ſucceeded him, was immediately baniſhed, from whence he returned after the Death of *Gallus*, in the beginning of the Year 254; but he did not long enjoy the Comforts of Peace, but ſuffered Martyrdom, after he had held the See of *Rome* for the ſpace of Eight Months only. *Stephen* was elected in his Place towards the end of that Year, or the beginning of the next. Under this Pope the celebrated Diſpute about the Validity of the Baptiſm of Hereticks was warmly diſcuſſed between the Churches of *Africa* and *Rome*. S. *Cyprian* being conſulted in the Year 255 by *Januarius*, and the other Biſhops of *Numidia*, whether it was neceſſary to re-baptize thoſe, who after they had been Baptized by Hereticks, deſired to be re-united to the Church, returned this Anſwer, as did ſeveral *African* Biſhops aſſembled in Council, that no Baptiſm could be valid out of the Church; that it was abſolutely neceſſary to Re-baptize thoſe who had received the Baptiſm of Hereticks; and in one Word, that this Queſtion had been already decided by the *African* Biſhops their Predeceſſors. *Quintus* having alſo ſent the ſame Demand to S. *Cyprian*, he made the ſame Anſwer, and ſent him the Deciſion of this Synod, which was moreover confirmed in another *African* Council held in 256, which wrote to *Stephen* about it, to exhort him to embrace this Diſcipline. But he was ſo far from ſubmitting to the Reaſon of the *Africans*, whether becauſe he imagined they had a Deſign to condemn the Roman Church, or becauſe he thought this Queſtion was of too great Conſequence, that he was enraged againſt S. *Cyprian* and his Collegues, and uſed their Diſputes ill: Nay, he prohibited all Chriſtians belonging to his Church, to receive or lodge them, depriving them not only of Eccleſiaſtical Communion, but alſo refuſing them the common Civilities of Hoſpitality. The Letter he writ back was full of Injuries and Invectives, and his Deciſion was compriſed in theſe Terms: 'If any one 'comes to you, of whatſoever Hereſie he is, let there not be made the leaſt Alteration in what has 'been regulated by Tradition, but only impoſe Hands upon him, and ſo receive him. This Letter being brought into *Africk*, S. *Cyprian* moved at the Proceedings of *Stephen*, ſent his Letter, with a Refutation of it, not only to *Pompey* of *Africk*, but alſo to *Fermilian*, and the other Biſhops of *Cappadocia*, who were all of the ſame Opinion with S. *Cyprian*, touching the Baptiſm of Hereticks. *Firmilian* having received it, writ a long Letter, wherein he amply refutes the Opinion and Letter of *Stephen*, and eſtabliſhes the Diſcipline which S. *Cyprian* defended; ſaying, It had been obſerved in his Country by an immemorial Cuſtom, and confirmed in two numerous Synods held at *Iconium* and *Synnada*. As ſoon as S. *Cyprian* had received this Letter, he aſſembled a Synod at *Carthage*, in which the Letter he had writ to *Jubaianus* upon this Queſtion was openly read, and all the Biſhops gave their Suffrages in favour of S. *Cyprian*'s Opinion. Thus I have delivered in a few Words, the Hiſtory of this famous Quarrel between two great Biſhops, both of whom the Church ſtill reverences as Saints.

However, if I may be allowed to make ſome Reflections upon their Opinions and Conduct, I ſhall not ſcruple to obſerve after S. *Auſtin*, that S. *Cyprian* ſhewed a great deal more Moderation in this Diſpute, and that we can by no means excuſe that Heat and Paſſion which ſo far tranſported *Stephen*: For though the firſt maintained his Opinion vigorouſly, yet he did it with abundance of Candor, and always

always declared he would leave other Bishops the Liberty to do as they judged convenient, and openly professed he would separate himself from the Communion of no Body upon the score of this Controversie, *Neminem separantes, said he often, aut a Communione submoventes.* Whereas on the other hand, Pope *Stephen* not only asserted his Opinion with a world of Heat and Rigour, but also treated those Bishops unworthily, who followed a Practice different from his own, calling them false Christians, false Apostles and Seducers, and refusing their Deputies not only the Communion of the Church, but even Lodging and Hospitality. As for what respects the Merits of the Cause, though 'tis commonly believed that the Pope had the Truth on his Side, yet there is sufficient reason to doubt whether he did not in the heat of his Opposition to S. *Cyprian*, carry things too far on the other side, and whether the Opinion of S. *Austin*, which the Church has since embraced, That we ought to receive those Persons without Baptism, who have been baptized by Hereticks in the Name of the Trinity, and to re-baptize those who have not been baptized according to that Form: Whether this Opinion, I say, does not steer the middle Course between *Stephen*'s, (*f*) who seems to have maintained, that all those who had been baptized by Hereticks should be received without Re-baptization, which way soever they were baptized, *a quacunque hæresi*, and S. *Cyprian*'s, who asserted that all such ought to be re-baptized. Be it as it will, 'tis certain (*g*) that S. *Cyprian* never altered his Opinion; that the Greek Churches were for a long time after him (*h* divided upon this Question; that the Council of *Arles* (*i*) first decided it in the West; that it is not unprobable that this was the Council which S. *Austin* (*k*) calls the *full Council*, which first decided this Controversie; that S. *Austin* followed its Decision, and proves it at large in his Books against the Donatists; that the Western Church has embraced this Opinion, and that though (*l*) the Eastern Churches have not agreed with her absolutely in this Point, yet they always made a distinction between Hereticks, and differently received them. It would be no difficult matter to justifie all this; but as this is no proper place to discuss this Question, so it would carry us too far from our Subject. The Reader need only consult our Annotations, to be better satisfied. S. *Cyprian.*

To compleat what remains of S. *Cyprian*'s Life, it would be necessary here to transcribe the ancient Acts of his Passion, and what his Deacon *Pontius* has related concerning it; but the Description of his Martyrdom does not concern the Subject or Design of this Work; and therefore I shall only observe, that towards the beginning of *Valerian*'s Persecution, in the Year 257, on the 30th of *August*, he was banished to *Curubis*, a City about ten or twelve Leagues distant from *Carthage*, by the Command of *Aspasius Paternus*, the Proconsul; that after he had tarried there eleven Months, he was

(*f*) *Between that of* Stephen, *who seems to have maintained.*] What induces us to believe that *Stephen* was of this Opinion, is, in the first place, because he makes no distinction at all, but says plainly, *a quacunq; Hæresi.* Secondly, Because S *Cyprian* and *Firmilian* take *Stephen*'s Words in this sense; now who can imagine that they would have engaged themselves in a Dispute, without so much as knowing the Opinion of their Adversary? Thirdly, There were scarce any Hereticks before *Stephen*, who Baptized in the Name of the Trinity, so that it had been only a Chimerical Question about a thing which had never been practised, to dispute whether it were necessary to Re-baptize those who had been Baptized in the Name of the Trinity by Hereticks, since there were almost no Hereticks that used to Baptize after that manner. Fourthly, The ancient Author of a small Book written against the Opinion of S. *Cyprian*, makes no mention of this Distinction of Hereticks, but generally approves all Baptism whatever given in the Name of Jesus Christ. Fifthly, S. *Augustin* never cites *Stephen*'s Decree for his Opinion; on the other hand, he opposes the Opinion of *Stephen* and S. *Cyprian*; and in his sixth Book *de unico Bapt.* c. 14. he tells us, *Stephen* maintained that no Body was to be Re-baptized, *in nullo iterandum Baptisma.* There are several other Reasons which I pass over in silence.

(*g*) *S.* Cyprian *never altered his Opinion.*] There is not the least probability that S. *Cyprian* altered his Opinion. In the time of the Council of *Arles*, the *Africans* still continued this Practice, and in *Optatus*'s time they distinguished between Hereticks and Schismaticks, receiving the latter without Baptism, but Re-baptizing the former.

(*h*) *Divided upon this Question.*] *Denis* of *Alexandria* in *Eusebius* testifies that the Eastern Churches were divided upon this Question. S. *Athanasius* rejects the Baptism of Hereticks. S. *Basil*, in two Canons of his Letter to *Amphilochius*, examines the different Customs of several Churches about this Question, and inclines to the Party of those who reject the Baptism of Hereticks as invalid.

(*i*) *First decided it in the West.*] The Council of *Arles*, 1. c. 8. *De Afris qui propria lege utuntur ut Rebaptizent.*

(*k*) *Calls the full Council.*] This Question has been discussed with mighty Heat in our time, though it be but of small Importance. It is certain that the Council of *Arles* has decided it agreeably to the Opinion of S. *Austin*, and that the *Africans* gave the Name of a full Council to Councils consisting of more than one Province, as was that of *Arles*. However it is, the Council of *Nice* has not decided this Question, but only ordained that the *Paulianists* should be Re-baptized. Now it is not certain whether they Baptized in the Name of the Trinity or no: And St. *Athanasius* himself seems to affirm the contrary; besides that, though they had not Baptized in the Name of the Trinity, yet we cannot say that this Council has determined the Question.

(*l*) *The Eastern Churches.*] Those of the East did not make use of S. *Austin*'s Distinction either in the Council of *Constantinople*, or in the Council that was held in the Emperour's Palace; but they distinguished between three sorts of Hereticks. Those that were to be Re-baptized, as the *Paulianists*, add the ancient Hereticks, together with the *Eunomians* and *Sabellians*, who did not observe three Immersions. Secondly, Those that were to be anointed, such as were the *Arians*, the *Macedonians*, the *Novatians*, the *Quarto decimani*, and the *Apollinarians*: And lastly, those who had nothing more to do than barely to make an Abjuration, as the *Eutychians*, the *Nestorians*, the *Severians*, the *Acephali*, and the *Monothelites.*

S. *Cyprian.* re-called by the Proconſul *Galerius Maximus*, who confined him to his own Gardens near *Carthage*; that being informed that the Proconſul had ſent ſome Soldiers to ſeize and carry him to *Utica*, he retired into a private Place, that he might not ſuffer Martyrdom out of his own Church, or after any other manner than in the Preſence of his own People; and that at laſt being come back again to his Gardens, after the Proconſul's return to *Carthage*, he was apprehended, and carried before him; where after he had generouſly made Profeſſion of the Chriſtian Faith, he had his Head cut off in a Place called *Sexti*, near the City of *Carthage*, on the 14th of *September*, in the Year 258, under the Conſulſhip of *Tuſcus* and *Baſſus*.

The firſt (*m*) Letter which S. *Cyprian* writ to *Donatus*, contains a Relation of a Conference he had with that Friend a little after his Baptiſm: Wherein, after he has ſpoke of the marvellous Effects of that Sacrament, he eloquently lays open the Perils we run in this World, the Crimes and Injuſtices that are there committed, and afterwards ſhewing the Excellence and Happineſs of thoſe Perſons who conſecrate themſelves to the Service of God; he exhorts his Friend to live a retired Life, to renounce the World, and to apply himſelf diligently to Reading and Praying. This Letter, which we are to conſider as the Firſt-fruits of S. *Cyprian*'s Works, is written in a very gay florid Style, by no means ſuitable to the Matter in hand, as S. *Auſtin* obſerves in his Book *of the Chriſtian Doctrin*; adding, That this Martyr did not follow the ſame manner of Writing in his other Letters, but that he took up a more maſculine and graver way of Writing, and which was more becoming a Chriſtian. Theſe Letters are divided according to the Order of Time (*n*) into five Claſſes: The firſt comprehends thoſe which he wrote in his firſt Exile. The ſecond thoſe which he wrote under the Pontificate of the two Popes, *Cornelius* and *Lucius*. The third, thoſe which he wrote under the Pontificate of *Stephen*. The fourth thoſe which he wrote during his laſt Exile, towards his latter End. The fifth, thoſe of which we cannot ſet down the preciſe time when they were written, which are but few. But beſides this general Order, which it is to obſerve, we are to take notice what Letters follow each other immediately, and this indeed has been attempted by *Pamelius*, but with very little Succeſs. The Order he has followed, has been reformed by a Learned Perſon, who has tranſlated S. *Cyprian*'s Letter into our Language, in the Preface which he ſets before his Tranſlation. And laſtly, He that publiſhed a new Edition of S. *Cyprian* in *England*, has diſpoſed them in a new Order, according to the Series of Time. We ſhall follow either of them as we ſee convenient.

The firſt of thoſe Letters that were written in the firſt Exile of S. *Cyprian*, in all probability is that which is the fourth in *Pamelius*'s Edition, addreſſed to his Clergy, that is to ſay, to his Prieſts and Deacons,, wherein he exhorts them to acquit themſelves in his Abſence of their own Functions and his, ſo that nothing may be defective in relation to Order and Diſcipline: He recommends to their Care thoſe Chriſtians who were impriſoned for the Religion of Jeſus Chriſt, to aſſiſt them in their Neceſſities, and to adviſe the Chriſtians not to go in Multitudes to the Priſons, for fear of provoking the Pagans; that the Prieſts, who went *to offer the Sacrifice of the Altar* in Priſon, ſhould go thither each in their Turns, along with a Deacon; and laſtly, that the Chriſtians ſhould accommodate themſelves to the Times, and take care, as much as in them lay, to ſoften the Rigour of the Perſecution.

[What *Du Pin* renders *to offer the Sacrifice of the Altar* in S. *Cyprian*, is only *to offer*. It is well enough known that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was called *a Sacrifice*, the Lord's Table, *an Altar*, and the Adminiſtration *Offering* in S. *Cyprian*'s Time; and it has been as often proved by all that have given an Account of the Belief of the Fathers in this Matter, That their Opinion was widely diſtant from that of the Church of *Rome* in this Point.]

This Letter was ſoon followed by another, mentioned by him in his ſixth Epiſtle, wherein he commends the Confeſſors for their Courage, and exhorts them to do nothing unworthy of ſuch glorious beginnings. Monſieur *Lombert* is of Opinion that it is loſt, whereas the Editor of the *Engliſh* pretends that it is the eighty firſt Letter which *Pamelius* ſuppoſes to have been written during his laſt Exile; but it is more probable that this Letter was written in his firſt, becauſe he there excuſes his Abſence, which he would never have done in his laſt, where he was (*o*) detained againſt his Will.

It happened at this time, that a Subdeacon of *Carthage*, named *Clementius*, who had gone to *Rome* towards the beginning of the Perſecution, came back to *Carthage*, bringing two Letters with him from the Clergy of *Rome*, during the Vacancy of that See by the Death of *Fabian*: One of them was

(*m*) *The firſt Letter.*] 'Tis rather a Treatiſe than a Letter, but all S. *Cyprian*'s Works were called Letters, as it appears by *Ruffinus* in his Apology. S. *Pacian* calls the Book *de Lapſis*, a Letter, *Ep.* 3. *ad Sempronianum*. S. *Auſtin* likewiſe not only calls the Treatiſe to *Donatus*, but the Book *of Unity*, the Treatiſe *of Zeal and Envy* by this Name; and in ſome other places he gives the Title of the Book to the Letters. It is an eaſie matter however to diſtinguiſh the Letters from the Treatiſes; We leave the Treatiſe to *Donatus* among the Letters, though it is a Treatiſe.

(*n*) *Into five Claſſes.*] In the Engliſh Edition before the other Letters of S. *Cyprian*, we find four that are ſaid to have been written before his Retirement, but they bring no Proofs or Conjectures ſtrong enough to ſupport this Opinion, and therefore we had better own that we cannot tell when they were written.

(*o*) *Detained againſt his Will.*] The five and thirtieth Letter is placed after this, in the Edition lately put out in *England*, but it ſeems to me to have been written towards the end of the Perſecution, becauſe he there ſpeaks of his Return. We are to paſs the ſame Judgment upon the Sixth, and Seventh, and the Fifth, which were all written at the ſame time.

directed

directed to S. *Cyprian*, and gave him Intelligence of the Martyrdom of *Fabian* Biſhop of *Rome*; the other was addreſſed to the Clergy of *Carthage*, exhorting them to take care of the Flock of Jeſus Chriſt in the Abſence of their Paſtor, and encouraging the Faithful to continue ſtedfaſt in the Faith of Jeſus Chriſt, and to raiſe up thoſe who had the Misfortune to fall; to look after the Priſoners, the Needy, the Widows, and Catechumens; to reconcile the relapſed Penitents at their Death to the Church, and to bury the Bodies of the Martyrs. It reproached the Paſtors who abandoned their Flock in the time of Perſecution; which Paſſage ſeems indirectly to condemn S. *Cyprian*'s Retreat. This Letter is the ſecond in the Order of *Pamelius*. S. Cyprian.

S. *Cyprian* anſwered this Letter of the *Roman* Clergy, by congratulating them for the glorious Martyrdom of S. *Fabian*; and having received a Copy of the Letter which the Clergy of *Rome* had writ to his, though it was both without Inſcription and Subſcription, yet he ſent to *Rome* to know whether this Letter was really writ by the Clergy of that City, giving them to underſtand that he was concerned at their ſeeming to diſapprove his Retreat: This is the third Letter. Some time after this, the Proconſul coming to *Carthage*, perſecuted the Chriſtians after a cruel manner, cauſing ſome of the Priſoners to be put to Death, and among the reſt, *Mappalicus*, who ſuffered Martyrdom on the 17th day of *April*. S. *Cyprian* being informed of this, made uſe of their Example to encourage the other Confeſſors to imitate their Conſtancy and Generoſity; and this he did in the 8th Letter. At the ſame time alſo he writ the 36th, addreſſed to his own Clergy, to whoſe Care he recommends the Confeſſors that were in Priſon, requiring them to inter the Bodies of thoſe who died there, to reverence them as Martyrs, and to ſend him word of the Day of their Death, *that he might offer Sacrifices* in remembrance of them. Some of the Chriſtians being then returned home from their Exile, without receiving Orders to do it, S. *Cyprian* writ a Letter to them, which is the 8th according to *Pamelius*'s Account, wherein he takes occaſion to blame their Conduct.

[Mr. *Dodwell*, in his 5th Diſſertation upon S. *Cyprian*, tells us what kind of Sacrifices theſe are: They could not be offered as Propitiations, becauſe the Church believed the Martyrs were already Bleſſed. They were only Anniverſary Celebrations of the Memory of the Martyrdom of thoſe who ſuffered ſo glorioufly for the Faith. Thus all the Saints were alſo remembred in the Diptychs of the Church: Thus the Patriarchs, Prophets, Apoſtles, and the Bleſſed Virgin her ſelf, though no Man ever thought they could ſtand in need of the Prayers of the Faithful. But the Chriſtians were careful, even in the moſt Primitive Times, to pay all poſſible Honours to the Memories of thoſe who made a glorious Confeſſion of the Faith. The Acts of S. *Polycarp*'s Martyrdom, which are the oldeſt we have, ſhew how ſolicitous the Chriſtians of *Smyrna* were to have his Aſhes, not to worſhip them, as they themſelves declare, but by paying the laſt Reſpect to them that was poſſible, to ſhew how willing they ſhould have been to ſuffer in the ſame Cauſe, if they had had an equal Call. Nay, all Chriſtians that dy'd in the Communion of the Church, had in thoſe early Ages ſome Honours paid to them after their Death. Therefore S. *Cyprian* commanded that no Honour ſhould be paid to *Geminius Victor*, becauſe he had left *Geminius Fauſtinus*, a Prieſt, his Executor by his Will: And ſo *Du Pin*'s Words, when he ſpeaks of this Buſineſs afterwards, are to be underſtood; for the ſame Phraſes are uſed, when he ſpeaks of the Commemoration of Martyrs Aniverſaries, and of this of *Geminius Victor* there forbidden.]

The Perſecution that ſtill continued, as it augmented the Number of Martyrs, ſo it augmented the Number of the *Lapſed*, that is to ſay, of thoſe Chriſtians who were ſo weak as to deny the Faith of *Jeſus Chriſt*, and offer Incenſe to Idols, or elſe ſuch as, to avoid Perſecution, got Certificates or Atteſtations under the Hands of ſome Judge, to certifie that they had ſacrificed. Now thoſe who had once fallen away, being thrown out of the Church, and excluded from Communion, addreſſed themſelves to the Martyrs, whoſe Credit and Authority in the Church at that time was extraordinary, who gave them Tickets, wherein they deſired that they might be admitted to Reconciliation. They writ to S. *Cyprian* on the ſame account, praying him to take this their Deſire into conſideration, and to receive theſe Perſons whom they recommended, whenever the Church ſhould be in Peace. But ſome of them happening to abuſe theſe Tickets of the Martyrs, demanded to be reconciled immediately, and addreſſing themſelves to *Feliciſſimus*, and ſome other Prieſts, who were Enemies to S. *Cyprian*, received Abſolution from their Hands. S. *Cyprian* being informed of theſe irregular Proceedings, after he had continued ſome time in ſilence, writ a Letter full of Zeal and Earneſtneſs to his Prieſts and Deacons (this is the ninth) wherein he ſeverely reproves the Prieſts, who forgetting their Rank, and the Duty they owed their Biſhop, had raſhly abſolved thoſe who had fallen into Idolatry. He reproaches them with deceiving the Faithful, inaſmuch as they reconciled them before they had done Penance for their Tranſgreſſion: He remonſtrates to them, that if in Sins of leſs Scandal and Conſequence, it is neceſſary to undergo publick Penance for ſome conſiderable time, before the Party offending is re-admitted into the Church, by Impoſition of Hands from the Biſhop and Clergy, it is a ſtrange perverting of Diſcipline, to admit theſe to the Communion, who, though they have ſhamefully denied the Faith of Jeſus Chriſt, and ſacrificed to Idols, yet have undergone no Penance for their Crime, nor received the Impoſition of Hands of the Biſhop and Prieſts; that as for the Martyrs, they were excuſable, becauſe they did not know the Law; but that thoſe who gave them this falſe Reconciliation were highly to be blamed: That it was a ſcandalous thing for Eccleſiaſticks to abuſe the eaſie Temper of the Martyrs, whom they rather ought to have diſſuaded, in caſe they requeſted any thing which was contrary to the Diſcipline of the Church, but that indeed the Martyrs had demanded nothing like it, ſince they only writ to him to grant the Favour of Reconciliation to thoſe, to whom they had given Tickets, when the Perſecution ſhould ceaſe. At laſt he threatens ſome of his

Clergy

S. *Cyprian.* Clergy who had shewn themselves rash, indiscreet and presumptuous upon this Occasion, if they continued in their Obstinacy, to forbid them to Offer, till such time as they gave an account of their Behaviour before himself, and the Confessors, and the Congregation of the Faithful. He writ likewise at the same time to the Confessors, to advise them not to be so free of their Tickets, or give them to all Petitioners, but to inform themselves better of the Character of those Persons, to whom they designed this Indulgence; and then dissuades the People from soliciting their Admission into the Church with so much precipitation, by making them sensible that a rash Absolution was so far from appeasing God's Anger, that it would rather draw his Vengeance down upon them. These Letters are the Tenth and Eleventh.

His Clergy returning him no Answer, obliged him to write a second Letter to them, wherein, after he has complained of their Silence, he gives the Priests and Deacons leave to reconcile those, who having fallen into Idolatry, had received Tickets from the Martyrs when they were dying; and orders them to Baptize the *Catechumens* that were in danger. This Letter is the Twelfth in *Pamelius*'s Order, and was written towards the beginning of the Summer, 250. His Clergy sending him word, that they did not fail to advise those that had fallen, not to be over hasty, but to undergo Penance; and yet, notwithstanding all the Remonstrances they made, there were some among them who daily pressed them; he answered as he did before in his former Letter, that they ought to reconcile those who had received Tickets from the Martyrs, when they were dangerously Sick; but that others, though they had received Tickets, ought to wait till the Bishops could assemble to fix this Business by common Consent. This Letter is the Thirteenth.

About this time having received Information, That the Letter, a Copy whereof he had by him, without any Subscription, came from the Clergy of *Rome*, he writ to them to justifie his Retreat, and give them an Account of the Pastoral Care he had of his Flock, all the while he was absent. This he does in his Fourteenth Letter, wherein he at large acquaints the Clergy of *Rome* with all that had passed upon the Occasion of the Lapsed; and tells them of the Resolution he had taken conformable to theirs, not to give Absolution to those that had fallen, except they were in danger of Death, till such time as several Bishops could meet to deliberate upon the Affair, by communicating the same to other Churches.

At the same time (*p*) *Celerinus*, a Confessor at *Rome*, writ a Letter to *Lucian*, a Confessor at *Carthage*; wherein he desires him to pray to God for his Sister, who having fallen away in the Persecution, was enjoyn'd Penance: This is the Twentieth. *Lucian* sends him word again, that he had reconciled all those who had fallen, pursuant to the Order he had received from the Martyr *Paul*, but upon condition that they would apply themselves to their Bishop, and do publick Penance for their Fault: This is the Twenty first Letter; and indeed this *Lucian* had given Tickets in the Name of *Paul* and *Mappalicus*, to all the Lapsed, who presented themselves before him, after he was informed of the Penance they had done after their Fall, and had writ to S. *Cyprian*, desiring him to acquaint the Bishops with it: This Letter is the Fifteenth. S. *Cyprian* having received it, sent word immediately to his Clergy, that since the Demand of the Confessors concerned all the Bishops, he durst not prevent them, or take upon himself the Decision of a Matter, wherein all his Brethren had a Share; that therefore he would not reconcile the Penitents till Peace was restored to the Church, and he had the Advice of the rest of his Brethren: This Letter is the Seventeenth. At the same time he sent a Copy of a Letter of a certain Bishop named *Caldonius*, who was of the same Opinion with himself, as to the Reconciliation of those that had fallen, together with his own Answer to it. These Two Letters are the Eighteenth and Nineteenth. At this Juncture arrived Letters from *Rome*, one from the Clergy, the other from *Moses*, *Maximus*, *Nicostratus*, and the other Confessors.

The first is addressed to the Clergy, the second to *Sturninus*, *Aurelius*, and some other Persons. The Scope and Design of both, is to exhort those that had fallen into Idolatry, not to use over much haste in getting themselves reconciled, but to wait a sufficient time to undergo a true Penance. These Letters, that were full of an Evangelical Spirit, rejoyced S. *Cyprian* exceedingly, and secured him from the Complaints that were made against him. He thought himself therefore obliged to thank the Clergy and Confessors of *Rome* in two Letters, which he wrote to them. In that directed to the Clergy, the 22d in order, he gives them an Acconnt of all that had happen'd in *Lucian*'s Affair, he complains of the Rashness of that Man, and tells them very properly to this Subject, *That the Martyrs don't make the Gospel, but the Gospel the Martyrs.*

In the other, which he sent to the Confessors (the 24) he commends their Zeal exceedingly, and tells them, That to be true Martyrs, we ought always to observe an inviolable Sanctity in our Words, and not to destroy the Precepts of JESUS CHRIST, when we pretend to die for him. He ordained *Saturus* a Reader, and *Optatus* a Sub-deacon to carry these Letters, because it was the Custom of Bishops in those Days to send their Letters by none but Clergy-men. He acquainted his Clergy with this Ordination in his 25th Letter, and sent them a Copy of the Letters he writ to *Rome*, and excused himself for being obliged to do this Business in the Absence of his Clergy. The Clergy of *Rome* being fully informed of S. *Cyprian*'s Conduct, sent him a Letter of *Novatian*'s composing, full of Esteem and Respect, which was brought him by *Optatus* and *Saturus*. They acknowledged, that though S. *Cyprian* being assured by the Testimony of his own Conscience, was therefore under no

(*p*) Celerinus *the Confessor.*] These Letters are placed in this Year, because it is not unlikely that they were written some time after the Persecution was begun. This of *Celerinus* was written after *Easter.*

great

great Neceſſity to juſtifie himſelf; yet he deſerved, however, abundance of Commendation, for deſiring that his Actions might be approved by his Brethren; that if he had communicated his Reſolutions to them, it was not becauſe they were his Judges, but only that they might partake the Glory of it with him, by ſupporting and authorizing them, as they do in the 30th Letter, wherein they declare that they were of S. *Cyprian*'s Opinion, That it was neceſſary to tarry till Peace were reſtored to the Church, that ſo the Advice of the Biſhops, Prieſts, Deacons and Confeſſors, who continued firm to the Church might be conſulted, before they regulated a Matter of that great Importance: That as for themſelves and their Neighbours, they would determine nothing till they had a Biſhop: That in the mean time they deferr'd to give thoſe Perſons Abſolution who were able to tarry; but as for thoſe who were in danger of Death, and had given ſufficient Marks of a ſincere Repentance and unfeigned Sorrow, they looked upon themſelves obliged to relieve them in that Neceſſity, leaving to God the Judgment of thoſe Perſons. This Letter is writ with a World of Elegance and Politeneſs, and abounds with admirable Thoughts upon the retarding of Abſolution, and alſo upon that Penance that is neceſſary to ſatisfie God. "Let thoſe People, ſay they, who, by reaſon of their Crimes, have "deſerved to be ejected out of the Church, knock at the Gates, but not break them open; Let them "come to the Church-Porch, but let them go no farther: Let them demand Peace and Abſolution, but "let it be with Modeſty, Humility, Patience and Submiſſion: Let their Tears and their Sighs inter-"cede for them, and teſtifie the real Sorrow they have for their Sins. S. *Cyprian.*

The Confeſſors of *Rome* likewiſe returned an Anſwer to S. *Cyprian* at the ſame time. Their Letter, which is the 25th, though not ſo polite as the former, is equally Learned. They thank S. *Cyprian* for the Letter he ſent them, and aſſure him they received no ſmall Satisfaction and Comfort from it; they looked upon the Condition of thoſe Perſons who had ſuffered Martyrdom to be extreamly happy, ſince they went directly to Heaven, and thought themſelves to be unfortunate, becauſe they were deprived of that Bleſſing. They commend S. *Cyprian* for his great Vigilance over his Flock, tho' he was conſtrained by Neceſſity to be abſent from it. In ſhort, they were of Opinion, that Penitents ought not to be admitted to Reconciliation, before the Church was in a State of Tranquility, ſhewing how neceſſary Repentance is to blot out our Tranſgreſſions, and how dangerous it is to cloſe up a Wound before it be throughly healed.

Theſe Letters being mighty advantagious to S. *Cyprian*'s Affairs, he diſpatched a Copy of them to his Clergy, with Orders to ſhew them to the Faithful of *Carthage*, and to the Biſhops that were Strangers, as we find in the 31ſt Letter: But notwithſtanding all this Advice, the *Lapſi*, in a full Body, writ a Letter to S. *Cyprian* in the Church's Name, wherein they demanded of him to grant them Reconciliation, as being a thing they might juſtly claim, pretending that *Paul* the Martyr had given it to all of them before he died. S. *Cyprian* ſent them Word, in the 26th Letter, that the Church conſiſting only of the Biſhop and Clergy, and all the Laicks who continued firm and ſtedfaſt, he wondred how they durſt be ſo bold, as to write to him in the Name of the Church, and demand Reconciliation of him as a thing that was their Due, inſtead of writing to him after a ſubmiſſive manner, as ſome had done before, who, though they had received Tickets from the Martyrs, yet humbly ſignified to him, that they acknowledged their Fault, that they were heartily ſorry for it, and were by no means urgent to receive the Peace of the Church: That he deſired them therefore, for the time to come, to let him know preciſely what they requeſted, and to ſend him their Names, that he might know what to do. He wrote alſo the 27th Letter to the Clergy, to inform them, that if any of his Prieſts and Deacons, or elſe any Stranger ſhould be ſo preſumptuous, as to communicate with the *Lapſi*, before that Affair were ſolemnly decided, he declared him to be cut off from Communion. He commends them for ſeparating themſelves from *Caius* a Presbyter of *Didda*, and his Deacon, who communicated with Apoſtates, though they had been twice reprimanded by the Biſhops; and declares, That he will not judge the Cauſe of *Philumenus* and *Fortunatus* the Deacons, and of *Favorinus* the *Acolyth*, who had withdrawn themſelves in the Heat of Perſecution, but that they muſt tarry till his return before he examined their Cauſe, not only with his Collegues, but alſo with the People; that in the mean time he would have them deprived of the Diſtribution that was given to the Clergy, though in ſuch a manner, as ſhould not do any Prejudice to the Merits of their Cauſe. He afterwards, in his 28th Letter, acquaints the Clergy of *Rome* with all that he had regulated and done about thoſe that had fallen; and they, for their part, return him a very obliging Letter, wherein they commend his Stedfaſtneſs, and condemn the Precipitation of thoſe that were ſo eager to be reconciled to the Church; but at the ſame time they excuſed the Martyrs, who ſent them to their Biſhop. Towards the end of the Letter, they thank him for the Information he had given them concerning *Privatus* of *Lambeſa*, and aſſure him that they think themſelves obliged to ſhew, that they are not indifferent in thoſe things which relate to other Churches, becauſe "Paſtors ought to watch in common for "the Body of the whole Church, the ſeveral Parts of which are extended in many Provinces. This Letter is the 29th. Towards *October*, *Celerinus* of *Africa*, after he had generouſly confeſſed the Chriſtian Faith at *Rome*, came back to *Carthage*; and going to find out S. *Cyprian* in his Retirement, comforted him exceedingly, by letting him know what an Affection *Moſes*, and the other Confeſſors of *Rome* bore unto him. This obliged him to write another Letter to them, to acquaint them how ſenſibly he received their Good-will, and to encourage them to perſevere in the Reſolution they had taken upon them to die for JESUS CHRIST. This is the 17th Letter in the Order of *Pamelius*. It contains an admirable Commendation of Martyrdom; he obſerves in it, that it was almoſt a full Year ſince they were in Priſon; but then endeavours to ſatisfie them, that their Recompence would be proportionable to the length of their Sufferings, and that immediately after their Martyrdom, they would

would receive the Happineſs of enjoying *GOD*. Theſe Confeſſors, animated by this eloquent Letter, ſuffered Martyrdom ſoon after the Receipt of it,

S. *Cyprian.*

In *December*, S. *Cyprian* ordained the Readers, *Aurelius* and *Celurinus*, both of whom had confeſſed the Faith of *JESUS CHRIST*, and ſignified this Ordination immediately after to his Clergy and People, in his 32d and 33d Letters, wherein he excuſes himſelf for having Ordained them before he had conſulted his Church, becauſe we need not ſtay for the Teſtimony of Men, when we have that of *GOD*. He gives them both an extraordinary Character for their Virtue, and the great Conſtancy they ſhewed in ſuffering for the Chriſtian Faith. He ſays, they deſerved to be advanced to the higheſt Dignities of the Church, but that he judged it more convenient to Ordain them only Readers, becauſe they were ſo very young: That in the mean time he deſigned to make them Prieſts; and therefore ordered them to give them their Diſtributions, as if they were ſo already. At the ſame time he aſſociated *Numidicus* the Prieſt to his Clergy, who was as illuſtrious for the Strictneſs of his Virtue and Faith, as for the Glory of his Confeſſion; for after he had, by his Exhortations, ſent a great Number of Martyrs to *GOD* before him, who were either burnt or ſtoned to Death, and ſaw his Wife, whom he entirely loved caſt, among ſeveral others, into the Fire, with Joy, he himſelf was half burnt, bruiſed with Stones, and left for Dead. This is related in the 34th Letter, which was writ in his Favour.

In the beginning of the Year 257, the Confeſſors that were in Priſon at *Carthage*, being ſet at Liberty, ſome of them were licentious in their Behaviour. S. *Cyprian* being informed of it, writ two Letters, one to his Clergy, and the other to the Confeſſors. In the firſt, which is the 5th according to *Pamelius*'s Order, he ſends his Clergy word, that he earneſtly deſired to come back to *Carthage*; but that the time not permitting him to do it, he conjured them to ſupply his Abſence, to have a particular Care of the Poor, and to exhort the Confeſſors not to loſe the Honour of their glorious Confeſſion by their Sins, but to ſuffer themſelves to be governed by the Prieſts and Deacons; that as for himſelf, he could not regulate the Affairs of his Church alone, having obliged himſelf, when he was firſt made Biſhop, to do nothing of his own Head, without the Advice of his Clergy, and the Conſent of the People.

In the Letter which he writ at the ſame time to the Confeſſors, he adviſes them to a ſtrict Obſervance of the Diſcipline of the Church, leſt otherwiſe they ſhould ſeem to renounce *JESUS CHRIST*, by their irregular way of Living, whom they had confeſſed before with their Tongues. He commends thoſe who behaved themſelves diſcreetly, and vigorouſly reprehends the reſt; he exhorts all Chriſtians to live ſoberly, and to forſake all Vices, that ſo they may be perfectly changed, and become perfect, when Peace, which *GOD* promiſes to ſend in a ſhort time, ſhall be reſtored to the Church. He gives the ſame Advice to his Clergy in the 7th Letter, where he tells them, that as the Perſecution had been occaſioned by the Corruptions of the Manners of the Chriſtians, ſo it would be impoſſible to obtain a Ceſſation of it from *GOD*, by any other Means, than offering up Prayers to him in the Spirit of Union, and living a Vertuous Life. Soon after he writ the 35th Letter to his Clergy, wherein he aſſures them, that he paſſionately deſired to come and ſee them, but that he was obliged to have Regard to the Peace of the Church; and he was afraid that his Preſence might exaſperate the Pagans; that as ſoon as ever they ſent him word that all was calm, and *GOD* ſhould inform him of it, he would ſpeedily to repair them. In the mean time he recommended the Poor to their Care, and ſent ſome Mony to *Regatianus* the Prieſt, to ſupply their Neceſſities; as alſo to relieve Strangers, and thoſe that were Sick.

S. *Cyprian* being not in a Capacity at that time to go to *Carthage*, diſpatched two Biſhops, whoſe Names were *Caldonius* and *Fortunatus*, to relieve the Poor with Mony, and to examine thoſe Perſons who were thought worthy to be choſen into Eccleſiaſtical Offices. *Feliciſſimus*, who had always caballed againſt S *Cyprian*, and aſſerted that it was neceſſary to admit thoſe that had fallen into a Reconciliation, hindred theſe Alms and Examinations, as much as lay in his Power, and threatned to ſeparate himſelf from thoſe that ſhould receive any thing, and obey their Biſhop. After this, he retired to a Mountain, with thoſe of his own Party, and declared himſelf their Head. S. *Cyprian* being informed of this Defection, writ to the two Biſhops, ſignifying, That ſince *Feliciſſimus* had threatned to communicate no longer with thoſe who were in his Place, he would deprive him, and all the reſt of his Faction, from the Communion of the Church, and that, ſetting this Crime aſide, he deſerved to be Excommunicated for the Rapines, the Cheating, and Adulteries of which he was accuſed. This Letter is the 37th. He writ likewiſe the 39th Letter to his own People, wherein, after he had repreſented what a Grief it was to him, that this Diſturbance retarded his Return, he remonſtrates with ſome Vehemence, that as there is but one Church, ſo there is but one Chair in every Church, whereof the Biſhop is Maſter; that we cannot ſet up Altar againſt Altar, nor eſtabliſh a new Prieſthood; and that thoſe who revolt from their Biſhop, and ſeparate themſelves from his Communion, are out of the Church. In ſhort he threatens, at the ſame time, to exclude thoſe for ever, who ſhould join themſelves to *Feliciſſimus*. *Caldonius*, *Fortunatus*, and the reſt of S. *Cyprian*'s Clergy had no ſooner received theſe Letters, but they excommunicated *Feliciſſimus*, and thoſe of his Cabal, and acquainted S. *Cyprian* with it in the 83d Letter. And thus I have given the true Order, as well as the Subject of all thoſe Letters that were written to S. *Cyprian*, during the time of his firſt Baniſhment.

The Order of the Letters written after his Return is leſs perplexed and confuſed in *Pamelius*'s Edition than that of the former. The 40th and 41ſt Letters are firſt in this ſecond Order, and are addreſſed to *Cornelius*. S. *Cyprian* had ſent him word of all that had paſſed in *Africk*, upon the Difference

Difference he had with *Novatian*, and informed him (q) of the Faction *Felicissimus*: At the same time also he writ the 43d Letter to the Confessors of *Rome*, to dissuade them from *Novatian*'s Party, and gave *Cornelius* Information of it in the 42d Letter, wherein he acquaints him, that he had given Orders to his Subdeacon *Metius*, who carried it, to shew it to him, lest he should suspect him to entertain a Commerce with the Schismaticks. In the mean time, *Primitivus* the Priest, who had carried S. *Cyprian*'s first Letter from *Carthage*, being returned thither, brought him a Letter from *Cornelius*, in which he complains that the Letters that were sent him from *Adrumetum*, were not directed to him, but to his Clergy, ever since *Juvenalis* and S. *Cyprian* were arrived there. To this S. *Cyprian* answers in the 44th Letter, that the Reason of this was, because they had acquainted the Christians of that Colony with a Decision lately made in *Africk*, which, by reason of their Bishop's Absence, they were ignorant of, *viz.* That they should neither write to *Novatian* nor *Cornelius*, but to the Clergy of *Rome*, till they had received certain News from *Caldonius* and *Fortunatus*; and that since *Cornelius*'s Ordination was now approved of by all the World, he himself in particular had writ about it to all the *African* Bishops. Towards the end of this Letter he he prays, That GOD, who chose and established Bishops, would not only vouchsafe to protect and defend them, but give them Grace and Knowledge necessary to repress the Licentiousness of Offenders with Vigor, and to manage the good Inclinations of the Penitents with Gentleness and Clemency. S. *Cyprian.*

In the mean time the Confessors of the Church of *Rome* returning from their Error, and being received by *Cornelius* in an Assembly of the *Roman* Clergy, where five Bishops made their Appearance; *Cornelius* communicated this News to S. *Cyprian* in the 45th Letter, which he sent to him by the Hands of *Acolyth Nicephorus*, wherein he gives him a particular Account of whatever had passed in relation to the Confessors, and how they had acknowledged their Fault, and desired to be publickly pardoned, owning that they had been abused by the Perfidiousness and Artifices of *Novatian*; and that, though they had communicated with him, yet they were always in their Hearts united to the Church, and acknowledged at the bottom, That as there was but one God, one Christ, and one Holy Ghost, so there ought to be but one Bishop in a Catholick Church: That after this solemn Profession, they had been received with the Approbation of the People; and that they had granted the Favour to *Maximus* the Priest, to keep his Rank and Dignity. The Person that carried this, brought S. *Cyprian* another Letter from *Cornelius*, wherein he informs him of the Departure of *Novatus* and his Companions, *Nicostratus* the Deacon, *Evaristus* the Bishop, *Primus* and *Dionysius*: This is the 47th Letter. S. *Cyprian* having received these two Letters, answered them by two others. In the first, which is the 46th, he rejoyces with *Cornelius* at the Return of the Confessors. In the second, which is the 48th, he paints *Novatus* in his true Colours, and accuses him of several Crimes. He tells him, it was he, who by his Caballing had got *Felicissimus* to be ordained a Deacon in *Africk*; and that coming to *Rome* afterwards, he had been the Cause of *Novatian*'s being Ordained; but that it was no wonder that this Man could not continue in the Church, who had violated all the Laws of Christian Morality, and Ecclesiastical Discipline; that he had plundered the Orphans and Widows; that he had cheated the Churches, by laying out the Mony to other Uses; that he had suffered his own Father to die of meer Poverty; and that he had been the Cause of his Wife's proving abortive, by Kicking and Ill-using her; that he ought not only to be deprived of the Priesthood, but also of the Communion of the Church, for his Crimes; and that he had prevented the Judgment which the Bishops ought to have passed against him by his voluntary Separation. At the same time likewise, the Confessors of *Rome* writ to S. *Cyprian*, signifying, that after they had deliberated among themselves, concerning the Welfare and Peace of the Church, forgetting what had passed, and leaving the Judgment of it to God, they had reconciled themselves to *Cornelius*, to the Clergy, and all the Church of *Rome*. S. *Cyprian* congratulated them upon their Return, in such a manner as sufficiently testified the Joy he had at such welcome News; as also the Sorrow he had formerly entertained at their falling away. These Letters in *Pamelius*'s Edition, are the 49th and 50th.

Towards the beginning of the year 252, *Antoninus* an *African* Bishop, who had been of *Cornelius*'s Side, having received a Letter from *Novatian*, to acquaint him, that *Cornelius* had received *Trophimus*, and several other Persons who had offered Incense to Idols, was a little staggered at it, and writ to S. *Cyprian*, praying him to inform him what was *Novatian*'s Heresie, and why *Cornelius* had received *Trophimus*, and the other Apostates. S. *Cyprian* perceiving him to waver, endeavoured to confirm him by a long Letter; wherein, after he has justified the Conduct that was observed at *Rome* and in *Africk*, concerning those that were fallen, he defends *Cornelius*, and demonstrates the Validity of his Ordination. He begins it with making a sort of Reproach to this Bishop for his Inconstancy, telling him, it by no means became discreet Persons, who had built their Judgments upon solid Grounds, to suffer themselves to be carried away with every Wind, and to be always changing their Opinions. After this he proceeds to justifie the Measures that were taken with those that had fallen into Idolatry, whether by taking Certificates, or Sacrificing to Idols. He tells him, as long as the Persecution lasted, he had been of Opinion, that it was their Duty to deny them Reconciliation, to encourage them the better to suffer Martyrdom; but that after Peace was once restored to the Church, and after a mature Deliberation upon this Affair, in a numerous Assembly of Bishops, it was thought convenient to keep a Temper, not by taking away all Hopes of Pardon from those that had

(q) *The Cabals of* Felicissimus.] These Letters were carried by *Metius* the Subdeacon as well as the one and fortieth.

S. *Cyprian.* fallen, for fear they ſhould live as Pagans, when they ſaw themſelves entirely ſhut out of the Church; but by obliging them to undergo a long Penance before they could be reconciled; that this had been regulated in Councils of ſeveral Biſhops, held in *Africk* and at *Rome*. He afterwards comes to the Perſon and Ordination of *Cornelius*, and tells him, that he had not all on the ſudden arrived to the Epiſcopacy, but that he had formerly paſſed through all the Eccleſiaſtical Dignities; that he had neither deſired it, nor ſtickled for it, but that he had received it with all Humility; that, in a Word, he had uſed no manner of Violence, as ſome have done, to get himſelf made a Biſhop, but that he had ſuffered it rather in receiving the Epiſcopacy againſt his Will, *Non ut quidam vim fecit, ut Epiſcopus fieret, ſed vim paſſus eſt ut Epiſcopatum coactus acciperet*; that he had been elected Biſhop by ſeveral Biſhops, who happened to be then at *Rome*, in expectation of the Choice of the Clergy, and the Suffrages of the People, and with the general Approbation of all Churches, the See being at that time vacant by the Death of *Fabian*; that after this Ordination, which was approved by all the Biſhops in the World, whoever would get himſelf ordained in the See of *Rome*, muſt neceſſarily be out of the Church; that no Credit was to be given to the ſecret Calumnies that were publiſhed againſt him; that his Collegues, after they had diligently examined the Accuſations of his Enemies, found him to be innocent; that he had never received any Certificates from the Magiſtrates, nor communicated with thoſe Biſhops that had Offered Incenſe to Idols, but that he had followed the Regulations which the whole Church had made concerning Apoſtates; that as for *Trophimus*, he had only received him for the Good of the Church, and to procure the Return of ſeveral Chriſtians, whom he had brought along with him back again to the Church; that for this Reaſon he had been received, but on this Condition, to be in the Number of the Laity, and not as the *Novatians* had reported, in Quality of a Biſhop; that ſince the Benefit of Reconciliation was allowed to Adulterers and Robbers, he ſaw no reaſon why Idolaters ſhould be totally excluded; that amongſt theſe, ſome were more to be blamed than others, that the *Libellatici*, [Thoſe who had Certificates of their having Sacrificed, though they had never done it,] were more excuſable than thoſe that had ſacrificed to Idols; that the firſt of theſe had been reconciled immediately, and that it had been determined, that Abſolution ſhould not be refuſed the latter upon the Point of Death, becauſe there was no Repentance in Hell, with Exception always to thoſe who deferred to do Penance till they were in Danger. After this he largely proves and demonſtrates the reaſonableneſs of this Conduct.

He obſerves that ſome of his Predeceſſors formerly had abſolutely refuſed Abſolution to Adulterers, but that they had not therefore condemned their Brethren, who acted indifferently, nor torn the Church, by making a Separation; that no body ought to be alarmed at what *Novatian* taught, ſince he was out of the Boſom of the Church; that he could not be Biſhop of *Rome*, ſince the Roman See was filled by *Cornelius*, who had been legally ordained, and whoſe Ordination had been approved by all the Biſhops in the World; that the Church being a Body whoſe Members were ſpread over all the Earth after the ſame manner, there was only one Epiſcopacy diffuſed in the Perſon of ſeveral Biſhops united together; and that though *Novatian* had been rightly Ordained, yet he forfeited that Dignity by ſeparating himſelf from his Collegues, and diſturbing the Repoſe of the Church, and that there were no hopes of Salvation for him, being out of the Church. In ſhort, S. *Cyprian* ſhews that it is cruel and unreaſonable to oblige Sinners, as *Novatian* had done, to undergo Penance, and yet refuſe them the Favour of Reconciliation, to exhort them to make Satisfaction for their Sins, and yet deny them that Cure which their Satisfaction deſerves; to ſay to them, Weep and Sigh Night and Day, Waſh your Sins in your Tears, endeavour to efface them by your good Works, and yet at the ſame time add, you muſt die out of the Church; do all you can to procure your Peace, though you ſhall never be able to obtain the Peace you ſo earneſtly deſire.

But *Cornelius* did not defend S. *Cyprian* at *Rome* with the ſame Reſolution and Conſtancy as this Saint defended his Party in *Africk*; for *Feliciſſimus* arriving there with a Company of factious Perſons, to get the Ordination of *Fortunatus* approved, whom he had cauſed to be Ordained in Oppoſition to S. *Cyprian*, *Cornelius* at firſt rejected him, and turned him out of the Church, without vouchſafing ſo much as to hearken to him, and writ to S. *Cyprian* about it. But ſeeing no body came from S. *Cyprian*, and that he had ſent him no Directions about it, whereas on the other hand it was openly diſcourſed, That *Fortunatus* had been ordained by Twenty five Biſhops; that S. *Cyprian* favoured the Party of the *Novatians*, and that if the Church of *Rome* refuſed to receive the Letters which they brought againſt him, they would read them in Publick. The Pope was not a little affrighted at the Menaces, and wrote a ſecond Letter to S. *Cyprian*, wherein he acquaints him that he was ſenſibly concerned at theſe Accuſations, and wondred why he would omit to give him Satisfaction in this Affair. S. *Cyprian* ſurprized at the Boldneſs of *Feliciſſimus*, and the Weakneſs of *Cornelius*, returns him a generous Anſwer, in which he tacitly reprehends him for all this Procedure. He tells him, that if the Inſolence of Wicked Men renders them terrible to Biſhops, and that if they can obtain by Menaces and Violence what they could never pretend to get by Reaſon and the regular Courſe of Juſtice, then there is an end of Epiſcopacy. As for himſelf, he declares, that he feared not the obloquies of his Enemies; that Diſcipline muſt not therefore be laid aſide, becauſe we are reviled with Calumnies, and ill-affected Perſons endeavour to affright us by their threatning Speeches; that the Original of Hereſies and Schiſms is ſolely owing to the Diſobedience ſhewn to the Biſhop, whom God has eſtabliſhed; and becauſe People don't conſider that there is only one Biſhop and Judge in a Church, who for that time ſupplies the Place of Jeſus Chriſt; that a Biſhop being once Canonically Elected, and acquitting himſelf worthily in the Functions of his Miniſtry, whoever ſeparates from him, does actually withdraw himſelf from the Church; that we ought not to impute this Loſs to the

Biſhop,

Biſhop, but to themſelves, who voluntarily choſe it; that the Reaſon why Biſhops are obliged to have ſo great a Care in the Diſcharge of their Conſciences, is that no body might pretend to leave the Church for their ill Adminiſtration; that his own Election was without any Blemiſh, as having been ſubſtituted in the room of a deceaſed Biſhop, Elected by the Suffrages of the People in the Time of Peace, protected by God in his Perſecution, united inviolably to his Collegues, approved by the vigilant Adminiſtration of his Office for four years, demanded often in the Cirque and Amphitheatre to be expoſed to Lions, and that very lately too upon the occaſion of a publick Sacrifice. He informs him at laſt with all that had paſſed in *Africk* concerning the falſe Biſhop *Fortunatus*, who was ſet up by the Faction of *Feliciſſimus*, and ordained by *Privatus* of *Lambeſa* a Heretick, particularly marked out in the Letters of *Fabian* and *Donatus*, and condemned in a Council of Nine Biſhops. He tells him, that he forbore to write to him concerning this Matter, becauſe he ſuppoſed he knew him well enough, ſince he was one of the Five Prieſts who had ſeparated themſelves from his Church a long while ago, and becauſe he himſelf had ejected *Feliciſſimus*, the Chief of that Faction, out of the Church; that *Novatus*'s Party had likewiſe choſen one *Maximus* an *African* Biſhop, and that he had ſcarce troubled himſelf to write about theſe Matters now; but ſince *Fortunatus* boaſted that he was Ordained by Twenty five Biſhops, he aſſures *Cornelius*, that except the Heretick *Privatus* of *Lambeſa*, there was only four Biſhops, and thoſe too all Apoſtates, that aſſiſted at his Ordination. After this, he accuſes *Feliciſſimus*, and thoſe of his Faction, for reconciling thoſe that had fallen in the Time of Perſecution, without ſtaying till they had done Penance for their Crime, contrary to the Decree of the *African* Council. He likewiſe deſcribes the furious Exceſſes of this Cabal, and adds; "After all "theſe Irregularities, after having Elected an Heretick to be a Biſhop, they have ſtill the Impudence "to go to *Rome*, and carry Letters from Schiſmaticks *to the Chair of S.* Peter, *to that chief Church,* "*which is the Spring of Sacerdotal Unity.* But what can their Deſign be, ſince they are ſtill reſolved "to perſevere in their Crimes? Or what Benefit can they expect in going from *Rome*? If they re- "pent of their Faults, they ought to underſtand that they muſt come back again hither to receive "Abſolution for them, *ſince it is an Order eſtabliſhed all the World ever, and indeed but reaſonable, that* "*every ones Cauſe ſhould be Examined where the Crime was committed. Every Paſtor has received a part of* "Jeſus Chriſt's *Flock to govern, and ſhall render an Account of his Actions to God alone.* Upon this ac- "count it is not to be allowed, that thoſe Perſons who are under our Charge, ſhould run to and fro, "and ſow Diſſention amongſt Biſhops by their Temerity and Artifices; but on the other hand, it is "neceſſary for them to defend themſelves in that Place, where they may be confronted by their Ac- "cuſers, and the Witneſſes of their Crimes. Their Cauſe has been examined, Sentence has been pro- "nounced againſt them, and it would be below the Gravity of Biſhops to be juſtly reproached with "being Wavering and Inconſtant. He concludes all with laying open the Method which he uſed with Schiſmaticks, that were deſirous to come back again to the Church. He ſays that he is extreme- ly indulgent to thoſe who acknowledge their Fault, and are heartily concerned for it; that his People complain of his Clemency, and that he rather offends by being too mild than too ſevere, but that at the ſame time he continues inexorable to thoſe that pretend to enter the Church by Menaces and Force. They ought to be perſwaded, *ſays he*, that the Church ſhall be always ſhut againſt them. He adds, That he was not in the leaſt apprehenſive of their Threats, and that a Biſhop who conforms himſelf to the Rules of the Goſpel, and keeps the Precepts of *Jeſus Chriſt*, may perhaps be murdered, but can never be overcome. At laſt, he warns and conjures *Cornelius* to order this Letter to be read to his flouriſhing Clergy that preſided at *Rome* together with him, that ſo if theſe malicious Reports, that were induſtriouſly ſpread about him, had left any ill Impreſſion, it might be entirely effaced by the Reading of this Letter. It was writ four years after his Election to the Biſhoprick, that is to ſay, in the Year 252.

S. *Cyprian.*

(r) About *April*, in the very ſame year, S. *Cyprian*, who had been conſulted by *Fidus* an African Biſhop, upon the occaſion of a Prieſt, whoſe Name was *Victor*, to whom his own Biſhop *Therapius* had granted Reconciliation, and upon the Baptiſm of Infants, propoſed theſe Queſtions in a Council of Sixty ſix Biſhops, who were come to *Carthage* at the Feſtival of *Eaſter*, according to the Cuſtom. They were ſurprized to hear that *Therapius* had ſo ſtrangely ſlighted the Authority of a Decree which

(r) *About* April *in the ſame Year.*] The Author of the Annals of S. *Cyprian*, in the Engliſh Edition, believes that this Synod was not held till the end of the Year 253, after the Perſecution of *Gallus*, and *Voluſian* was ended: But if it was aſſembled at that time, the Biſhops ought not to have blamed *Therapius* for giving the Peace to *Victor*, ſince they themſelves had freely granted it to all People before the Perſecution of *Gallus*; and indeed ſo far was he from doing any thing againſt the laſt Decree, that he rather ſeems to have put it into Execution; for it is not true that S. *Cyprian* makes any mention in this Letter of the two Decrees of the preceeding Synods; he only ſpeaks of the firſt, whereby it was ordained that the Peace ſhould not be given to thoſe that had fallen, unleſs they fell into any dangerous Diſeaſe, or in caſe of Extremity. S. *Cyprian*'s Words are theſe, *Quæ res ſatis nos movit receſſum eſſe a Decreti noſtri auctoritate, ut ante legitimum & plenum tempus ſatisfactionis, & ſine petitu & conſcientia plebis nulla infirmitate urgente, ac neceſſitate cogente pax ei concederetur.* He ſpeaks only of one Decre, *Decreti noſtri*, and not *Decretorum*, and he does not diſtinguiſh between two, for *infirmitate urgente* and *neceſſitate cogente* ſignifie the ſame thing. And though *Terapius* the Biſhop had reconciled *Victor* before the Perſecution, and his Conduct ought for that reaſon to be blamed, yet it could never be doubted after the Perſecution was over, whether this Reconciliation were valid; beſides there is no great probability that *Fidus* ſhould ever be ſo ill adviſed as to accuſe *Therapius* for giving Abſolution to *Victor* long after, and at a Juncture too, when all Biſhops gave it to thoſe that were fallen. 'Tis infinitely more proba-

S. *Cyprian.* ble that this Council was held after the firſt Council of *Carthage*, which prohibited the giving Abſolution to thoſe that had fallen, unleſs in caſe of extream Sickneſs, and the ſecond which granted the Peace to all that had fallen. 'Twas likewiſe in this Interval, that the 52 Letter was written, but after this Council, which in all probability was held about *Eaſter*, in the Year 252. For if Abſolution had beed granted to all the lapſed, the Queſtion of the Biſhops concerning thoſe Perſons who yielded only through the Violence of their Torments, and S. *Cyprian*'s Anſwer had been impertinent; and what is more, it was written three years after the Perſecution of *Decius*. Therefore this could not happen but at the beginning of the year 253, and conſequently the Synod of *Carthage* which granted the Peace, was held in the ſame year, and not in 252, as Biſhop *Pearſon* ſays. Thus if we would be exact in our Chronology, we ought to place the firſt Synod of *Carthage* about *Eaſter*, in the year 251, the ſecond at *Eaſter* 252, which is that of the Sixty ſix Biſhops, and the third at *Eaſter* in the year 253.

they had Synodically paſſed the Year before; but nevertheleſs, after they had maturely weighed every thing, they were of Opinion that the Reconciliation he had received from his Biſhop was not to be reverſed, and ſo they permitted him to enjoy Lay-Communion, contenting themſelves with Admoniſhing their Collegue, and adviſing him to do ſo no more for the time to come. As for what concerned the Baptiſm of Infants, they declared that it was neceſſary to Baptize them immediately after their Birth, and that there lay no Obligation upon Chriſtians to tarry till the 8th day. S. *Cyprian* returns this Anſwer to *Fidus* in his Fifty Eighth Letter.

Soon after, S. *Cyprian* being conſulted by ſome of his Brethren, who were aſſembled at *Thapſus* to ordain a Biſhop, about the Caſe of ſome Penitents in the City of *Thapſus*, who having generouſly confeſſed Jeſus Chriſt, had at laſt yielded to the Violence of their Torments, but had done Penance for it three years afterwards; he anſwers them in the Two and fiftieth Letter, that in his Opinion, they ought by no means to refuſe Pardon to ſuch ſort of Perſons; that their generous Confeſſion ought to attone for the Infirmity of the Fleſh, and that, ſince it had been judged expedient to grant Reconciliation at the Hour of Death, to all thoſe that had fallen, we ought to ſhew greater Indulgence to thoſe who had maintained the Combat a long time, than to thoſe who had yielded merely through Cowardiſe: Nevertheleſs, ſince this was a Queſtion of great importance, he promiſes to propoſe it to the Synod that was to meet about *Eaſter*.

About this time alſo he writ againſt *Fortunatianus*, who had been Biſhop of *Aſſuri*, his Sixty third Letter, directed to *Epictetus*, who was Elected in his Place, and to the People of that City. This *Fortunatianus* had the unhappineſs to fall into Idolatry, and was upon that account diveſted of his Biſhoprick: After his Deprivation he laboured earneſtly to re-poſſeſs himſelf of it, and to perform his reſpective Functions as formerly. S. *Cyprian* condemns theſe Proceedings in this Letter, wherein he demonſtrates how neceſſary a thing Sanctity is to make our Sacrifices acceptable, and adviſes the People not to ſuffer him to exerciſe his Office, but to ſeparate from him, in caſe he continued in his Deſign. Towards the end of this Letter, he exhorts the Penitents that were amongſt them, not to be impatient at the length of their Penance, but to endeavour to ſatisfie God, and to continue knocking at the Gate of the Church: Which Paſſage evidently diſcovers, that it was writ before the Decree of the Council of *Carthage*, which granted Abſolution to all Penitents.

The Council was held in the Year 253, about the time that the Emperors *Gallus* and *Voluſian* diſpatched Letters to all Parts, to oblige the People to Sacrifice to Idols: So that the Chriſtians had reaſon enough to apprehend a general Perſecution. Now to encourage them the more to fight againſt the Enemies of their Faith, the *African* Biſhops thought it convenient to grant Reconciliation to thoſe who were in a State of Penance ſince their Fall, and having accordingly determined it in this Aſſembly, they writ a Letter to *Cornelius*, which is the 53d amongſt thoſe of S. *Cyprian*, to acquaint him with their Decree, and to adviſe him to do the like: They repreſented to him, that though they had reſolved to prolong the Penance of Apoſtates, and not to reconcile them till the Hour of Death, yet ſince they were informed that the Church was going to be perſecuted, they judged it expedient to ſtrengthen the Chriſtians, that ſo they might the better bear the Attacks of their Enemies, and to animate them to the Combat, by giving them *the Body and Blood of Jeſus Chriſt*, which would inſpire them with Vigor to ſuffer Martyrdom couragiouſly. That if there were any Biſhops who thought themſelves obliged to do otherwiſe, it would certainly lye at their Doors to render an Account to God of ſo ill-timed a Severity; that as for themſelves, they had only done what they owed to Charity, as well as to their own Conſciences, by declaring, that the Time of Perſecution drew near, and not hiding that which God had revealed to his Servants. A little after this Decree, S. *Cyprian* writ an excellent Letter to the *Thibaritans*, which is the 55th in *Pamelius*'s Order, wherein he exhorts them in a very vigorous and moving manner, to ſuffer undauntedly for Jeſus Chriſt.

Some time after, S. *Cyprian* being informed that *Cornelius* was ſent into Baniſhment with many of the Faithful of *Rome*, he writ immediately to him to congratulate him upon the account of his Conſtancy, which he had ſo viſibly ſhewn by being the firſt of his Church, that confeſſed the Name of Jeſus Chriſt: He extols his Action, and from thence takes occaſion to triumph over *Novatian*, ſaying, That the Confeſſion of *Cornelius* had evidently diſcovered which of thoſe two was the true Biſhop; and that the Conſtancy of thoſe who had fallen away in *Decius*'s Perſecution, ſufficiently proved, that there was good reaſon to reconcile them to the Church. At laſt he exhorts *Cornelius* to paſs Night and Day with all his People in Faſting, Watching and continual Praying, becauſe the Day of Combat and Triumph was at hand.

It

It was perhaps at this Time, that is to ſay, towards the end of the Reign of *Gallus* and *Voluſian*, that the Empire being invaded on all ſides by the *Barbarians*; and ſeveral Chriſtians happening to be taken Captives by them in *Numidia*, the Biſhops of that Country contributed to redeem them, and wrote to S. *Cyprian*, deſiring him to aſſiſt them in that Conjuncture. S. *Cyprian*.

S. *Cyprian* intimates to them in the 59th Letter, that he was extremely afflicted at the Misfortune that had befallen his Brethren, that Chriſtians, being all Brothers one to another, ought to be concerned at the Captivity of the Faithful, who were carried away Priſoners, as much as if it were their own Caſe: That their Sufferings ought to repreſent to them the Perſon of Jeſus Chriſt, who made himſelf a Captive to deliver us from the Captivity, wherein we were inthraled: That the extreme Peril of the Virgins, who were conſecrated to God, and had reaſon to apprehend the loſs of their Virginity, was a convincing Motive to haſten their Delivery. He tells them therefore, that he returns them his Thanks, becauſe they were willing to let him have a Share in their Works of Charity, and for giving him a fertile Field to caſt his Seed in, that ſo he might one Day reap a plentiful Harveſt out of it: That all the Chriſtians of his Church had readily and liberally contributed to raiſe a Sum of Mony upon this Occaſion: That he had ſent them this Sum, which amounted to an Hundred thouſand, Seſterces, that is to ſay, the 7500 Livres, to diſtribute it as they ſhould think fit, and together with it the Names of thoſe who had contributed towards it, that ſo they might remember them in their Prayers and Sacrifices.

Lucius, who was Elected Biſhop of *Rome*, after the Death of *Cornelius*, being now returned from his Exile, where he had been ſent immediately after his Election; S. *Cyprian* writ the 57th Letter, wherein he congratulates him at the ſame time, both upon the Score of his Baniſhment and his Return; as he had before writ a Letter to him, to Compliment him for (*s*) his Election and glorious Confeſſion.

About the ſame time *Pupienus*, an *African* Biſhop, giving Credit to the Calumnies which *Felicisſimus*, and the Enemies of S. *Cyprian* had publiſhed againſt him, writ him a very diſobliging Letter, wherein he aſſured him, That he could not with a ſafe Conſcience communicate with him, becauſe he did not look upon his Ordination to be lawful; and upon that he accuſes him of Pride, and of being the Occaſion of the Diviſions that were in his Church. S. *Cyprian* anſwered him in the Sixty eighth Letter, That he wondred extremely how he came to call his Ordination in queſtion, after he had been elected Biſhop of *Carthage*, by the Conſent of the Clergy and People, that is to ſay by the Judgment of God himſelf, and had exerciſed that Function for the ſpace of ſix years, which ſhews, that this Letter was writ in the Year 254. That it had been approved by all the World, and acknowledged even by the Pagans themſelves; That an infinite Number of Prelates, Martyrs, Confeſſors, and holy Virgins had owned him for their lawful Biſhop; that after this, he deſired *Pupienus* to judge in his Favour, and to ratifie the judgment of God, and of Jeſus Chriſt; That he had done him wrong in liſtning to ſcandalous Calumnies, and ſuch too as were juſtly puniſhable, againſt his Brother and againſt a Biſhop; That even the Pagans were ſenſible of the Effects of his Humility, and that *Pupienus* had formerly known him when he communicated with him; That there were no Diviſions in his Church, becauſe all his People lived in a wonderful Union with him; and that thoſe only continued without the Church, who deſerved to be ejected out of it, if they had been within. After this, he exhorts *Pupienus* to repent of his Raſhneſs and Pride, and promiſes to communicate with him, provided he is ſorry for his Crime, and endeavours truly to ſatisfie God. He tells him, that God had informed him in a Viſion, That whoſoever would not believe in Jeſus Chriſt, when he eſtabliſhed a Biſhop, ſhould believe him againſt his Will, when he came to take Vengeance upon him; That he very well knew, that the World made theſe Viſions and Dreams paſs for ridiculous, ill-grounded Imaginations, but that the ſame thing had been ſaid of *Joſeph*'s Dreams. At laſt, he concludes with theſe Words: *You have my Letter, and I have yours; they will both be read on the Day of Judgment, before the Tribunal of Jeſus Chriſt.*

Towards the beginning of Pope *Stephen*'s Pontificate, S. *Cyprian* was conſulted by the Biſhops of *France* and *Spain*, about two Affairs of great Conſequence. To give the Reader a ſhort Account of that which related to *France*, he is to know, That the Hereſie of *Novatian* having ſpread it ſelf in that Country, *Marcianus*, Biſhop of *Arles*, being infected with it, joyned himſelf to *Novatian*, and brought over ſeveral Perſons to his Party. And becauſe he was not excommunicated by Name, he arrogantly inſulted over his Brethren. *Fauſtinus*, Biſhop of *Lyons*, and the other Biſhops of that Province, writ to *Stephen* and S. *Cyprian* about it, earneſtly deſiring that they would concur with them in excommunicating *Marcianus*. *Stephen* neglecting to ſend them any Anſwer, *Fauſtinus* writ the Second Time to S. *Cyprian* about it, (*t*) who adviſed *Stephen* in the Sixty ſixth Letter, to ſatisfie the Deſires of the *Gallican* Biſhops, and diſpatch Letters into *Provence*, and principally to the Inhabitants of the City of *Arles*, wherein he ſhould declare *Marcian* Excommunicated, and give them notice to elect another

(*s*) *His Election and glorious Confeſſion.*] The Engliſh Annaliſt ſays, that this Letter was written before the Death of *Gallus* and *Voluſian* in 252, becauſe S. *Cyprian* there ſpeaks of the Perſecution as not being quite over, or at leaſt as being ſtill to be feared: but this does not prove that *Lucius* returned before their Death, but only that though theſe Emperors were dead, there was reaſon ſtill to apprehend a Perſecution, and he actually ſuffered Martyrdom ſoon after, at the beginning of the Empire of *Galienus*, or under *Emilian*.

(*t*) *Who adviſed* Stephen *in his 66th Letter.*] *Baronius* and ſome others have made uſe of this Letter to advance the Authority of *Rome*, but with ſmall ſucceſs; for firſt of all S. *Cyprian* only adviſes *Stephen* to do what he himſelf might do, and what he had really done. Secondly, The *Gallican* Biſhops writ to S. *Cyprian* as well as to *Stephen*. Thirdly, They addreſſed

S. *Cyprian.* addreſſed themſelves to them, becauſe *Marcianus* had alledged in his own Defence, that theſe Biſhops had not excommunicated him. Fourthly, S. *Cyprian* does not write to him to Cite or Depoſe *Marcianus*, but only to declare him ſeparated from the Communion, and to adviſe the People of *Arles* to Elect an other Biſhop, becauſe he was notoriouſly Excommunicated and Depoſed, for joyning himſelf to *Novatian*, who was then out of the Church. Fifthly, He does by no means ground the Neceſſity of *Stephen*'s writing into *France* upon his Authority, but only upon a Motive of Charity, whereby Biſhops were obliged to aſſiſt one another, and upon the Unity of the Epiſcopacy. Monſieur *Launoy* has endeavoured to bring the Truth of this Letter into queſtion, and has propoſed ſome Conjectures to ſhew that it is ſpurious, but they are weak and ill grounded, and ſcarce any body has been induced to embrace his Opinion, becauſe this Letter is really S. *Cyprian*'s Style, which has a peculiar Character, as S. *Auſtin* well obſerves, by which it may be eaſily known. The firſt Difficulty relates to the time of this Letter, but this is eaſily anſwered, by ſaying that it was written at the end of the Year 255, and that the Quarrel between *Stephen* and S. *Cyprian* began not till the Year 256. The ſecond is taken from the Silence of the Ancients, but we ought not to be ſurprized that this particular Fact was not taken notice of, ſince that of *Baſilides*, and *Martialis*, which are not queſtioned by Monſieur *Launoy*, were alſo as much forgotten. Add to this, that S. *Auſtin*. Lib. 6. *de Bapt. contra Donatiſt.* Ch. 15. makes mention of a Letter of S. *Cyprian* to Pope *Stephen*, which takes no notice of the Queſtion about Baptiſm, and cannot be any other than this. The Third Objection of Monſieur *Launoy* is, that it is not to be found in ſeveral Manuſcripts, as in that of the *Vatican*, and above twenty more, according to the Engliſh Edition; but then it is to be found in three ancient ones, as *Rigaltius* has obſerved, and there are ſeveral Letters of S. *Cyprian* that are wanting in ſome Manuſcripts. The Principal and Laſt is taken from the Hiſtory of *Trophimus*, who came not to *Arles*, of which place he was Biſhop (if we may believe the ancient Author of the Life of S. *Saturninus*, quoted by *Gregory* of *Tours*) till the time of *Decius*, which is four or five Years before this Letter of S. *Cyprian* was written, though it appears by this Letter that *Marcianus* was Biſhop of *Arles*, and not *Trophimus*, and the Chriſtian Religion had been a long time eſtabliſhed in that City. This we confeſs to be the greateſt Difficulty, but we may anſwer it by admitting the Epocha of *Sulpitius Severus*, who tells us, that *Trophimus* came ſome Years before *Decius*, and that it is not the Author of the Life of *Saturninus*, but *Gregory* of *Tours*, who upon occaſion of what this Author ſays, that *Saturninus* was Biſhop of *Thoulouſe* in the time of *Decius*, adds ſeven other Biſhops of *France*, amongſt whom is *Trophimus*, and it is poſſible that he might reckon ſome who came ſome time before. The fifth Epiſtle of *Zozimus*, which *Queſnellus* has defended againſt the Conjectures of Monſieur *Launoy*, confirms our Opinion, for there it is ſaid: Trophimus *being ſent to* Arles *by the Holy See, was as it were the Spring of all thoſe Rivers that run through the whole Body of* France. Which Paſſage ſhews, that it is probable that he came ſome years before the Empire of *Decius*, though it were a long time after the Times of the Apoſtles, and ſeveral years after the Martyrdom of S. *Irenæus*.

Biſhop in his Room. He remonſtrates to him, that ſince this Biſhop had joyned himſelf to *Novatian*, who was notoriouſly excommunicated, there was no neceſſity of having a new Judgment againſt him; that all Biſhops were obliged to take care that Admiſſion into the Church ſhould not be denied to Penitents; that the numerous Body of Biſhops being united to one another, by a Bond of mutual Charity, they were all bound, in caſe any one ſhould make himſelf Chief of an Hereſie, or the Flock of Jeſus Chriſt, which they feed in common, ſhould be attacked or carried away, to come to their Relief, and to re-unite the Sheep of Jeſus Chriſt, like the good Shepherds that truly love their Flock.

The Biſhops of *Spain* likewiſe had recourſe to S. *Cyprian*, about an Affair of the ſame Nature, *Baſilides* and *Martialis*, one the Biſhop of *Leon*, the other of *Aſtorga*, having been publickly proved to have taken Certificates of their having Sacrificed, and convicted of ſeveral other Crimes, were depoſed, and *Felix* and *Sabinus* elected in their Places. *Baſilides* owning his Crime, had voluntarily quitted his Biſhoprick, and was placed in the Rank of *Penitents*, where he thought himſelf over happy, if he could but communicate as a Laick: Nevertheleſs, theſe two Biſhops being afterwards puſhed on by their Ambition and Envy, uſed their utmoſt Endeavours to regain their Sees; and finding they could not compaſs their Deſigns there, they went to *Rome*, not to demand their re-eſtabliſhment from *Stephen*, but only that he would be pleaſed to admit them to his Communion, which they ſaid would be very ſerviceable to them to procure their Re-eſtabliſhment. They acted their Parts ſo dexterouſly, that *Stephen* granted them what they requeſted; ſo upon this they went back to *Spain*, where they became more inſolent than ever, and would by all means re-poſſeſs themſelves of their Sees by Force. The Clergy and People of *Spain* writ to S. *Cyprian* about it, and deputed *Felix* and *Sabinus*, who were ordained Biſhops in the Room of theſe two Apoſtates, to go to him, to know what they were to do in this Exigence. But *Felix*, Biſhop of *Saragoſſa*, whom S. *Cyprian* calls a great Defender of the Faith, writ to him likewiſe in particular. The Saint judging this to be an Action of no ſmall Importance, read the Letters ſent him from *Spain*, in a Synod of the *African* Biſhops, who, after they had diligently examined the Matter, came to this Reſolution, That the Depoſition of *Baſilides* and *Martialis* ought to ſtand good, as well as the Ordination of *Felix* and *Sabinus* in their Place. They writ a Synodical Letter concerning it to the Clergy and People of *Leon* and *Aſtorga*, which is placed the 67th, amongſt thoſe of S. *Cyprian*, and ſent them word, that they had no reaſon to ſuffer *Baſilides* and *Martialis* to re-enter upon their Epiſcopal Functions, after they had been found guilty of ſuch enormous Crimes, and *Baſilides* himſelf had acknowledged ſo much; that ſince the People had Power to elect good Biſhops, and to reject the bad, they would appear culpable before God, if they communicated any longer with them; That the Ordination of *Felix* and *Sabinus* was lawful, ſince it was made with the Conſent of the People by the Neighbouring Biſhops; That it ought not to be reverſed, though *Baſilides* had ſurprized *Stephen*, who, by reaſon of his great diſtance from the Place, could

could not exactly inform himself of the Truth of Affairs; that this Conduct was so far from effacing their Crimes, that on the other hand it augmented their Guilt, because though *Stephen* was in some sort excusable for suffering himself to be deceived merely out of Negligence; yet we ought to have a Detestation for those Persons, who had so maliciously imposed upon his Easiness; That they extremely commended their Faith and Zeal, and desired them to maintain a Correspondence no more with Bishops of such a profligate Character, who were notorious for so many Crimes. S. *Cyprian.*

(u) The same Year another Synod of Bishops was held in *Carthage*, who being consulted by *Januarius*, and the rest of the *Numidian* Bishops about the Baptism of Hereticks, returned them this Answer, that it was necessary to re-baptize all those who had been Baptized by Hereticks, according to the ancient Regulation made by *Agrippinus* in *Africk*.

S. *Cyprian* writ the same Year to one *Quintus*, a Bishop, who had ordered the same Question to be put to him by *Lucian* the Priest. This Letter is the 71st, as *Pamelius* has ranged them. He assures him, that some of his Brethren were of a different Opinion from him in this Affair, who pretended that it was the ancient Custom before *Agrippinus*, not to re-baptize Hereticks after they had been once admitted into the Church. To weaken the Authority of this pretended Custom, he lays it down for an undoubted Truth, that we are not to be determined by any Customs of that Nature, but to examine whether they will bear the Test of Reason; That S. *Peter*, in his Dispute with S. *Paul* upon the Business of Circumcision, did not treat that Apostle with Arrogance and Pride; That he never alledged his Primacy, or told him that the new Disciples of *Jesus Christ*, as S. *Paul* was, who had likewise been a Persecutor of the Church, ought blindly to obey him, and not to question his Decisions, but gave him the Hearing, and humbly received the Counsel of Truth which S. *Paul* gave him, and readily submitted to the powerful Reasons of that Apostle, teaching us by that Behaviour to be Peaceable and Patient, and not to espouse our own Opinions with Heat and Obstinacy, but to embrace the advices of our Brethren, whenever they are useful and agreeable to Truth.

Some time after this, S. *Cyprian* assembled at *Carthage* a Council of Seventy one Bishops, as well of the Province of *Africk* as *Numidia*, who confirmed all that had been determined by the preceding Synod, concerning the Baptism of Hereticks, and decreed, that all Priests and Deacons who were ordained amongst them, or who, after having been some time of their Party, returned to the Church, should be received only in the Quality of Laicks: And after this, to maintain that Honour and Friendship which Bishops owed to one another, they acquainted Pope *Stephen* with these Constitutions, by a Synodical Letter, which is the Seventy second amongst those of S. *Cyprian* in *Pamelius*'s Order, and towards the end of it represented to him, that since the things they had ordained were conformable to the Christian Religion, and to Truth, they hoped he would make no difficulty to approve them; That nevertheless they knew there were some Bishops in the World, who could be hardly perswaded to change their Opinions, and yet though they kept up their own particular Customs, would never break the Laws of Peace and Charity; that after the same manner they would not pretend to prescribe Laws, or constrain any Persons, since they were satisfied that every Bishop was free to behave himself, as he saw expedient in the Administration of his own Church, for which he was accountable to God alone.

About the same time likewise, S. *Cyprian* immediately after this Council, writ a long Letter to *Jubaianus* a Bishop, who had also consulted him about this Question, wherein he urges abundance of Reasons, and Texts of Scripture to support his own Opinion; and after he has answered the Objections that were brought against it, concludes with this new Protestation, that he had not the least Design to impose Laws upon any of his Collegues, or to fall out with them upon this Occasion, but inviolably to preserve Faith and Charity, the Dignity of the Priesthood, and Concord with his Brethren. *Stephen* having answered S. *Cyprian* very roughly, *Pompey* Bishop of *Sabra*, a Maritime City of *Africk*, desired him to let him know what *Stephen* had writ to him. So he sent him a Copy of the Letter, with another of his own, wherein he bestows a particular Answer upon the Pope's Letter, which is the Seventy third, as *Pamelius* has placed them. In it he principally opposes the Truth of the Gospel, and the first Traditions of the Apostles, both to the Custom and Tradition which Pope *Stephen* had alledged for himself. He sent likewise by *Rogatianus* the Deacon, another Copy of *Stephen*'s Letter to *Firmilian* Bishop of *Cæsarea* in *Cappadocia*, and to the other Bishops, giving them an Account of what had been determined in *Africk* upon this Question, and desiring them to acquaint him with the Opinion of their respective Churches. He could not have expected a more favourable Answer than what he received from *Firmilian*, for that Bishop openly condemns, and that in Terms severe enough, the procedure of *Stephen*; extols S. *Cyprian*'s Conduct, declares himself entirely in favour of the last, proves it by several Reasons, and assures him it was the ancient Custom of the Asiatick Churches; and that it had been regulated many Years before in two numerous Synods held at

(u) *In the same Year another Synod of Bishops was held.*] This Synod must of necessity have been assembled in the Year 255, as what followed sufficiently shews. It is different from that which was held upon the account of *Basilides* and *Martialis*, at least the Names that are to be seen at the Head of two Synodical Letters, are different. Hence it follows, that there must have been more than one held that very Year, and we are not to wonder at it, because it was the Custom of the *Africans* to hold two every Year, one in the Spring, and the other in Autumn. This might be assembled in the Month of *September*, in the Year 255, the next in the Spring 256, and the last in the Month of *September* in the same Year.

Synnada

Synnada and *Iconium*. This Letter of *Firmilian*, which is the 74th among those of S. *Cyprian*, (x) was written in Autumn in the Year 256.

S. *Cyprian*.

Before this Letter came to S. *Cyprian*'s hands, he writ to *Magnus*, who had asked his Opinion about the Baptism of the *Novatians*, whether these Hereticks were to be excepted out of the Number of those who were to be re-baptized, since they owned the same Faith as the Catholicks did in relation to the Trinity, and Baptized after the same manner. He answers him, I say (y) in the Seventy fifth Letter, that they ought to be re-baptized as well as the rest, forasmuch as there was no true Baptism out of the Church. In this Letter he answers another Question, proposed to him by *Magnus*, concerning the Baptism of *Clinicks*, that is to say, of those that were Baptized in their Sickness, that there was no reason to doubt of the Validity of this Baptism; That the Sacrament was equally efficacious, whether the Person was plunged in the Water, or had it sprinkled upon him. He concludes with repeating his usual Protestation, that he would give Laws to none, but leave them an entire Liberty of doing what they thought convenient, and that every one must give an account of his Conduct to GOD alone.

Thus we have given an exact Account of all the Letters extant in S. *Cyprian*'s Works, that treat of the Baptism of Hereticks. To these we ought to add the Acts of the last Council of *Carthage*, consisting of Eighty seven Bishops, who assembled there the same Year in the Month of *September*. In the first place, the Letters of *Jubaianus* to S. *Cyprian*, and those of S. *Cyprian* to that Bishop, were read in the Council. After that S. *Cyprian* proposed to all the Bishops that were present, to deliver their Opinions freely, but yet so as not to condemn or excommunicate those that were of a different Judgment. "For none of us, says he, ought to make himself a Bishop of Bishops, or pretend to awe "his Brethren by a Tyrannical Fear, because every Bishop is at liberty to do as he pleases, and can no "more be judged by another, than he can judge others himself. But all of us ought to wait and "tarry for the Judgment of Jesus Christ, who alone has Authority to set us over the Church, and "to judge our Actions. After this Proposition the Bishops gave their Opinions, and concluded all in Favour of S. *Cyprian*.

The Persecution of *Valerian*, that was raised against the Church in the Year 257, put an end to the Controversie about the Baptism of Hereticks. This Emperor, who was pushed on by *Marcianus*, a professed Enemy to the Christians, and a great Protector of the *Ægyptian* Superstitions, declared himself against the Christians, and published an Edict against them in *July* that very Year, whereby he prohibited them to meet in the Cœmeteries, or any where else upon Pain of Death. Pope *Stephen* having been found in a Cœmetery, contrary to the Emperor's Prohibition, suffered Martyrdom for it on the Twentieth of *August* the same Year, and (z) *Xystus* was Elected in his Place.

On the 30th day of the same Month, S. *Cyprian* generously confessed the Christian Faith before *Paternus*, the Proconsul, and was banished to *Curubis*. At the same time the Præfect of *Numidia* condemned several Christians to the Mines, and among the rest many Bishops and Priests of his Province, after he had put some of them to Death, and order'd others to be scourg'd. S. *Cyprian* from the Place of his Exile, sent them a Letter, which according as *Pamelius* has distributed them is the 76th, and is the first of the 4th Part of S. *Cyprian*'s Letters. In it, with wonderful Eloquence he heightens the Glory of their Confession, and encourages them to suffer with Constancy. He comforts them in their difficulties, and principally the Priests that were not able to offer Sacrifice in those Places, by representing to them that they themselves continually offer'd up their own Bodies as living Sacrifices to the Lord. He excites them at last to use more fervency in their Prayers, that so God may give Grace to all the Confessors, to finish their Course couragiously, in order to be crowned with everlasting Glory. He sent this Letter to three different Places, where these Holy Confessors were dispersed, and remitted some Mony to them to supply their present Extremities. It appears by the Answers they made him, what Consolation and Joy this Letter gave them in the midst of their Sufferings. These Answers are the 77th, 78th, and 79th Letters, written from three several Places, in which they return him their Thanks for his great Charity and Kindness in a simple and unaffected Style, and assure him, that this Letter had raised their declining Spirits, heal'd their Wounds, and rendred their pressures more light, and supportable to them.

(x) *It was written in the Autumn, in the Year* 256.] We are told in this Letter, that it was written about Twenty two years after the Empire of *Alexander*, who died in the year 235, and that it was composed in haste, because *Rogatianus* was obliged to return by reason of the approaching Winter. It could not be written in 257, because S. *Cyprian* was banished at the end of that Year.

(y) *In the* 75*th Letter.*] The English Annalist thinks that this is the first Letter which was written concerning the Question of Baptism, because it does not plainly and openly make mention of the Synods that were held in *Africk* upon that Occasion. It appears more probable to me, that it was written afterwards, because it supposes the general Question to be decided, and the Author clearly speaks of some of his Collegues that received the Baptism of Hereticks. He says he knew no reason why Christians should take the Part, if he might so say, of Antichrists, which induces me to believe, that it was written after his Quarrel with *Stephen*; besides, it is more natural to imagine, that this Question, which regards the Exception of the general Rule, was made after the Decision. For *Magnus* proposes it to him as a new difficulty. *You demand of me*, says he, *whether those that come from* Novatian's *Party, are to be baptized as well as other Hereticks.*

(z) S. Zystus *was Elected in his Place.*] This Persecution lasted forty two Months, according to S. *Denis* of *Alexandria*, and *Valerian* was taken by the *Persians* in 251, so it began about *July* 257.

The

The 80th Letter which is directed to the Confessors in Prison, was rather writ in his first Exile, than in this, as we have observed after the Author of the *English* Edition. The 81st was writ at the beginning of the year 258, after the Death of Pope *Xystus*, and the return of S. *Cyprian*. It is addressed to one *Successus*, a Bishop, and in it he sends him word, That he was informed by some Letters he had received from *Rome*, that *Valerian* had directed a Rescript to the Senate, by which he ordered all Bishops, Priests, and Deacons to be put to Death without delay, and that the Senators, the Roman Knights, and all other Persons of Quality, who were Christians, should be deprived of their Offices and Estates, and that if they continued, after this Edict, to make Profession of the Christian Religion, they should be condemned to Die; That the Ladies should not only forfeit all their Fortunes, but be Banished, and that those of *Cæsar*'s Houshold should be sent to Prison. He adds, that this Emperor had dispatched Letters to the Governours of Provinces, wherein he enjoyn'd them to Punish the Christians with all Rigour and Severity, who daily expected to see these Orders put in Execution against them; That Pope *Xystus* had suffered Martyrdom on the sixth day of *August*, and one *Quartus* along with him; That the Præfects of the City of *Rome* were very violent against the Christians, causing some of them to be executed every day, and that they confiscated the Goods of all those that were presented before them. In fine, he desires this Bishop to communicate the news to the rest of his Brethren, that all Christians might prepare themselves the better for the Combat. S. *Cyprian*.

The last Letter of S. *Cyprian* is that which he writ a little before his Martyrdom, when he withdrew from his Gardens where he was ordered to Reside, because he received information, that the Proconsul had sent some Soldiers to carry him away to the City of *Utica*, and he was not willing to suffer Martyrdom in a place distant from his own Church and People. But lest this retirement should be interpreted to proceed from a fearful degenerous Spirit, he acquainted his Clergy and People with the reasons that moved him to preserve himself; and at the same time conjures them not to raise disturbances, but to preserve Peace and Unity, and that no body should be permitted to present himself of his own accord to the Gentiles, since it was sufficient to speak courageously when they were apprehended by them.

Besides these Letters of S. *Cyprian*, the time of whose writing we know, there are five others that respect some points of Discipline, and have no certain Date. The Author of the *English* Edition has placed four of them at the head of all the Letters, and affirms that they were written by S. *Cyprian*, before his first Banishment in the Year 246. The first, which is the Sixty Sixth in *Pamelius*'s Order, is directed to the Clergy and People of *Furni*, and is writ againg one *Geminius Victor*, who by his Will had nominated a Priest called *Geminius Faustinus* to be Guardian to one of his Relations. He sends them word, That both himself and his Collegues were extreamly surprized when they were informed of it, because it had been prohibited long before by a Council of Bishops to name any Clergyman in a Will to be a Guardian or Executor, since those that were honoured with the Priesthood, and had undertaken the Office of Clerks, ought only to serve at the Altar, and the Holy Sacrifices, and should not take any other employment than that of Praying to the Lord. He shews them that for this very reason the Laity supplied them from time to time, with all things necessary for Life, as in the time of the Old Testament they paid Tithes to the Levites and Priests. He concludes, that since *Victor* had violated a Constitution made some time ago by a Council, they ought not to *Pray for him after his Death*, or suffer his Memory to be honoured in the Prayers of the Church.

The second, which is the Sixty first in *Pamelius*'s Order, was writ upon the occasion of an Actor upon the Stage, who after he had turned Christian, continued to follow his Profession. S. *Cyprian* tells *Eucratius*, who had consulted him to know whether he should let him stay in the Church, that it was below the Divine Majesty, the Evangelical Discipline, and the honour of the Church, to permit a Man that exercised so infamous a Profession to be in her Communion; That if the Law forbid Men to put on Female Habits, it certainly forbad them much more to Personate the Gestures and Postures of Women, and to represent unseemly and lascivious Actions; That though this Actor had forborn to appear on the Stage himself, yet he was no less Criminal in teaching his scandalous Art to others: That if he pretended in his own excuse that he was Indigent, and had no other way left to maintain himself, he should be relieved as the other Poor belonging to the Church were, provided he would be content with that little Subsistence the Church allowed him, and did not believe, that this was given him by way of recompence for sinning no more, since he alone reaped the benefit of it.

The third, which is the Sixty fifth in *Pamelius*'s Order, was writ to *Rogatianus*, against one of his Deacons, who forgetting the respect he owed to his own Bishop, had treated him after an undutiful manner. S. *Cyprian* and his Brethren, to whom this Bishop had writ about the Matter, answered him that he might have punished him immediately for his Boldness, if he had been so pleased, and that his writing to him about it was only an Effect of his Humility. They enlarge upon the Respect and Obedience that is due to Bishops, affirming, that the Original of all Schisms and Heresies proceeded from the Contempt that was shewn to them. At last they advised this Bishop, in case his Deacon still continued to provoke him with new Injuries, to make use of his Episcopal Authority, and to Excommunicate him, together with the other who had joyned himself with him; hoping nevertheless that he would give him full Satisfaction, *Because*, say they, *we had rather overcome the Evils we receive, by Patience, than revenge our selves by the Sacerdotal Power.*

The Fourth Letter, which is the Sixty second in *Pamelius*'s Edition, was writ in the Name of a Councel to *Pomponius* a Bishop, who had consulted S. *Cyprian*'s Advice about some Virgins, who having made a Resolution to keep their Virginity, had been too familiar with some Persons, and particularly with a Deacon. He commends this Bishop for depriving the Deacon, and the rest that had

S. *Cyprian.*

lived with them, of the Communion. As for what concern'd the Caſe of the Virgins, it was ordained, that thoſe who had loſt their Virginity ſhould do publick Penance for their Crimes a conſiderable time, as being Adultereſſes in reſpect of Jeſus Chriſt their Spouſe, and that if they would not quit the Company of thoſe Perſons, with whom they had maintained this Criminal Correſpondence, they ſhould be for ever turned out of the Church, without hopes of Pardon and Salvation, ſince it is impoſſible to be ſaved out of the boſom of the Church. And then as for thoſe who had not loſt their Virginity, he judged it expedient to admit them to the Communion of the Church, but with this warning, That if they ſtill continued to live in the ſame Houſe with thoſe Perſons, they ſhould be puniſhed after a more ſevere manner, and muſt no more expect to be pardoned ſo eaſily. Thus I have briefly run over theſe four Letters, which the Author of the Annals of S. *Cyprian* has placed at the head of his Engliſh Edition, and pretends to have been written before any of the reſt; becauſe S. *Cyprian* (*yz*) makes no mention of any Perſecution either preſent or paſt in them, as he does in almoſt all the reſt. [The Reader ought to conſult Mr. *Dodwell*'s Learned Diſſertation upon this Letter to *Pomponius*, wherein he will ſee what gave occaſion to thoſe Virgins to live in ſo Scandalous a manner with the Deacons, fully explained.]

There remains nothing now but the 63 Letter, which the Author of the Annals in the Engliſh Edition, (*aa*) affirms to have been written in the year 253, in the time of the Perſecution under *Gallus* and *Voluſian*. It is addreſſed to *Cæcilius* and condemns the Error, or rather the Abuſe of ſome Prieſts, who offered only Water in the Holy Sacrifice of the Maſs. He confronts this ill Cuſtom, which was introduced in ſome places, with the example and precept of Jeſus Chriſt, and ſhews that we ought to offer in the Chalice nothing but Wine mingled with Water. He ſpeaks of this after ſuch a manner as may encline us to believe that it was abſolutely neceſſary in his Opinion to mingle Water with the Wine, for he tells us, that as the Body of Jeſus Chriſt could not be only of Meal unleſs it were tempered with Water, ſo likewiſe the Blood of Jeſus Chriſt could not be of Wine alone, if it is not mingled with Water. But beſides that, in the Explication of theſe Words, we may underſtand them of the Body of Jeſus Chriſt taken in a Myſtical Senſe, we ought not to wonder that the Fathers ſpeak often thus of Cuſtoms eſtabliſhed in their own time when they are Ancient; ſuch as this is, which came from the example of Jeſus Chriſt, and the Tradition of the Apoſtles; we are not at all to wonder, I ſay, if they ſpeak of them as of neceſſary things, without ſcrupulouſly examining whether they are of abſolute neceſſity, taking them in the rigorous ſenſe. He obſerves in this Letter, that they uſed in his time to Celebrate the Sacrifice of the Maſs in the Morning; and that Baptiſm was a neceſſary preparation for the Euchariſt. He ſpeaks of this Sacrament in ſuch terms, as plainly ſhews, that he believed it really contained the Body and Blood of Jeſus Chriſt; and yet he lays down ſeveral Myſtical Reaſons to explain why they made uſe of Bread, and Wine mingled with Water. He tells us, that *Jeſus Chriſt* is figuratively repreſented by the Wine, and that the Water which is mingled with it ſignifies the Union of the People with *Jeſus Chriſt*. Upon theſe grounds it is that he ſays, that if we offered pure Wine, the Body of *Jeſus Chriſt* would be without us; and that if we offered only Water, we ſhould be without *Jeſus Chriſt*; and laſtly, That as ſeveral grains of Corn ground and kneaded together make one Loaf, ſo after the ſame manner we are one and the ſame Body in *Jeſus Chriſt*, who is that Cæleſtial Bread. [See here the Power of Prejudice! The extract which M. *Du Pin* has given of this Letter, demonſtrates that S. *Cyprian* underſtood the Inſtitution of the Euchariſt to be only Myſtical; *Cæcilius* deſired to know what S. *Cyprian* thought of a Cuſtom newly taken up of uſing Water alone in the Morning when they adminiſtred the Lords Supper; it was in dangerous times, when by their Breaths the Chriſtians might have been diſcovered, if they ſhould have drank Wine ſo Early: This Innovation of theirs does not ſeem to have proceeded from a wilful Contempt of the command of Chriſt, but from the Notions they had always been inſtructed in, concerning the Euchariſt. They believed that the Lord's Supper was only a commemorative Sacrifice; and ſo they thought the Death of *Jeſus Chriſt* could equally be remembred by Water in a Morning, as by Water and Wine together in an Afternoon. The Queſtion then is, whether if S. *Cyprian* had believed that *Jeſus Chriſt* was Corporeally preſent in the Sacrament, he would have uſed ſuch Myſtical Arguments to perſwade them to break off ſo unwarrantable a practice. He ought according to Roman Catholick Principles to have confuted their Error by a right Explication of the Nature of the Euchariſt: He ought to have ſhewed them that it was not a Myſtical but a Real Sacrifice, and that *Jeſus Chriſt* is literally offered up in that Sacrament as he was upon the Croſs; and eſpecially he ought to have told them, that Water could not have ſerved inſtead of Wine, becauſe upon Conſecration it could not have been Tranſubſtantiated into the Blood of Chriſt, and ſo by conſequence it had been no true Sacrament for want of that real Preſence, ſince *Jeſus Chriſt* had never given his Miniſters a Power to turn any thing beſides Wine into his Blood, upon Pronouncing the words of the Inſtitution. Whereas here S. *Cyprian* owns the Euchariſt to have been a Myſtical Sacrifice, and gives this as a principal Reaſon why Water alone without Wine is ineffectual, becauſe there was a poſitive Inſtitution from which the Church had no Warrant to recede.

(*yz*) St. *Cyprian.*] The Principle Reaſon is, becauſe he does not ſpeak of any Perſecution in his Letters, though this reaſon is not abſolutely convincing.

(*aa*) *Pretends to have been written in the Year* 253.] Becauſe it appears that S. *Cyprian* was then a Biſhop. *Cum mediocritatem noſtram ſemper humili & verecunda moderatione teneamus:* Beſides that, there he ſpeaks of the Perſecution, and ſays, that this was the cauſe why ſome of the Faithful abſtained from offering Wine. [This rather, as I intimated above, was the true Reaſon of this Innovation.]

This

This is further confirmed by his ſecundary Arguments; In the firſt place he ſays there muſt be Wine, *Quia non poteſt videri Sanguis ejus, quo redempti & vivificati ſumus, eſſe in Calice; quando Vinum deſit Calici, quo Chriſti ſanguis oſtenditur:* *Becauſe*, ſays he, *his Blood by which we are redeemed and quickned cannot ſeem to be in the Cup, if the Wine that repreſents the Blood of Chriſt be not in the Cup.* If S. *Cyprian* had believed Tranſubſtantiation he ought to have ſaid, *That the Blood of Chriſt is not in the Cup, unleſs Wine had been put into it.* But he ſays, *It cannot ſeem to be there, i. e.* cannot be Typically repreſented by Water, ſo well as by Wine. This is no force upon his Words; becauſe he afterwards brings ſeveral Texts out of the Old Teſtament to prove that the Blood of Chriſt was *repreſented* by Wine, and not by Water, and that *Baptiſm* only was typified by Water by the Prophets. This Reaſoning does not agree with modern Gloſſes; no Man ever ſearches for a myſtical Reaſon when he can give a plain one. Wine after Conſecration is not a Figure of Chriſt's Blood, but the Blood it ſelf, according to the Church of *Rome*. And it is improper to ſay, that the Blood of Jeſus Chriſt *could not ſeem to be in the Cup if the Wine did not repreſent it*, if the Wine were believed to be the real Blood: *To be*, and *to be Repreſented* are very different things. And though S. *Cyprian* calls the Euchariſt a Sacrifice, yet ſince he deſcribes it as a Commemorative one, by which we are Myſtically united to *Jeſus Chriſt*, by Faith in him, it is impoſſible to gather from thence, that he believed any other Preſence of the Body and Blood of Chriſt in the Sacrament, than that which is taught by the Church of *England*.] S. *Cyprian.*

Hitherto we have not been willing to interrupt the order of the Letters, by mingling them with his other Books, according to the Series of the time they were written in, becauſe we could not poſſibly have made an Abridgment of them without breaking the Continuation of the Letters, but nothing hinders us now from doing it: We ſhall carefully ſet down the years wherein they were compoſed, and this will be full as well for the Chronology of them, as if we had introduced them among the Letters.

It is probable that S. *Cyprian*'s firſt Book, I mean after his addreſs to *Donatus*, is, (*bb*) That ſmall Treatiſe, Intituled, *The Vanity of Idols*, wherein he refuſed the Pagan Religion which he had lately quitted. This Treatiſe may be divided into three Parts. In the firſt, he proves that the Deities of the Heathens are not true Gods; in the ſecond, he ſhews that there is only one God; And laſtly, in the Third, he ſhews that *Jeſus Chriſt* is the word of God, who was ſent to bring Salvation to Men. The two firſt parts are almoſt word for word taken out of *Minutius Felix*, and the laſt out of *Tertullian*.

(*cc*) The firſt Books of the *Teſtimonies to Quirinus* were alſo in all probability writ by S. *Cyprian* before he was Biſhop, when he wholly employed himſelf in Reading and Studying the Holy Scriptures. Theſe Books are a Collection of ſeveral Texts out of the Bible, and principally the Old Teſtament upon different Matters. In the firſt Book he cites thoſe paſſages that prove, that the Jewiſh Law was to be only for a time; that it ought to be Aboliſhed, and the Jews to be rejected; That *Jeſus Chriſt*, was to come to eſtabliſh a New Temple, and New Sacrifices, a New Prieſthood, and a New Church; That the Gentiles ought to believe in him, and through his means to obtain Remiſſion of their Sins. In the ſecond he urges thoſe places that concern the Myſtery of the Incarnation of *Jeſus Chriſt*, and particularly thoſe that ſhew that *Jeſus Chriſt* is the Wiſdom and Word of God, who took our Nature upon him, to redeem Mankind, with the Prophecies wherein it is foretold that he was to be born of the Race of *David* in the City of *Bethlehem*; That his firſt coming was to be without Glory; That the Jews were to Crucifie him; That he ſhould riſe the Third Day, and come at laſt to Judge the World. (*dd*) The third Book was Compoſed after theſe, upon a quite different Subject.

It is a Collection of ſeveral Teſtimonies, taken as well out of the Old as the New Teſtament, containing many Precepts of Morality, that either have a relation to Chriſtian Virtues, ſuch as are the Fear and Love of God, Patience under Sufferings, Martyrdom, and Virginity; or that diſſuade from Vices, ſuch as Anger, Evil Speaking, Pride, the ſuperfluous Ornaments of Women, and the inordinate

(*bb*) *A ſmall Treatiſe intituled of the vanity of Idols.*] This Book is cited by S. *Jerome*. *Epiſt.* 84. *ad Magnum. Cyprianus, quod Idola Dii non ſunt, qua brevitate, qua hiſtoriarum omnium ſcientia, quo verborum & ſenſuum ſplendore perſtrinxit.* It is probable that it was written in the year 247.

(*cc*) *The firſt Books of the Teſtimonies to* Qurinus.] Theſe Books are not only cited by *Bede*, and by *Gennadius*, but alſo by S. *Jerome*, *adverſ. Pelag.* and by S. *Auſtin*, *lib. contra duas Epiſt. Pelag. c.* 8. & 10. who teſtifies that *Pelagius* the Heretick had made a Collection of ſeveral Teſtimonies out of the Scripture, to imitate, or rather to compleat the Work of S. *Cyprian*. S. *Jerome* cites the third Book. He and S. *Auſtin* have drawn ſome paſſages out of it, ſo that though they are not to be found in ſeveral Manuſcripts, yet we are not in the leaſt to doubt of them. *Quirinus*, to whom this Work is addreſſed, was in all probability a *Neophyte*, when it was written to him; for S. *Cyprian* calls him his Son, and tells him in his Preface, that he ſent him theſe Teſtimonies to give him the firſt Tincture of the Faith, and that he preſented him with a little Water drawn out of the Divine Fountains, which he might make uſe of till he could go to drink of them himſelf at the Spring-Head.

(*dd*) *Has been Compoſed ſince theſe.*] In the Preface of the firſt Book he only ſpeaks of two Books, and the third is not to be found in ſome ancient Editions: but it is cited, as we have obſerved by S. *Jerome* and S. *Auſtin*, *Retract. lib.* 2. *c.* 1. *adverſ. Pelag. c.* 9. *de Prædeſtin. Sanct. c.* 3. and 'tis properly ſpeaking, a work by it ſelf: For the two firſt were written to inſtruct *Quirinus* in the firſt grounds of the Chriſtian Faith, and the deſign of this is to teach him the precepts of Morality. Some few Texts of Scripture may have been ſince added to it, which follow the Vulgar Latin. This Treatiſe might perhaps be written in the year 249.

love of Riches: Or Laſtly, thoſe that lay down the manner how Chriſtians ought to behave themſelves towards their Superiours; ſo that we may juſtly ſay of this Treatiſe, that it is a very uſeful Collection of all the Morality in the Holy Scriptures.

S. *Cyprian.*

The Book of *the Diſcipline, or the Conduct and Apparel of Virgins* ſeems to be the firſt Work that S. *Cyprian* compoſed, (*ee*) after he was ordained Biſhop. The Deſign of it is to inſtruct the Virgins, with the care of whom he was intruſted, to preſerve in their Habits, and the whole tenour of their Life a truly Chriſtian Modeſty. He begins with recommending Diſcipline, that is to ſay, a good conduct; as being the Guardian of Hope, the Anchor of Faith, and the Guide to the way of Salvation. He ſhews by ſeveral Texts of Scripture that it is of great neceſſity; and afterwards addreſſing himſelf to the Virgins, and extolling their Condition, he exhorts them to maintain this Diſcipline with the greateſt of exactneſs, as having more need of it than any Perſons beſides. He convinces them, that Chriſtian Continence can by no means ſuit with profane Ornaments; that their Wealth did not excuſe this Vanity of Dreſſing; that God gave 'em Riches not to throw away upon idle Superfluities, but to employ them to good uſes, to feed and relieve the Poor; that a great Fortune, unleſs employed after this manner, does only become a great Temptation; that although theſe Ornaments that Virgins made uſe of, did not of themſelves deſtroy them, yet they ought to abſtain from them, ſince they had proved the ruin of others, by drawing the Eyes of young Men after them, and by that means kindling the fire of Love in their Hearts; that rich attire and care in Dreſſing only became Proſtitutes, and that the Scripture always ſpeaks of them after this manner; that they abuſed the works of God to ſet themſelves out, and that they diſfigured the Image he made by the Painting and Curling, and abundance of other Ornaments. After this he adviſes the Virgins, carefully to avoid all thoſe things that might injure their Chaſtity, and ſeverely reprehends thoſe who were not aſhamed to go to publick Baths, though they did it without entertaining the leaſt ill deſign. In ſhort, after having given theſe Inſtructions to the Virgins, he takes occaſion to ſpeak of the great advantages of Virginity, and he tells them it was the neareſt State to that of Martyrdom; that Virgins avoid the Curſe pronounced againſt the firſt Woman; that they are equal to the Angels; that Virginity is not of abſolute neceſſity, but that it is a great deal more excellent than any other Condition. At laſt he concludes with deſiring the Virgins to remember him when they ſhould receive the Recompence of their Virginity. *Tantum mementote tunc noſtri, cum incipiet in vobis Virginitas honorari*: Words which make it appear that in S. *Cyprian*'s time they believed that the Saints interceded for us before God.

The Treatiſe concerning thoſe that had fallen away in the time of Perſecution, and that of the Unity of the Church were compoſed in the year 251, immediatly after the Perſecution of *Decius*. This laſt was writ upon the occaſion of the Schiſm of the *Novatians* and the Faction of *Feliciſſimus*; and the firſt was writ againſt thoſe of the Faction of *Feliciſſimus* that raſhly granted the Grace of Reconciliation to all that had fallen into the Perſecution. He Read both theſe Books in an African Council held that very year, and afterwards ſent them to *Rome*, as he teſtifies in his Fiftieth Letter according to *Pamelius*'s Order.

In his Treatiſe concerning thoſe who had fallen away during the Perſecution, he begins with giving Thanks to God that Peace was reſtored to the Church, and makes an honourable Elogium of the Holy Martyrs and Confeſſors. He deplores the lamentable Fall of thoſe Perſons that had Apoſtatized, and obſerves that GOD never permits a Perſecution but to puniſh the Corruptions and Vices of the Chriſtians. He deteſts the crime of thoſe who had preſented themſelves before the Magiſtrates to deny the Faith of Jeſus Chriſt, and carried their Children to the Altars of their Gods to make them, if it were poſſible, partakers of their Crimes, and cauſe them to loſe, as one may ſay, the Grace of Baptiſm. He obſerves that a Love for the World, and an Inclination to Earthly Things occaſioned the Fall of greateſt part of thoſe Perſons who had Apoſtatized, and even hindered them from flying to avoid the Perſecution: He affirms that the fault of thoſe who were overcome by the extremity of their Torments was a great deal more excuſable; but that thoſe who had fallen away merely out of fear of Suffering, before they ever did ſuffer, could alledge nothing in their own defence. After he has ſhewn the greatneſs of the crime of theſe Apoſtates, he paſſes to the Remedies, and greatly blames thoſe that admitted them to a raſh and over haſty Reconciliation. He maintains that a Prieſt of GOD ought by no means to deceive Chriſtians by a pernicious Complaiſance, but to heal them with wholeſome Remedies, herein imitating a skilful Chirurgeon, who makes deep Inciſions that ſo he may perfectly heal up the Wound, and never harkens to the Complaints and Crys of his Patient, who will certainly thank him for it as ſoon as he is healed; that the liberty ſome Perſons had aſſumed to themſelves to grant Reconciliation unadviſedly to thoſe that had fallen, was a new calamity that ſucceeded the Perſecution; that this falſe Peace was pernicious, as well to thoſe that gave it as fatal to thoſe

(*ee*) *After he was Ordained Biſhop.*] He was then a Biſhop, for he ſpeaks to them, as having Authority over them, and calls himſelf their Father. *Pontius* inſinuates, That it was not compoſed till after his Retirement; for, to prove that S. *Cyprian*'s Retirement was of great advantage to the Church, becauſe of the Books he wrote, during his Solitude, he places the Book *about the Conduct of Virgins* in this number. *Who is it*, ſays he, *who has taught the Virgins to preſerve Diſcipline, to wear modeſt Apparel, agreeable to their Condition*? But *Pontius* in this place enumerates the works of S *Cyprian*, like a Rhetorician, ſince the firſt he mentions is the Epiſtle to *Donatus*, which was certainly written before his Confinement, and in all appearance the Luxury of Women, the uſe of frequenting Baths, and the other Irregularities he reprehends in that Treatiſe, better agree with a time wherein the Church had long enjoy'd Peace. Be it as it will, *Pontius* always places the Book *of the Conduct of Virgins* firſt.

that

that received it; that a Sinner ought to have time sufficient to expiate his Sin by a true and lawful satisfaction; that it was abominable Sacriledge to approach the Holy of Holys, and to receive the body of Jesus Christ, while their hands were still polluted with sacrificing to Idols, and had scarce digested the meats offered to false Gods; that this in effect is to drink the Cup of the Lord, and the Cup of Devils, to eat at the Table of the Lord, and at that of the Devil, and to offer violence, as one may say, to the body and blood of Jesus Christ; that they deceive themselves who think that the Reconciliation which is given them before they have expiated their Crime by a publick Penance, and purified their Conscience by Sacrifice and Imposition of Hands from the Bishop, is a true Reconciliation; that is rather a War, a new Persecution, a new Temptation, whereof the Enemy makes use to consummate the destruction of those that fell, by taking away from them the Spirit of Repentance; that they ought not to flatter themselves because they were absolved by the Martyrs, since Jesus Christ only can pardon Sins; that the Merits and Works of the Martyrs can indeed do much, but that only for the day of Judgment, and that it is downright rashness to believe that they can without distinction grant Remission of Sins to all the World, against the express command of Jesus Christ; that if what the Martyrs ordain is just and lawful, it ought to be granted at their request; but if what they demand is against the Law of GOD, and the Gospel, it is not reasonable that it should be granted; besides, that it is not to be presumed that those who are Martyrs for the Gospel, would attempt any thing in derogation to it. After this to strike terrour into those who had fallen, he relates several Examples of Persons, whom God had severely punished for being so bold as to receive the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ after their Apostacy. Then he addresses himself to those who had taken Certificates from the Magistrates, which testified that they had sacrificed, tho' they had really done no such thing, and advises them not to flatter themselves, as if there was no necessity of repenting, since to confess that one has committed a crime, is effectually the same thing as to commit it, and that this Declaration was a solemn renouncing of the Christian Religion; that tho' this crime did not appear very shameful in the Eyes of Men, yet it was heinous before God, who knows the most secret motions and inclinations of our hearts. At last he mightily extolls the Piety of those who had neither offered Sacrifice, nor taken Certificates. However, since they had a desire to do it, he exhorts them to confess themselves largely and with sorrow before the Priests of GOD, discovering the Secrets of their Conscience, to quiet their Consciences, and to search out a remedy for their Wounds, tho' they appeared to be slight and insignificant; and he persuades those that were conscious to themselves of this fault, not to be ashamed of discovering it, and to do Penance for it, that so they may obtain Pardon. He concludes all with an exhortation to Sinners, to renounce the Pleasures and Vanities of the World, and to satisfie the Divine Justice by a long and sincere Repentance. S. *Cyprian.*

(ff) In his Treaty of *The Unity of the Church* he begins with advising all Christians to joyn Prudence to Simplicity, and to take diligent care to keep themselves from the secret Attacks of the Devil, as Heresies and Schisms, whereby he draws Christians, before they are aware, to separate themselves from the Unity of the Church. After this, he demonstrates, by several Reasons, That the Church of Jesus Christ is essentially One, and that there cannot be more. He tells us, *That for a visible mark of this Unity, Jesus Christ had built his Church upon S.* Peter; *and that he gave the Power of his Keys only to him, tho', after his Resurrection, he gave equal Power and Authority to all his Apostles*; that as the Church is One, so there is One only Episcopacy, a part whereof every Pastor truly and really possesses; that such as are out of this Church, have no Salvation to hope for; that a Man may be killed indeed out of the Church, but that he could not be crown'd unless he were actually in the Church; that Schism and Heresie are the most enormous Crimes a Man can be guilty of, which God has always punished with the greatest Severity; that the example of a few Confessors ought not to stagger or scandalize any one; for besides that, we are not to imitate them in the faults they may commit; there was still a very great number of them that continued stedfast in the Unity of the Church. At last, he exhorts all Christians whatsoever, to return to it again, to promote Union by their joynt endeavours, and to have no manner of Commerce with Schismaticks.

[In the Account which our Author gives of this Discourse of S. *Cyprian*, he seems not to be so fair as he is at other times. He says from S. *Cyprian*, *That for a visible mark of this Unity of the Church, Jesus Christ had built his Church upon S.* Peter, *and gave the Power of the Keys only to him; tho', after his Resurrection he gave equal Power and Authority to all his Apostles.* S. *Cyprian*'s words are these, *Loquitur Dominus ad Petrum, ego tibi dico, inquit, quia tu es Petrus, & super istam Petram ædificabo Ecclesiam meam, & portæ inferorum non vincent eam, &c. & iterum eidem post Resurrectionem suam dicit, Pasce oves meas. Super unum ædificat Ecclesiam suam. Et quamvis Apostolis omnibus, parem potestatem tribuat, & dicat, si cui remiseritis peccata, remittentur illi: Si cui tenueritis, tenebuntur: tamen ut unitatem manifestaret, unitatis ejusdem originem, ab uno incipientem sua auctoritate disposuit. Hoc erant utique & cæteri Apostoli, quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio præditi & Honoris & Potestatis, sed exordium ab unitate proficiscitur, ut Ecclesia una monstretur.* 'The Lord said unto *Peter*, I say unto thee, says he, that 'thou art *Peter*, and upon that Rock I will build my Church, and the Gates of Hell shall not prevail 'against it, *&c.* And again, after his Resurrection, he says to the same S. *Peter*, 'Feed my Sheep. He builds 'his Church upon one. And tho' he gives equal Power to all the Apostles, and tells them, whose Sins

(ff) In the Treatise of the Church.] *Pontius* mentions this Treatise. It is cited by S. *Austin* in his second Book, *Contra Crescon.* and by *Facundus, lib.* 1. *cap.* 16. under the name of the *Treatise of Unity*; and in some ancient Editions, it is Entituled, *A Treatise of the Simplicity of Pastors.*

ye

S. *Cyprian.* 'ye retain, they ſhall be retained, and whoſe Sins ye forgive, ſhall be forgiven; yet that he might 'make that Unity manifeſt, he ordered by his own Authority, that the Original of that very Unity 'ſhould begin from one. For the other Apoſtles were the ſame as he, equally Partners of Honour 'and Power, but the beginning ſprings from Unity, that the Church may be ſhew'd to be but one.

Here is no diſtinction made of different Powers granted before and after the Reſurrection. S. *Cyprian* ſeems to have deſigned to obviate this Objection; and leſt any Man ſhould think, that any Primacy, except that of being named firſt was intended, he ſays, that the other Apoſtles were S. *Peter's* equals, both in Honour and Power. But this Paſſage has had foul dealing ſhew'd to it long ago; *Manutius* publiſhed it at *Rome* with Interpolations in his Edition in 1563. *Rigaltius* was aſhamed of it, and ſo Printed it in his Notes faithfully. The wonder is, how Mr. *Du Pin* ſhould ſay, *That Jeſus Chriſt gave the Power of the Keys to S.* Peter *only*, when he had the *Oxon* Edition before him, and all the other Editions that preceded *Manutius's* of which he has given us a Catalogue. One ſees the Reaſon now, why he deſires afterwards that ſome Catholick Divine (as he calls them) would Reprint S. *Cyprian*, and Illuſtrate him with Catholick Commentaries. This is the Reaſon why the *Oxon* Edition could not ſatisfie him: Biſhop *Fell's* Notes are too candid and ſincere for any one of that Communion; ſo that tho' he could not omit ſpeaking honourably of it, leſt his judgment ſhould have been queſtioned, yet the want of *Catholick Commentaries* was ſo very deplorable a thing, that he thought by this ſly inſinuation to depreciate ſo valuable an Edition of ſo great a Father: For S. *Cyprian* alone cannot be put into all Mens hands without danger; and it is an unanſwerable Argument how little Antiquity favours their Cauſe, when the Father who wrote more and more earneſtly for Catholick Unity, and the ſupport of Eccleſiaſtical Diſcipline againſt Schiſmaticks, and Diſturbers of the Peace of the Church, than any Man before the Council of *Nice*, cannot be brought to ſpeak as they would have him, without uſing the moſt palpable miſrepreſentation, and the moſt unjuſt dealing that can be ſhewn to the Writings of any Author whatever.]

The Treatiſe about the Lord's Prayer immediately follows that of the Unity of the Church, in *Pontius* the Deacon's Catalogue, and it is probable, that it was compoſed ſoon after, towards the beginning of the Year 252. In this Book he highly recommends Amity and Concord, which ſhews, that he writ it ſoon after the former, when he had his Head full of the ſame thoughts, and at a juncture when it was neceſſary to inforce them the ſecond time on the World. We may divide it into ſeven Parts: In the firſt, he demonſtrates, that the Lord's Prayer is the moſt excellent and efficacious Prayer, ſince Jeſus Chriſt himſelf compoſed it for our uſe. In the ſecond, he ſets down Rules how we ought to Pray, and tells us we muſt do it with a World of Reverence and Modeſty; that the tone of our voice ought not to be high; that when Chriſtians aſſemble together to celebrate Divine Sacrifices with the Biſhop, it is convenient that they ſhould remember to be moderate, and not to make a confuſed noiſe with their Voice, becauſe it is not the Voice, but the Heart which is to be elevated to Heaven; that we muſt pray with great Humility, which he confirms by the example of *Hannah*, the Mother of *Samuel*, and of the Publican mentioned in the Goſpel. In the third part, he inſtructs us what things we are to Pray for; and taking occaſion to explain the Lord's Prayer, he obſerves in the firſt place, that we do not ſay, *My Father*, but *Our Father*, becauſe the Prayer of every Chriſtian is a common Prayer, who does not pray for himſelf alone, but for the whole Congregation of the Faithful, which make up but one body; that we invoke God by the name of Father, becauſe we are made his Children by Baptiſm; that we beſeech him that his name may be ſanctified in us, that is to ſay, we pray him to ſanctifie and purifie us continually to the end of our Life; that the Kingdom of Jeſus Chriſt, which we expect, is the recompence we hope to receive in the other Life, at the day of Judgment; that when we pray to God that his *Will may be done*, our meaning is not, that he would do whatever pleaſes him, but that he would work in us what he would have us to do, that is to ſay, that he would make us accompliſh his Will, which no body is able to do by his own ſtrength alone, without the aſſiſtance of God's Mercy; that this Will of God, which we are required to fulfil, is no other than what Jeſus Chriſt has done and taught, that is to ſay, Humility, Stedfaſtneſs in the Faith, Prudence, Juſtice, Mercy, a good Deportment, to do wrong to none, to preſerve Peace with our Brethren, to love God with all our Heart, and to prefer nothing before Jeſus Chriſt, ſince he himſelf preferred nothing before us; that when we pray that this *Will may be done in Earth as it is in Heaven*, we mean (according to his Explication) in our Body, and in our Mind, or rather in the Unbelievers as well as the Believers. After this he ſays, that the *daily Bread* we pray for in the Lord's Prayer, may be underſtood either of Spiritual or Corporeal Bread; that the Spiritual Bread we beg for is the Body of Jeſus Chriſt in the Euchariſt, which the Chriſtians who are truly devoted to Jeſus Chriſt deſire to receive, daily fearing to be ſeparated from it by ſome great Sin; that if we underſtood it of Corporeal Bread, the meaning is, that we are not to beg of God what is neceſſary for our Suſtenance every day, unleſs we carry our deſires farther: That in praying to God that he would *Forgive us our Treſpaſſes*, we acknowledge that we Treſpaſs continually, and impoſe upon our ſelves at the ſame time a Law not to obtain remiſſion, but only upon condition, that we forgive our Brethren the Treſpaſſes they have committed againſt us: When we deſire of God that he would not permit us to *fall into Temptation*, we intimate, that our Enemy has no Power over us, if God does not give him leave to tempt us, and that he never gives him leave but for two Reaſons, either to puniſh us for our Sins, or elſe to try us: That the Lord's Prayer concludes at laſt with a Petition, which is a ſort of an Abridgment of all the reſt; for when we beſeech God to deliver us from all Evil by his Almighty Power, nothing more remains for us to ask.

In

In the fourth part he tells us, that Jesus Christ has instructed us to pray as well by his Example as by his Words; and since he who was without Sin pray'd often, certainly we who are Sinners are to pray continually. In the fifth, he recommends vigilancy and attention in our Devotions, exhorting us to think upon nothing but only him to whom we address our selves, and to banish all carnal Thoughts out of our Hearts. To impress the greater Authority upon this Exhortation, he takes notice of the Prayer which the Priest repeated at that time, when he celebrated the Eucharist, saying, *Sursum corda, Lift up your Hearts*, and observes, that the People answer'd, *We lift them up to the Lord.* S. *Cyprian.*

In the sixth part, he advises all Christians not to content themselves with vain barren Prayers, but to joyn Alms-giving, and other Actions of Piety to them. And lastly, in the seventh part, he discourses of the time of Prayer, after he has taken notice, what are the most solemn hours to Pray in. He concludes with affirming, that Christians ought to Pray to God at all times; and since the serious performance of these duties will procure for them one day, everlasting Happiness, they ought, even now, to begin to thank God. This Treatise of S. *Cyprian* was so highly approved by S. *Austin*, that he recommended it to the Monks of *Adrumetum*, to whom he addressed his Book about Grace and Free-will, to read it over carefully, and to learn it by Heart; and he observes, that this Saint speaks after such a manner in this Treatise, as shews, that he was perswaded we ought to pray to God to give us his Grace to perform what he commands us to do in his Law. And indeed, amongst all the Treatises that were composed in the first Ages of the Church, perhaps there is not one that ascribes so much to the Grace of Jesus Christ as this does, or contains more formal Passages to prove the efficacy and necessity of it.

The Exhortation to Martyrdom, directed to *Fortunatianus*, at a time when the Christians expected the Persecution of *Gallus* and *Volusian*, was writ in the Year 253. 'Tis a Collection of Texts of Scripture, to excite all Christians to confess the Name of Jesus Christ Courageously, and to suffer Martyrdom for the Truth. In the first Chapter he cites those places, that discover the vanity of Idols. In the second, those that shew, that we must only Worship God. In the third, those that mention the severe Punishments wherewith God threatens to visit those that Sacrifice to Idols. In the fourth and fifth, those that declare, that God will not easily pardon Idolatry, but punishes those with Death who counsel others to adore Idols. In the sixth, he urges those Texts that may induce us to consider, that since we have been redeemed and enlivened by Jesus Christ, we ought not to prefer any thing before him, since he himself prefer'd nothing before us. In the seventh, those that represent to us, that since we have once escaped the Snares of the Devil, and the Ambushes of the World, we ought to take heed that we fall into them no more, but make the best use of that delivery. In the eighth, those that recommend Perseverance in the Faith, and all other Virtues. In the ninth, those that shew, that Persecutions and Afflictions are sent only to try us. In the tenth, those that give us Consolation, and teach us not to be afraid, since God is more powerful to Protect us, than the Devil to Overcome us. In the eleventh, those that prove, that it was foretold, that the World would hate us, and stir up Persecutions against us; and that good Men always suffered. In the last, there is a Collection of Texts to encourage Christians to suffer Martyrdom, out of hopes of finding a sufficient recompence in Heaven. Here is an Abridgment of this Treatise made by St. *Cyprian* himself, which he sent at the end of his Letter to *Fortunatianus*, to whom he Dedicates this Book. He observes in this Letter, that it is the duty of the Bishop to train and exercise those Soldiers, whom Jesus Christ has committed to his Charge; and that Observations drawn out of the Holy Scripture, are the best Arms he can give them.

The Treatise of Mortality was composed (gg) upon occasion of a certain Pestilence that afflicted the Roman Empire, but principally *Africk*, the Year after the Death of *Gallus* and *Volusian*. He shews in his Treatise, that Christians ought not to be afraid of Sickness or Calamities, but that they rather ought to wish for them, since they furnish them with an opportunity to exercise their Patience, and to merit the Rewards of Heaven; that they ought not to fear Death, but rather to desire it, since it delivers them from all the miseries of this Life, and unites them to Jesus Christ for ever; that we ought not to be surprized, that the Pestilence seizes Christians as well as Pagans, since all the miseries of the Flesh are equally common to both, nay, that a Christian ought to suffer more than the other; that the difference that ought to be between him, and one that does not know God, is, that the latter complains and suffers his Evils with impatience, whereas a Christian shews his Faith at such a juncture, by being not afraid of Death, and his Vertue in bearing every thing patiently, and his Charity in helping his Neighbour; that though the Good dye as well as the Bad, yet their end is very different, because the Good after their Death, are sent into a place of Refreshment, whereas the Wicked are thrown headlong into a place where they are Tormented for ever; that the first dye to be put into a better state of security, and the last to be more severely punished: That Sicknesses prepare us for Martyrdom, and make us Martyrs of Jesus Christ; that for this reason we ought not to be afflicted, because they deprive us of the glory of Confession, since not to mention, that it does not depend upon our selves to be Martyrs, and that it is the Grace of God to let us dye with a Will of suffering Martyrdom, God will crown us as if we had really suffered it: That it would be to no

(gg) *Upon the occasion of the Infection.*] It had its rise in *Arabia*, then spread it self in *Ægypt* and *Africa*, from whence it passed into all the West. It was an Epidemical Distemper, a great deal worse than a common Pestilence. It began under the Empire of *Gallus* and *Volusian*, and lasted several Years; it raged with twice the violence, under the Empire of *Gallienus*, as we have already observed. This Treatise was written in the Year 253, or 254.

purpose

S. *Cyprian.* purpoſe to beg of God, that his Kingdom may come, if the Captivity wherein we are does ſtill pleaſe us: That we ought not to bewail thoſe of our Brethren, whom God has taken to himſelf, ſince we have not loſt them, and they have only gone a Journey before us, which we are all to make one time or another: That we do in ſome ſort diſtruſt the promiſes of Jeſus Chriſt, if we concern and afflict our ſelves at the Death of our Neighbours and Friends, as if they were no more, and that we ought rather to rejoyce that they are paſſed into a better Life, and enjoy a ſtate of repoſe and tranquility that will never end. At laſt he exhorts all Chriſtians heartily to wiſh for the happy day of their Death, which will free them from the exile of this Life, and give them admiſſion into the Kingdom of Heaven, which is their Country, where they will be everlaſtingly in the Company of the Saints, and with Jeſus Chriſt.

His Treatiſe to *Demetrianus* (*hh*) a Judge in *Africa*, was likewiſe compoſed during the rage of this Peſtilence, immediately after (*ii*) the Death of *Gallus* and *Voluſian*. He there refutes a Calumny, which the Pagans frequently formed againſt the Chriſtians for being the cauſe of thoſe Wars, Famines, Plagues, and other Calamities that waſted the Roman Empire. He ſhews, that thoſe misfortunes that daily happen in the World, which grows old every day, ought to be rather attributed to the Crimes and Impiety of Men; and that the Chriſtians were ſo far from being the occaſion of them, becauſe they did not adore falſe Gods, that the Pagans rather drew down all theſe heavy Viſitations upon Mankind, becauſe they did not worſhip the true God, and Perſecuted thoſe that Worſhip'd him: That all this was the immediate hand of God, who to revenge himſelf for the contempt they ſhew'd of him, and of thoſe that ſerved him, puniſhed Men after this rigorous manner, and made them feel the weight of his diſpleaſure: That the Gods of the Pagans were ſo far from being able to exerciſe this Revenge, that they were fettered and ill uſed, as I may ſay, by the Chriſtians, who ejected them by force out of the Bodies of thoſe Perſons, whom they had poſſeſt: That the Chriſtians ſuffered patiently, as being aſſured that their Cauſe would be ſoon revenged, that they endured the ſame Evils which the Pagans did in this World, but that they comforted themſelves, becauſe after their Death they ſhould poſſeſs everlaſting Joy, whereas the Pagans at the day of Judgment would be condemned to everlaſting Torments. He exhorts them at laſt, with great zeal and ardour, to quit their Errors, and to repent of them while they are in a condition to do it; becauſe after this Life is once over, there is no room for Repentance, and afterwards the Satisfaction is uſeleſs, ſince it is here upon Earth, that every Man renders himſelf worthy or unworthy of everlaſting Salvation: That neither Age nor Sins ought to hinder any one from ſuffering himſelf to be Converted, ſince, as long as we are in this World, there is ſtill time for us to Repent, the Gate of the Divine Mercy being never ſhut to thoſe that diligently ſearch the Truth. *Though you were*, ſays he, *at the point of Death, if you pray'd to have your Sins forgiven, and implored the goodneſs of God, you would obtain remiſſion of your Crimes, and paſs from Death to Immortality. Jeſus Chriſt has procured this favour for us by conquering and triumphing over Death on the Croſs, by redeeming thoſe that Believe with the price of his Blood, by reconciling Man to God, and communicating a new Life to him by a celeſtial Birth. Let us follow them all if it is poſſible, and receive this Sacrament, and his Sign*, &c

It is probable, that the (*kk*) Treatiſe of *Mercy and Alms-giving* was writ when S. *Cyprian* gathered conſiderable Alms to redeem the Chriſtians, who had been taken Priſoners by the Barbarians, towards the Year 253. He demonſtrates in this Book, by ſeveral Authorities of Scripture, and many Convincing Reaſons, the neceſſity of giving Alms; he refutes the frivolous excuſes, and vain pretences uſed by Rich Men to avoid the doing ſuch acts of Charity; and obſerves, that in his time every one brought a Loaf at the Celebration of the Euchariſt, [which was always once a day, in the Morning before it was Light, and often at Night after Supper.]

S. *Cyprian* tells us himſelf, in his Letter to *Jubaianus*, that he compoſed his Book of *Patience*, upon the occaſion of a Queſtion concerning the reiteration of the Baptiſm of Hereticks, to ſhew that we ought to preſerve Charity and Patience in all Diſputes with our Brethren. So this Treatiſe was compoſed, at the beginning of the Year 256, and S. *Cyprian* (*ll*) ſent it as ſoon as it was finiſhed to one *Jubaianus* a Biſhop, together with the Letter which he writ to him. In it he exhorts Chriſtians to Patience, by the Example of Jeſus Chriſt, and the Saints as well of the Old as the New Teſtament.

(*mm*) The Book *of Envy* was writ a little after that of *Patience*. In it he diſſwades Chriſtians from that Vice, which is the occaſion of all Miſchief, and exhorts them to the practice of Charity and Chriſtian Humility.

(*bb*) *After the Death of* Gallus *and* Voluſian.] This Treatiſe was written during the Plague, to ſhew that the Chriſtians were not the cauſe of it. He there ſpeaks of the late Fall of Kings, which is to be underſtood of the Death of *Gallus* and *Voluſian*, who were killed by their Soldiers.

(*ii*) *Judge*] It has been commonly believed, that he was Proconſul: But the Author of the Engliſh Edition has very well obſerved, that S. *Cyprian* does not ſpeak to him as to a Proconſul; and that what he ſays of him, *viz.* that he often came to him to diſpute with him, and that he drew ſeveral Perſons over to his Party, is by no means ſuitable to the Character of a Sovereign Magiſtrate of *Africk*.

(*kk*) *The Treatiſe of the Works of Mercy and Alms-giving.*] This Treatiſe is cited by *Pontius*, by S. *Jerome*, *Ep. ad Pamm.* by S. *Auſtin*, *contr. Jul. contr. Pelagianos & alibi*

(*ll*) *He ſent to* Jubaianus *a Biſhop.*] *Ep. ad Jub. Teneatur a nobis patienter, & firmiter Charitas animi, Collegii honor, vinculum fidei, & concordia ſacerdotii; propter hoc etiam libellum de bono patientiæ, quantum valuit noſtra mediocritas, permittente Domino, & inſpirante conſcripſimus, quem ad te pro multa dilectione tranſmiſimus.* Pontius mentions it, S. *Jerome* cites it, *adverſ. Lucif.* and S. *Auſtin* in ſeveral places.

(*mm*) *The Book of Envy was writ ſome time after that of Patience.*] It was written after the Book of *Patience*, becauſe when he writ to *Jubaianus*, he ſent him only the *Treatiſe of Patience*. It is cited by *Pontius*, by S. *Jerome*, *in Epiſt. ad Gal. c.* 5. and by S. *Auſtin* in many places.

Hitherto

Hitherto we have only mentioned thoſe Works that unqueſtionably belong to S. *Cyprian*, I ſhall now ſpeak a few Words of thoſe that are falſly attributed to him, which are put by themſelves in S. *Cyprian. Rigaltius*'s and the Engliſh Edition. There is a great number of theſe Books, ſome of which are really uſeful and ancient, tho' we don't know their Authors, ſome carry the Names of their Authors at preſent, and ſome are of a later date, and deſervedly deſpiſed.

In the number of the firſt, we muſt place the following Treatiſes. That *againſt publick Shews*, the Books of *Chaſtity*, and the Homily againſt *Novatian*, all which Works ſeem to proceed from one Author; and (*n*) might be attributed to S. *Cyprian*, if it were not for the difference that is ſo viſible between the Style of this Father, and that of theſe three Books.

The Treatiſe or (*o*) Homily againſt *Gameſters*, is yet more different from S. *Cyprian*'s Stile than any of the former, being an intricate confuſed Book, and abounding with barbarous Words. The Scriptures are cited there after another manner than they are in S. *Cyprian*; and the Author mentions a Book, Intituled, *The Doctrin or Doctrins of the Apoſtles*, which, in all probability was compoſed ſince S. *Cyprian*'s time.

The Book of the *Cœlibacy of the Clergy* is extreamly uſeful: In it he proves, that Churchmen ought not to live with Women; ſome have attributed it to S. *Cyprian* upon the Faith of ſome MSS. others to S. *Auſtin*, others to S. *Jerom*, and laſtly others to *Gaudentius Brixienſis*. However, it is certain, that it was never writ by S. *Cyprian*, as the difference of Style, and (*p*) the barbarous Words, ſufficiently witneſs. Nor is it a Tranſlation out of *Origen*, but the Work of ſome Latin Author: In ſhort, it is neither (*q*) written in the Style of S. *Jerom* nor *Origen*.

The Author of the Engliſh Edition ſuppoſes that this Treatiſe was writ in the time of Venerable *Bede*, when the famous Queſtion of the Cœlibacy of Churchmen was ſo warmly diſcuſſed in the Weſt: But this is only a bare Conjecture, ſupported by no ſolid Reaſon; ſo that we can ſay nothing poſitive concerning the Author of this Work.

The Book *of the Twelve Abuſes of the Age*, which is likewiſe attributed to S. *Auſtin*, was neither written by that Father, nor by S. *Cyprian*; for, beſides that, it has not the leaſt reſemblance of their Style or manner of Writing, the Scripture is always cited there, after S. *Jerom*'s Verſion. *Pamelius* has aſcribed it to one *Erardus*, whoſe Name he found in the Margin of this Treatiſe in a MSS. of S. *Auſtin*. Others again beſtow'd it upon S. *Patrick* Biſhop of *Ireland*, and ſome upon S. *John Climacus*.

To theſe Treatiſes we muſt join an Oration *in praiſe of Martyrdom*, and another *about double Martyrdom*, both which were compoſed by ſome Author who is not very ancient for his Diverſion. The firſt is penn'd in an elaborate affected Style; and it ſeems probable, that the Perſon that made it, only tried how he could make an Harangue in form. He begins with an *Exordium*, as if he delivered it before an Aſſembly; the Periods are carefully wrought, his Thoughts are odd and uncommon, and the whole Turn is extreamly Stiff. The Oration *about double Martyrdom* is writ after a more negligent way by ſome young Author, who had a mind to imitate S. *Cyprian*'s Style. *Gravius* imagined that *Eraſmus* was the Author of this Cheat; but in all probability, ſo able a Man as he was, would have carried on the Impoſture better than it is managed in this Book: For though the Author pretends that he writ it 240 Years after Jeſus Chriſt; yet he makes no ſcruple of telling us, that the Chriſtian Religion was farther extended than the Empire. He ſpeaks of the Perſecution under *Diocleſian*, and *Maximin* or *Maximian*, of a War againſt the Turks, and makes mention of Monks and their Practices: And theſe are the Books falſly attributed to S. *Cyprian*, which may be of ſome uſe, whoſe Authors are not known.

The Treatiſe *of the Cardinal*, or *principal Works of Jeſus Chriſt*, which was attributed to S. *Cyprian*, though it does not reſemble his Style, has been reſtored upon the Faith of ſeveral Manuſcripts, to *Arnoldus Bonævallis*, a Friend of S. *Bernard*'s, who addreſſed it to Pope *Adrian* IV. and who compoſed ſome other Treatiſes beſides this, in the very ſame Style, *viz.* one *concerning the Sayings of Jeſus Chriſt*, another *upon the Creſs*, *the Work of the Six Days*, and *the Praiſes of the Virgin*, all which are Printed in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*; and laſtly, a Treatiſe *of Meditations*, which was never Printed before, but has been added in the Engliſh Edition of S. *Cyprian*, to all the other Works of the ſame Author.

The Explication of the Apoſtles Creed belongs undoubtedly to *Ruffinus*. The Treatiſe of the *Baptiſm of Hereticks*, Publiſhed by *Rigaltius*, but directly contrary to S. *Cyprian*'s Opinion in the matter, was writ by an ancient Writer who lived before S. *Auſtin*'s time, and perhaps was a Contemporary of S. *Cyprian*.

The other Treatiſes attributed to S. *Cyprian* are not only ſpurious, but are full of nothing elſe but Impertinencies and Errors. The firſt is a Treatiſe of the Mountains of *Sion* and *Sinai*, writ by ſome body who was wholly beſotted with the dreaming Enthuſiaſms of the *Rabbines* and *Caballiſts*. The *Supper* is a ridiculous impertinent Book. The *Revelation of* John Baptiſt's *Head* is a fabulous Story, writ after the time of S. *Athanaſius*, S. *Cyril*, *Theodoſius*, the *Vandals*, the *Chronicle of Marcellinus* and *Pipin*, whom it mentions. His Preface attributed to *Celſus*, upon the diſpute of *Papiſcus* and *Jaſon* ad-

(*n*) *Might be attributed to* S. Cyprian.] I ſay it might be, for beſides the difference of Style, which is obvious to every Eye, they are not attributed to S. *Cyprian* in the Manuſcripts, but only in the Printed Books.

(*o*) *The Treatiſe againſt Gameſters.*] It was writ by ſome Biſhop, but we are not to conclude, that it was by a Biſhop of *Rome*, becauſe he calls himſelf the Vicar of Jeſus Chriſt, for anciently that Name was given to all Biſhops.

(*p*) *Barbarous Words.* Such as *Repulſorium*, *Conſtitutionarios*, *Vulgaritatis*, *Flumirorum*, *Probroſitatis*, *Participiis*, *Adunari*, *Vanificat*, *Egeſtoſam*, *Procurativa*, *Abſentarii*, *Conjugaliter*.

(*q*) *In ſhort, it is neither writ in the Style of* S. Jerom, *nor* Origen.] That which has given occaſion to attribute it to *Origen*, is, becauſe the Author ſeems not to condemn a Man's making himſelf an Eunuch; but *Origen* was at laſt of a contrary Opinion, and repented of his Action. There is only one Manuſcript in the King's Library, that attributes it to *Origen*; as ſome Modern Authors think, after *Vincentius Bellovacenſis*: But it rather reſembles the Style of *Gaudentius Brixenſis*, were it not, that in no Manuſcripts or Printed Editions it is ever attributed to him.

S. *Cyprian.* dreſſed to *Vigilius*, and the Treatiſe *againſt the Jews*, are two Books, wherein there is nothing regular or ſolid. The two Treatiſes directed *to the Martyrs*, and the *Confeſſion* or *Repentance* of S. *Cyprian* the Martyr, are Books which the Modern Greeks have attributed to the Martyr *Cyprian*, who perhaps is the Biſhop of *Carthage*, whoſe Life they have amplified.

The Secrets and Prayers of S. *Cyprian*, are Treatiſes full of Superſtition and Impiety. There remains nothing behind but (*r*) a Calendar upon *Eaſter*, Printed under S. *Cyprian's* Name in the Engliſh Edition. 'Tis the Work of an ancient Author, but the Stile is wholly different from that of S. *Cyprian*. I ſay nothing of the Poems that are attributed to him, becauſe they go likewiſe under *Tertullian's* Name, and I ſpoke of them when I gave an Account of that Author. [A Man muſt have a very nice taſte of Styles, that can throw away a Book that is almoſt all Calculation, from any Author to whom it is attributed, if he has no other Reaſon to reject it.]

S. *Cyprian* is the firſt of the Chriſtian Authors, that was truly Eloquent, as *Lactantius* has obſerved; and we may ſay, that there has been never another ſince him, * if we except *Lactantius*, who was Maſter of ſo much true, and noble, and genuine Eloquence. He profeſſed Rhetorick with mighty Reputation, before he was Converted to Chriſtianity; and what he writ afterwards is admirable in its kind. For as *Lactantius* adds, 'He had an eaſie, fertile, agreeable Invention; and what is more, a Spirit of 'Perſpicuity reigns throughout all his Works, which is one of the beſt Qualities belonging to any Diſ-'courſe. He has a great deal of Ornament in his Narration, an eaſie Turn in his Expreſſions, and Force 'and Vigour in his Reaſonings, in ſuch a manner that he had all the three Talents required in an Ora-'tor, which are to pleaſe, to teach, and to perſuade; and it is not eaſie to ſay which of theſe three 'he poſſeſſes in the moſt eminent degree. As S. *Jerom* ſaid, that his Diſcourſe reſembled a Fountain of pure Water, having a ſweet and gentle Stream, ſo we may ſay, that it does likewiſe very often reſemble an impetuous Torrent, that carries away with it every thing it meets, ſince he was capable of raiſing what Paſſions he pleaſed, and of perſuading us to do whatever he had a mind to. Whether he gives Conſolation, or whether he exhorts or diſſuades, he does it with ſo much force, that one cannot poſſibly avoid being ſenſibly comforted or encouraged, or deterred by what he ſays. His Eloquence is natural, and far removed from the Style of a Declamer. There is no inſipid mean Railery, no common Proverbs; in ſhort, nothing that has the tincture of ordinary Literature in his Writings, but the Chriſtian and the Biſhop ſpeak all along: A Man may ſee that his Tongue ſpoke out of the abundance of his Heart, and that as he had ſearched into the deepeſt Chriſtian Truths, ſo he expreſſed them nobly and generouſly: Though we muſt at the ſame time own, that after all his endeavours to ſpeak as diſtinctly and purely as was poſſible, there is ſomething of the *African* Genius in him; and he could not forbear now and then to intermix (*ſ*) ſome harſh Terms. So difficult a matter it is to vanquiſh Nature, or to abſtain from thoſe words we daily hear from thoſe with whom we converſe.

* *This can only be underſtood of the Latins.*

His ſtudying and reading of *Tertullian*, whom he looked upon to be his Maſter, might in ſome meaſure contribute to corrupt his Style: But then on the other hand we muſt acknowledge, that it furniſhed him with ſome Advantages, and that he has borrowed ſeveral Thoughts out of him, which he ſets off and beautifies, though he was Religiouſly careful to avoid all his Faults and Errors. For, at the bottom, the Characters of theſe two Authors are exceeding different. *Tertullian* is harſh and obſcure; S. *Cyprian* is polite and clear; *Tertullian* is hot and fiery; S. *Cyprian*, though he does not want all neceſſary force upon occaſion that requires it, is ſoft and gentle: *Tertullian* reproaches his Adverſaries, and inſults over them in a bitter railing manner; S. *Cyprian* is infinitely more moderate, and if he is obliged at any time to ſpeak ſome Truths that diſpleaſe them, he takes care to ſoften them by the agreeableneſs of his Narration: *Tertullian* vents abundance of falſe Reaſons, and teaches ſeveral Errors; on the contrary, S. *Cyprian* argues almoſt every where with a World of Juſtice and Solidity, and is exempt, I mean, not only from groſs Errors, but even from thoſe of ſmall conſequence, commonly found in the Fathers of the *Three firſt Centuries:* He ſays nothing concerning the Myſteries of the Trinity, or the Incarnation, that carries any difficulty with it, or ſtands in need of an Explication. He rejects the Error of the *Millenaries*, and that of the State of the Soul before the Day of Judgment. He is the firſt that ſpoke clearly of Original Sin and the Neceſſity of the Grace of Jeſus Chriſt. He plainly diſtinguiſhes between Baptiſm and Impoſition of Hands, as two different Sacraments. He ſpeaks of the Euchariſt as of a Sacrament, wherein the Body and Blood of Jeſus Chriſt is received, and which requires great Purity and great Preparation to be worthily received. He eſtabliſhes the matter of this Sacrament, but he urges the neceſſity of mingling Water with the Wine, with too much heat. He is the firſt that talked largely of Penance, and of the Power of the Prieſthood to bind and unbind. He zealouſly demonſtrates how neceſſary it is towards Salvation, to be within the Church: He diſcourſes

(*r*) *A Calendar of* Eaſter.] It has been cited under S. *Cyprian's* Name, by *Paulus Diaconus*. The Scripture is cited there according to the Verſion made uſe of by S. *Cyprian*, but there are ſome words in it that have nothing of the Purity of S. *Cyprian*, and the Turn of the Phraſe is wholly different. To diſcover the Truth of this, we need only ſet down the very firſt Period. *Multo quidem, non modico tempore anxii ſumus & æſtuantes, non in ſæcularibus, ſed in ſanctis & divinis ſcripturis quærentes invenire, quidnam ſit primum diei, non menſis, in quo menſe præſcriptum eſt Judæis in Egypto XIV. Luna comedere Paſcha.* *Cyprian* would never have uſed ſuch a Turn as this is to expreſs his Thoughts. This Author tells us, That Jeſus Chriſt celebrated the Paſſover five times, and died the ſixth, in the 16th Year of *Tiberius*, after he had Preached for the ſpace of a Year only. This Syſtem is ancient.

(*ſ*) *Some harſh Terms.*] Such as *exambire*, *remiſſa*, *ſanctificari*, *magnanimitas*, *mortalitas*, *confundi*, *abſtinere* to excommunicate, *Dominicum*, &c. Words which are not Latin. He has likewiſe ſome harſh Turns; as for Example, he uſes the Pronouns, *ſe*, *ſui*, inſtead of *iſte*, *iſtic* for *hic*, *quando* for *cum*, *quamdiu* for *donec*, *imo* for *potius*. He has alſo ſome Alluſions and Antitheſes proper to the Africans.

very

very advantageously of the Bishop of *Rome*, and looks upon the Bishop of that See to be the Superintendent of the first Church in the World. *But then he was of Opinion, that he ought not to assume any Authority over the rest of the Bishops that were his Brethren, or over their Churches: That every Bishop was to render to God an account of his own Conduct: That the Episcopal Authority is indivisible, and that every Bishop has his Portion of it.* That in case of necessity, all Bishops may assist their Brethren with their Counsels, though they are not under their ordinary Jurisdiction: That Causes ought to be determined in their respective Provinces, where the Accusers and Witnesses are to be found: That Councils or Assemblies of Bishops are extreamly useful: That the Keys were given to the whole Church in general, in the Person of S. *Peter*, to denote Unity. It may be proved out of his Writings, *That they used to offer Sacrifice for the Dead in his time; That they were persuaded that the Saints interceded for us, and that Sacrifices were offered in Honour of their Memory*; That they made use of Holy Water, that they had Virgins who made Profession of Virginity; and that this condition was mightily honoured among the Christians. I take no notice of abundance of other points of Discipline and Morality, which may be observed in the Abridgment we have made of his Works, where the Reader, as he peruses them, may collect them for himself; and indeed, they are of great importance to all People. S. *Cyprian.*

The 1st Edition of S. *Cyprian*, which appear'd a little after the Invention of Printing, neither bears the Name of the Printer, nor of the City where it was Printed. It is more Correct, and freer from Faults than the following ones.

The 2d Edition is that of *Spire*, by *Wendelinus*, in the Year 1471, in Folio. It is mighty full of Errors.

In the Year 1512, *Remboldus* caused this Author to be Printed at *Paris*, and was the first that divided the Letters into several Books. Afterwards *Erasmus* having Review'd and Corrected it, Printed it with a Preface and some Annotations, in the beginning in 1520, and 1525, for *Frobenius*. It was likewise Printed the very same Year at *Colen*. Afterwards at *Paris*, for *Langelier*, in 1541. At *Antwerp*, in *Octavo*, in the Year 1542. by *Crinitus*, and for *Frobenius*, in 1549. At *Lyons* for *Gryphius*, in *Octavo*, in 1544, and 1550. At *Basil*, according to *Erasmus*'s Edition, in *Folio*, for *John Hervagius*, in 1558. *Gravius* caused it to be Printed with some Notes at *Colen*; and it was also Printed at *Lyons*, in 1535, 1543, 1549 and 1556, in *Octavo*. At *Venice* in the same Volume, in 1547. After these Editions, which are none of the most Correct, *Manutius* caused it to be Printed at *Rome*, Corrected by several Manuscripts in 1563. in *Folio*, in a very neat Character, and augmented with a fifth Book of Letters. *Morellus*'s Edition at *Paris* in the Year following, is larger and more accurately done. It was Printed too at *Geneva*, in the Year 1593. with the Notes of *Goulartius* and *Pamelius*.

Pamelius, after he had taken pains with *Tertullian*, set himself to Publish a more exact Edition of S. *Cyprian*'s Works. He is the first that disposed the Letters according to the Series of Time, distributing them, as we have done into five Classes; but he has not been very exact in distributing those of the same Clas in their natural Order. He likewise writ S. *Cyprian*'s Life, and has made large Observations upon this Author, wherein he applies himself more to confirm the Doctrin and Discipline of our Times, than to explain the difficulties of his Author.

Pamelius's S. *Cyprian* has been Printed twice at *Antwerp*, in 1568, and 1589. And at *Paris* in 1607, 1574, 1616, 1632, and 1644. These Editions are compared with several ancient Manuscripts, and the former Editions. In imitation of him, *Rigaltius*, after he had Published *Tertullian*, undertook S. *Cyprian*, and without making the least alteration in the Order observed by *Pamelius*, he only Corrected the Works of this Author, upon the different Readings of two *Italian* Manuscripts, which Monsieur *de Monchal*, Archbishop of *Tholouse*, had Copied in the Margin of his S. *Cyprian*, and made some Notes to explain the most difficult places; and some Observations to enlighten the Discipline that was in vigour in this Saint's time. Some of these Observations seem to be bold, and he endeavours to excuse himself for them in his Preface. This Edition was Printed at *Paris* for *Dupuis*, in 1648.

In the Year 1666, *Dupuis* Reprinted the Works of this Saint, as he did those of *Tertullian*, that is to say, he added to the Text, which is conformable to the Edition of *Rigaltius*, the entire Notes and Observations of that Learned Man; together with some choice Observations of *Pamelius*, and join'd to this Author *Minutius Felix*, *Arnobius*, *Firmicus*, and the Instruction of *Commodianus*. In the Year 1681. *Frederic Reinard*, a *Minister* in *Germany*, put out S. *Cyprian*'s Letters at *Altdorf*. There is nothing particular in this Edition, but the great number of Manuscripts with which it was compared.

Monsieur *Lombert* having Translated the Works of S. *Cyprian* into *French*, and follow'd *Pamelius*'s Method in his Translation, has reformed some part of this Method in his Preface, and has given us, by the assistance of several judicious Men, a more accurate order of the Letters and Treatises of S. *Cyprian*, than that of *Pamelius*. [He is quoted with great respect by the Bishops of *Oxford* and *Chester*, in the *Oxford* Edition of this Father's Works.]

After all, two English Bishops, not long since, put out a new Edition of S. *Cyprian*, which is more correct and exact, and larger than all the former. The Text is here Printed in a very fine Character, Revised upon four new Manuscripts, and several different Readings, Copied out of other Manuscripts by very able Men. The Margin is all along charged with a very short and clear Summary of all that is contained in the Text. Just under the Text, the different reading of the Manuscripts and Editions are set down. At the bottom of the Page are placed the Notes, some of which are borrowed from *Rigaltius* and *Pamelius*, and the rest which are new are made by the Bishop of *Oxford*. Most of them are Theological. His Tracts precede the Letters in this Edition, and are disposed according to the Order wherein they are supposed to have been written. The Letters likewise are distributed after a new Method, but very exact. The Books that are falsly attributed to S. *Cyprian*, are Printed at the end in a smaller Character, with the Works of *Arnoldus Bonævallis* that carry his Name with a Book of Meditations never Printed before. The Calendar of *Easter* is at the end of

S. *Cyprian.* the Volume. At the head of all, there is an Advertiſement to the Reader, containing the general Deſign of this Edition; S. *Cyprian*'s Life, by *Pontius* his Deacon; ſome Teſtimonies of the Ancients concerning S. *Cyprian*; a Table as well of the Books according to the different Editions, as of the Texts of Scripture cited in the Works of S. *Cyprian*, and the matter of them. This is followed with a Book written by Dr. *Pearſon*, Biſhop of *Cheſter*, Intituled, *The Annals of S.* Cyprian, becauſe it contains the Hiſtory of the Lives and Works of this Saint from Year to Year. [After all, there are ſome Diſſertations of Mr. *Dodwell*'s upon difficult places, wherein he not only explains his Author, but makes large Digreſſions to clear ſome of the moſt conſiderable Queſtions in all Eccleſiaſtical Antiquity: And to illuſtrate thoſe Matters of Fact, and Points of Diſcipline which are only alluded to in S. *Cyprian*, as things at that time perfectly known.]

I have been lately informed, That a Doctor of the Faculty in *Paris*, a Man of prodigious Learning, deſigns to oblige the World with a new Edition of S. *Cyprian*. It were to be wiſhed, that this Deſign were put in Execution, it being a matter of great Importance, that S. *Cyprian* ſhould be Publiſhed by a Catholick Divine, who is throughly verſed in the Doctrin and Diſcipline of the Church, and who, in his Annotations would not depart from the Rule of Faith, nor condemn or diſapprove the practice of the Church; that ſo by this means the Works of the Father might without any danger be put into the hands of all People.

PONTIUS.

Pontius. SAint *Jerom* reckons *Pontius* among the Eccleſiaſtical Authors, who writ the Life of S. *Cyprian*, whoſe Deacon he had been. Some Learned Perſons, and *Rigaltius* in particular, ſeem to have doubted whether this Work was not Suppoſititious; and indeed, we muſt own, that it is written with ſo much affectation of Eloquence, that it might well be ſuſpected to be ſpurious, if S. *Jerom* had not owned it as genuine. But, after the Teſtimony of that Learned Father, I don't think we ought to queſtion the truth of it. This Life is not written, as *Rigaltius* has well obſerv'd, after an Hiſtorical manner, but in the Language of one that deſired to be thought an Orator, and has more Rhetorical Ornaments, than Hiſtorical Exactneſs in it. The Narration which ought to be plain and ſingle, is full of Rhetorical Figures; and the Style, which ought to be conciſe, is ſwelling. In ſhort, as I have obſerved already, there is rather an affectation of Eloquence, than any true Eloquence in this Book.

CORNELIUS.

Cornelius. *Cornelius* was ordained Biſhop of *Rome*, towards the beginning of the Year 251. Soon after, *Novatian* got himſelf ordained by three Biſhops, but his Ordination being Irregular, was Condemned, and *Cornelius* acknowledged to be the true Biſhop of *Rome* by all the Biſhops in the World.

He was ſent into Baniſhment in the Perſecution of the Emperor *Gallus*, and then receiv'd the Crown of Martyrdom, towards the end of the Year 253. after he had preſided in the Roman Chair two Years and ſome Months.

There are two Letters of this Pope among S. *Cyprian*'s, and (a) *Euſebius* mentions three more.

In the firſt, he informs *Fabius*, Biſhop of *Antioch*, of what had paſſed in the Synod held at *Rome* againſt *Novatian*, and ſends him the Opinion of the *Italian* and *African* Biſhops.

In the ſecond, he gives a more particular Account of the Decrees of this Synod; and in the third, he deſcribes the Manners and Actions of *Novatian*. *Euſebius* has preſerved a long Fragment of this laſt Letter, wherein *Cornelius* deſcribes the Artifices which *Novatian* had uſed, to get himſelf Ordained Biſhop, by abuſing the ſimplicity and eaſineſs of three Biſhops, one of whom having acknowledged his Crime, did Penance for it. He afterwards obſerves, that there were at that time in the Church of *Rome*, 44 Prieſts, 7 Deacons, and as many Sub-Deacons, 42 Acolyths, 52 Porters and Exorciſts, without reckoning the Widows and Poor, upwards of 1500. and a (b) very great multitude of People.

He adds, That *Novatian* could never hope to arrive to the Epiſcopal Order, becauſe he was Baptized in his Bed, and never received Impoſition from the hands of the Biſhop, that is to ſay, the Sacrament of Confirmation, and was afterwards ordained Prieſt only at the requeſt of a Biſhop, contrary to the Order of the Church, which Prohibits the Ordaining of thoſe who had been Baptized after that manner: He reproaches him for denying his Sacerdotal Function in time of Perſecution; as alſo for obliging thoſe of his own Party, when he gave them the Body and Blood of Jeſus Chriſt (inſtead of anſwering *Amen*, as was the cuſtom of the Church) to Swear, that they would never return to *Cornelius*'s Party. Laſtly, he informs *Fabius*, that the Confeſſors of *Rome* had left his Party, and that ſeveral Biſhops, whoſe Names he ſends him, were condemned in a Synod. This Letter, as well as the others ſent by *Cornelius* to the Eaſt, were in all probability written in Greek. In the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, we find a very ſhort Letter, attributed to *Cornelius*, directed to *Lupinicus*, Biſhop of *Vienna*; but that Letter does not belong to this Pope, no more than the two others which go under his Name in the Decretals. For firſt of all it is not of the ſame Style with thoſe we find in S. *Cyprian*. Secondly, the word *Maſs*, which was unknown at that time, occurs there. And thirdly, it is unworthy of this Pope, and 'tis plain, it was counterfeited by ſome ignorant Impoſter. The Style of *Cornelius*, as far as we are able to judge of it, by thoſe few Letters of his that are ſtill extant, is not very lofty; tho' he ſets off whatever he ſays, turning every thing to his own advantage, and does not ſpare his Enemy in the leaſt.

(a) *Euſebius mentions three more.*] S. *Jerom* reckons Four Letters, but he is miſtaken, and *Euſebius* takes notice only of three.

(b) *And a very great multitude of People.*] There were at that time ſeveral Churches at *Rome*, for they had but one Prieſt to one Church: And this is the Reaſon why *Optatus*, ſpeaking of the Churches that were at *Rome* in the Time of *Diocleſian*, ſays, that there were above forty of them.

NOVA.

NOVATIAN.

NOvatian, who had been a Philoſopher before he was a Chriſtian, was, as we have hinted already, Baptized in his Bed, being dangerouſly ill. He was afterwards ordained Prieſt of the Church of *Rome*, at the inſtance of his Biſhop, who obtained this Favour for him from the Clergy and People, who would have oppoſed it. *Cornelius* accuſes him for abſconding in a Chamber during the Perſecution, and for anſwering the Deacons, who deſired him to go out and Baptize ſome *Catechumens*, That he would not be a Prieſt any longer, but that he would follow another ſort of Philoſophy. Being Maſter of a great deal of Wit, Knowledge and Eloquence, he might have been very ſerviceable to the Church, if his Ambition to be a Biſhop, which was, in a manner, the ſole occaſion of the Apoſtacy of the firſt Hereſiarchs, had not carried him to a Separation. After the Death of Pope *Fabian*, he wrote in the Name of the Clergy of *Rome*, a very Elegant Letter to S. *Cyprian*, which is the thirtieth among thoſe of that Father, and he ſtill continued in the Communion of the Church during the Vacancy of that See. But as ſoon as *Cornelius* was choſen in *Fabius*'s room, puſhed forward by his Envy and Jealouſie, he attacked his Ordination, accuſed him of ſeveral Crimes, and publiſhed a Libel againſt him. The principal Plea he made uſe of, was, That *Cornelius* admitted thoſe who had been guilty of Idolatry to Communion; and to make the beſt advantage of this Accuſation, he maintained, That we never ought to ſuffer thoſe Perſons to participate of the Communion, who had fallen into Idolatry. So he ſeparated from *Cornelius*, and from thoſe who believed, that the Church might receive them again. The greater part of thoſe who had ſuffered Couragiouſly for the Faith of Jeſus Chriſt, not being able to endure that others, who had not ſhewn the ſame Conſtancy and Reſolution, ſhould (if I may uſe the Expreſſion) ſtand on the ſame level with themſelves, embraced his Party, together with ſome Prieſts. *Novatus*, a Prieſt of *Afric*, who had raiſed great Feuds againſt S. *Cyprian* at *Carthage*, joined himſelf to *Novatian*, and brought with him thoſe of his own Faction. (*a*) It was he who gave him that pernicious Advice to get himſelf Ordained Biſhop. *Novatian*, the better to execute this deſign, ſent two of his own Cabal to three ſimple ignorant Biſhops, who lived in a ſmall Province of *Italy*, and prevailed with them to come to *Rome*, under a pretence of accommodating Affairs, and putting a ſtop to ſome Diviſions. As ſoon as theſe three Biſhops were come to *Rome*, he ſhut them up in a Chamber, and cauſed himſelf to be ordained Biſhop of *Rome* by them, about Ten a Clock at Night, and this, after he had made them drunk, if we may believe *Cornelius*. Immediately after his Ordination, he diſpatched two Letters to the Biſhops of the other Provinces, and ſent ſome Deputies into *Afric* to get his Ordination approved. But the *African* Biſhops rejected his Deputies, and ratified *Cornelius*'s Ordination. The reſt of the Biſhops alſo adhered to *Cornelius*: And one of the three who had ordained *Novatian*, acknowledged his Fault, and did Penance for it. The Confeſſors gave him up to *Cornelius*, who having got him condemned in a Synod of Sixty Biſhops, wholly turned him out of the Church. He continued however ſtill to teach this Doctrin, That the Church neither could nor ought to admit thoſe to the Communion who had Apoſtatized: And as this Severity pleaſed abundance of People, ſo he became the Head of a Hereſie, which diſturbed the Peace of the Church for a very long time. *Novatian.*

Beſides, this Letter which he writ before his Separation in the Name of the Clergy of *Rome*, S. *Jerom* tells us, he compoſed the following Treatiſes, *viz.* of the *Paſſover*, the *Sabbath*, *Circumciſion*, the *High Prieſt*, *Prayer*, *Jewiſh Meals*; of *Firmneſs of Mind* with relation to *Attalus*, and many more, together with a great Volume about the *Trinity*, which is, as it were, an abridgment of *Tertullian*'s Work, that has been by ſeveral Perſons attributed to S. *Cyprian*; not that *Tertullian* made a Book expreſly about the *Trinity*, but becauſe he had borrowed whatever he ſays out of the Books of *Tertullian* upon the *Trinity*. We have none of theſe Works under the Name of *Novatian*, but 'tis extreamly probable, that the Treatiſe of the *Trinity*, and that of the *Jewiſh* Meats, that are to be found in *Tertullian*, are the ſame which S. *Jerom* attributed to *Novatian*.

And indeed, as for the Book of the *Trinity*, *Ruffinus* obſerves, that it was not compoſed by S. *Cyprian*, under whoſe Name it went, but by *Tertullian*. S. *Jerom*, who ſaw farther into this matter than *Ruffinus*, takes notice in the Apology which he has compoſed againſt him, that it was not written by *Tertullian*, but by *Novatian*. There are ſeveral Reaſons which make it evidently appear, that the Book we now have, is the very ſame with that mentioned by S. *Jerom* and *Ruffinus*. For in the firſt place it carries the ſame Title. Secondly, it imitates *Tertullian*, and uſes his Arguments. Thirdly, the Style of it is polite enough, and the Terms very pure. Fourthly, we find ſome Paſſages there againſt the Divinity of the Holy Ghoſt, a Fault which *Ruffinus* and S. *Jerom* obſerve to have been in the Book of the *Trinity*, which they cited, and which might have been inſerted afterwards by the *Macedonians*. For this Author eſtabliſhes very Orthodox Principles concerning the Myſtery of the *Trinity*, which prove the Divinity of the Holy Ghoſt, as well as that of the Son.

It is very probable likewiſe, that the Treatiſe about *Jewiſh Meats*, attributed to *Tertullian*, belongs to *Novatian*, as well by reaſon of the conformity of the Style, as becauſe the Author obſerves in the

(*a*) *It was he who gave him that pernicious Advice.*] S. *Cyprian* in his 41ſt Epiſtle tells us, That *Novatus* had ordained a Biſhop of *Rome*, as one *Felicíſſimus* a Prieſt had done one at *Carthage*; not that he made them ſo himſelf, for he was no Biſhop, but becauſe he had made him ſo by his Counſels and Faction

beginning

Novatian. beginning, that he wrote two Letters, wherein he demonſtrated, that the *Jews* knew not what is the true Circumciſion, or what is the true Sabbath. All which agrees with *Novatian*, who, according to S. *Jerom*, wrote two Treatiſes upon the ſame Subjects.

The Deſign of this Treatiſe is to ſhew, That the Animals forbidden to be eaten by the Moſaical Law, were not abſolutely and in themſelves impure. To demonſtrate the Truth of this Aſſertion, he tells us, that the Fruits of Trees were the firſt Nouriſhment of Mankind; that afterwards they eat the Fleſh of Animals; that the Law came in afterwards, which made a diſtinction betwixt thoſe Creatures that might be eaten, and thoſe that were prohibited; that under this Diſpenſation they were called Unclean, not becauſe they were really ſo in their own Nature, ſince they were the Creatures of God, but firſt, to inſtruct Men to avoid the Vices that were figured, and (*b*) repreſented by theſe Animals; and in the ſecond place, to ſerve as a Remedy againſt Intemperance; that Jeſus Chriſt, who is the end and accompliſhment of the Law, has given liberty to Men to eat of all ſorts of Meats, provided they don't violate the bounds of Chriſtian Sobriety; and from thence he takes occaſion to reprove the Irregularities and Diſorders of ſome Chriſtians, who lived intemperately. He obſerves, that this is by no means fitting for thoſe Perſons who are to pray Night and Day. At laſt, out of the number of Meats that are permitted to be eaten, he excepts thoſe that have been offered to Idols, from which the Primitive Chriſtians abſtained very Religiouſly; and he concludes all with theſe Words, that are an Abridgment of his whole Diſcourſe: 'Having therefore ſhewn what is the nature of Meats, (for he had before diſcovered the Genius of the Moſaical Law, and explained the nature of the Evangelical Liberty) 'Let us live up to the Rules of Temperance, and abſtain from things offered to Idols, giving 'thanks to our Lord Jeſus Chriſt his Son, to whom be Praiſe, Honour and Glory for ever and ever. *Amen.*

Some think that *Novatian* writ this Letter during the Perſecution of *Decius*, before he had ſeparated from the Church; but his way of ſpeaking, at the beginning, makes me rather believe, that it was compoſed after he became Chief of the Party, in the Perſecution of *Gallus* and *Voluſian*. This Author has abundance of Wit, Knowledge and Eloquence; his Style is pure, clean and polite; his Expreſſions choice, his Thoughts natural, and his way of Reaſoning juſt: He is full of Citations of Texts of Scripture that are alway to the purpoſe; and beſides, there is a great deal of Order and Method in thoſe Treatiſes of his we now have, and he never ſpeaks but with a world of Candor and Moderation.

(*b*) *Repreſented by theſe Animals.*] As for Example, he ſays, that the Prohibition of eating Swines-fleſh is to intimate to us, that we are not to lead a Carnal Life: That when we are forbidden to eat Weaſils, the meaning is, we are forbidden to Steal; that by Crows, Pleaſures are ſignified, &c.

S. MARTIALIS.

S. Martialis SAint *Martialis* came into *France* with S. *Dionyſius* (*a*) under the Emperor *Decius* towards the year of our Lord 250. Two Letters attributed to him, one written to the People of *Burdeaux*, the other to thoſe of *Tholouſe*, which were ſaid to be found in the Veſtry of (*b*) S. *Peter* of *Limoges* in the Eleventh Century, and have been ſince (*c*) frequently Printed, and inſerted into the laſt *Bibliotheca Patrum*, though no Man queſtions that theſe Letters are Suppoſititious. For in the firſt place the Author tells us, that he lived with Jeſus Chriſt, which can by no means agree with him who was Biſhop of *Limoges* in 252. Secondly in the Eighth Chapter of the Second Letter, he ſaith, that he Baptized King *Stephen*, and another Tyrant with his Noblemen. Now in the time of *Martialis* there was neither King nor Tyrant in *France*. Thirdly, he tells us, that in his time the Temples of the Gods were demoliſhed, and that Churches were built by the Kings Authority, which does not agree with the time of S. *Martialis*. Fourthly, the Texts of Scripture quoted in theſe Letters follow the vulgar Tranſlation, which was compoſed long after. Fifthly, the Author tells us, that he had eaten with Jeſus Chriſt at the laſt Supper, though it is certain that none but the Apoſtles were there.

The Life of S. *Martialis*, Printed at the end of *Abdias*, which carries the Name of *Aurelian* Biſhop of *Limoges*, is a ſpurious Piece, no leſs than the Epiſtles of that Biſhop, and full as Fabulous as the Hiſtory of *Abdias*, to which it is joined. The Author by a very groſs Error ſuppoſes, that *Veſpaſian* ſucceeded *Nero* immediately. He tells us that S. *Martialis* received from Jeſus Chriſt after his Reſurrection, the ſame Power which the Apoſtles had; that he never ſuffered either Hunger, Thirſt or Pain, and recounts ſeveral other Fables concerning him, which are no leſs ridiculous than thoſe that are to be found upon the ſame Subject in the two Councils of *Limoges*, held in the Years 1029 and 1031.

(*a*) *Under the Emperor* Decius.] S. *Gregory* of *Tours* is the Man that fixes this Epocha of the coming of S. *Denis*, *Martialis*, and their Collegues into *France*. There is no Author extant, who is either more ancient or more worthy to be believed than S. *Gregory*, that has given us any Account of their arrival there any ſooner.

(*b*) Peter of *Limoges*.] This Story is related by a Monk called *Gauſius*, in a Chronicle which is to be found in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, p. 288, 289. firſt printed in the Year 1521, with *Abdias*, and afterwards in 1571, and 1614.

(*c*) *Frequently Printed.*] They were firſt printed by *Badius* in the Year 1521, afterwards by *Berdes* in the Year 1573, with the Notes of *Elmenhorſtius* at *Helmſtad* in 1614. at *Baſil* in 1655, at *Colen* in 1560.

SIXTUS

SIXTUS *or* XYSTUS.

Sixtus.

IT is a long time ago, ſince under the name of Pope *Sixtus*, who preſided in the *Roman* Chair in the Year 257. *Ruffinus* publiſhed a Book of a certain Pythagorean Philoſopher named *Sixtus*, tranſlated out of Greek into Latin. (*a*) S. *Jerom* often reproaches him with this Impoſture; S. *Auſtin* ſuffered himſelf at firſt to be deceived by it, and has cited it in his Book of Nature and Grace, as if it had been compoſed by Pope *Sixtus*, but afterwards (*b*) he retracts his Error. *Gelaſius* placed it among the Heretical Books, ſuppoſing it to have been written by ſome Chriſtian. (*c*) It is ſtill extant, being a Medley of Philoſophical Sentences, uſeful indeed in themſelves, and ſerviceable to the Truth, but having little of the Spirit of Chriſtianity in them. There is no mention made in it either of Jeſus Chriſt, the Holy Ghoſt, the Prophets or the Apoſtles; and it is full of the Errors of the *Pythagoreans* and the *Stoicks*. It renders Man equal to God, and affirms that he is made of a Divine Subſtance, and would have him be without Paſſion, according to the Principle of the *Stoicks*, and without Sin, purſuant to the Doctrin of the *Pelagians*. There are ſeveral other *Pelagian* Errors to be found in it.

(*a*) *S.* Jerom *often reproaches him with this Impoſture.*] *Ep. ad Cteſiphont. contra Pelag. in Cap.* 22. *Jerom. in Cap.* 18. *Ezechielis.*

(*b*) *He retracts this Error.*] *Aug. lib.* 2. *retract. c.* 42.

(*c*) *It is ſtill extant.*] In the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, but I cannot tell whether it was ever Printed by it ſelf.

S. GREGORY THAUMATURGUS.

S. Gregory Thaumaturgus.

SAint *Gregory*, whoſe Name at firſt was *Theodorus*, and afterwards Surnamed *Thaumaturgus*, that is to ſay, the Worker of Miracles, by reaſon of the great number of Miracles he is ſuppoſed to have wrought both in his Life-time, and after his Death, was born in the City of *Neo-Cæſarea* in *Pontus*, deſcended of a Family that was very conſiderable as well for its Nobility, as for its great Poſſeſſions. He was educated in the idolatrous Worſhip, having a Father who was extreamly bigotted to Paganiſm. After he had loſt him at the Age of Fourteen Years, his Mother would have him ſtudy Rhetorick to qualifie himſelf for the Bar. His Siſter being married to a Lawyer, who was afterwards Governour of *Paleſtine*, and being obliged to follow her Husband, *Gregory* and *Athenodorus* her Brothers went along with her, intending to go as far as *Berytus*, and there apply themſelves to the Study of the Laws in a Celebrated School of that City. But being arrived at *Cæſarea* in *Paleſtine*, they there met *Origen*, who having exhorted them to ſtudy Philoſophy, by little and little inſpired into them the Principles of the Chriſtian Faith, and ſoon after made them his Diſciples. After they had been with him for the ſpace of five Years, *Gregory* being willing to teſtifie the great Obligations he had to *Origen*, and beſides, to give him ſome publick Marks of his Acknowledgment, as he took his leave of him, compoſed a very eloquent Diſcourſe, which he recited before a numerous Aſſembly invited to that Solemnity. After his return to *Neo-Cæſarea*, he retired for ſome time, and lived a ſolitary Life, and was at laſt, contrary to his Inclinations, ordained Biſhop of *Neo-Cæſarea* by *Phædimus* Biſhop of *Amaſea*, towards the Year of our Lord 240. At that time there were but very few Chriſtians in that City, but the number of them was ſoon augmented by his vigilance and care, and by his Miracles, ſo that this Church became in a little time one of the moſt flouriſhing Churches in the World. He aſſiſted at the firſt Council of *Antioch* held againſt *Paulus Samoſatenus*, as *Euſebius* tells us in the Sixth Book of his Hiſtory, *ch.* 23. and Died a little after in the Year 265. This is an Abridgment of this Biſhop's Life, drawn out of his Diſcourſe to *Origen*, out of *Euſebius*, S. *Baſil*, S. *Jerom* and S. *Gregory Nyſſen* in the Relation that he gives of the Life of this great Saint.

The Works of this Father (part whereof of *Zinus*'s Verſion were Printed at *Venice* in Latin in 1574, and at *Rome* in 1594.) were collected and Printed in Greek by *Gerrard Voſſius*, at *Mentz* in *Quarto*, 1604, and afterwards in *Folio* at *Paris*, 1621, with ſome other ſmaller Fathers.

The firſt, as well as the moſt Eloquent Work he has compoſed, is the Harangue he made to thank *Origen*, which was ſeparately Publiſhed by *Hoeſchelius* at the end of his Edition of *Origen* againſt *Celſus* in 1605. He begins his *Exordium* with the difficulty of commending *Origen* as he deſerved. Afterwards he tells him in what a ſtrange manner the Providence of God conducted him to *Cæſarea*, the Converſations this great Man held with him and his Brother to exhort them to the Study of Philoſophy, and to poſſeſs them with a Veneration for the Holy Scriptures and the Chriſtian Religion; and afterwards he teſtifies the Regret he had to be obliged to quit a Maſter whom he ſo tenderly loved. This Harangue is very Eloquent, and we may ſay it is one of the moſt conſummate pieces of Rhetorick that are any where extant among the Ancients. It was printed under the name of *Gregory Thaumaturgus* in Greek, and in Latin at *Antwerp* in 1613, in *Octavo*.

The Second Book mentioned by *Euſebius* and S. *Jerom*, as well as the firſt, is his Paraphraſe upon *Eccleſiaſtes*. It was Tranſlated by *Jacobus Billius*, who attributed it to S. *Gregory Nazianzen* upon the Credit of a Manuſcript in the King's Library. But certain it is, that it belongs to *Gregory Thaumaturgus*

S. *Gregory Thaumaturgus.*

maturgus, not only becauſe we read in *Euſebius*, and in S. *Jerom*, that he compoſed a Book bearing that Name, which we are no where told of S. *Gregory Nazianzen*, but alſo becauſe we find there word for word a long Paſſage cited by S. *Jerom* upon the fourth Chapter of *Eccleſiaſtes*, as taken out of the Paraphraſe upon *Eccleſiaſtes*, done by *Gregory* Biſhop of *Pontus*. I have no more to ſay of this Book, but only that it is a Paraphraſe which largely explains the Moral Reflections in *Eccleſiaſtes*.

S. *Gregory Nyſſen* in his Life of this Father, takes notice of a Creed which, as he pretends, this Saint received from S. *John* in a Viſion which he ſaw in the Night, and which was ſtill preſerved, being, as he ſays, written by the Hand of *Gregory Thaumaturgus*. This Profeſſion of Faith is as follows: 'There is only One God the Father, who is the Father of the Living Word, his eſſential Wiſdom, his 'Power, and his eternal Image; it is he who being Sovereignly perfect, has begotten a Son Sovereignly 'perfect as himſelf. He is the Father of the only Son. There is only one Lord, the only Son of the 'only Father, God begotten of God, the Character and Image of the Divinity, the efficacious Word by 'which all Creatures were formed, the true Son of the true Father, the inviſible Son of the inviſible Fa'ther, the Incorruptible of the Incorruptible, the Immortal of the Immortal, the eternal Son of him 'who is from all Eternity; and there is only one Holy Ghoſt, who proceeds from God, and was given to 'Men by the Son, he is the Image of the Son, and a perfect Image of him that is perfect. He is Life, 'and the Principle of Life to thoſe that Live; He is the Holy Spring, Holineſs it ſelf, and the Author 'of Sanctification. By him God the Father is made manifeſt, who is above all things, and in all things, 'and God the Son, who is equally in all things. This is the perfect Trinity, which is not divided, 'but is One in Glory, in Sovereignty and Eternity.

The following Words, which ſome Perſons do ſtill attribute to *Gregory Thaumaturgus*, belong to S. *Gregory Nyſſen*, who draws this Concluſion from the above-mentioned Profeſſion. 'There is therefore no 'created Perſon or dependent Being in the Trinity, it admits into it nothing that is Foreign, nothing 'that has been out of it during a time, or which afterwards began to be there; the Father was never 'without the Son, nor the Son without the Holy Ghoſt, but the Trinity has ever been immovable 'and invariable.

There is likewiſe attributed to S. *Gregory Thaumaturgus* another Expoſition of Faith, much longer, and tranſlated by *Turrianus*, which ſome People might believe to be that which is cited by S. *Baſil*, in his Sixty Fourth Epiſtle, directed to one whoſe Name was *Ælian*. But it is manifeſt, that this is different from that mentioned by S. *Baſil*, and that it could not be compoſed by S. *Gregory Thaumaturgus*: For, in the firſt place, it is different from that S. *Baſil* ſpeaks of, which was addreſſed to *Ælian*, and made in form of a Diſpute, wherein he ſays, That the Father and Son were one in *Hypoſtaſis*, and only diſtinguiſhed by abſtraction of the Mind, the Words which the *Sabellians* abuſed; whereas in this which is neither addreſſed to *Ælian*, nor compoſed after the manner of a Diſpute, the Error of *Sabellius* is clearly rejected; and it is formally ſaid, that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt are Three *Perſons*, and Three *Hypoſtaſes*. In the ſecond place, it cannot be of the time of S. *Gregory Thaumaturgus*; for the Author expreſly refutes the *Arians*, ſaying, That thoſe who affirm, that the Son is created of nothing, are Enemies to the Faith of the Church, and that thoſe who reject the Word *Conſubſtantial*, are out of the Church. Beſides, when he explains the Myſtery of the Incarnation, he ſpeaks after a manner which makes it credible, that he had the *Neſtorians* and *Eutychians* in view. *Caniſius* attributes this Profeſſion of Faith to *Apollinarius*, but it too plainly refutes the Error of that Heretick to be ever his. However it be, it was compoſed after the time of S. *Gregory Thaumaturgus*. We ought to paſs the ſame Judgment upon the twelve *Anathema's*, which follow this Expoſition, and are likewiſe compoſed out of the Errors of the *Neſtorians* and *Eutychians*.

No Body doubts of the Canonical Epiſtle of this Saint, which is cited in the ſixth Council, and is ſet down by *Balſamon*. It has all the Characters of Antiquity, which any one can deſire in ſuch Monuments. It was written after the *Goths* had ravag'd *Aſia* under *Galienus*, and it is directed to a Biſhop, whoſe Name we know not, to inſtruct him how he was to preſcribe Penance to thoſe who had fallen into any ſcandalous Crimes, during the Inundations of the *Barbarians*. In the firſt Canon he ſays, that thoſe who having been taken Priſoners by the *Barbarians*, had eaten the Food which was given them, ought not, upon that account to ſuffer Penance, as well becauſe the *Barbarians* did not ſacrifice any Victims to Idols, as alſo becauſe that which defiles the Man is not the Meat which enters into the Man, but that which goes out of the Man. That for the ſame reaſon thoſe Captive Women who had been forcibly carried away by the *Barbarians*, were not to be blamed; but nevertheleſs, that thoſe who had lived diſſolute Lives before their Captivity, were not eaſily to be admitted to Communion.

In the ſecond Canon, and the three following, which to ſpeak properly are only one Canon, he deteſts the Avarice and Injuſtice of thoſe Perſons, who took the advantage of the Captivity of theſe miſerable Creatures to plunder them of their Goods. He ſhews, that they are obliged to make Reſtitution, and that they cannot keep in their Poſſeſſion the Goods of other Men. In the ſixth, he endeavours to ſhew with what Horror the World ought to look upon the Cruelty of thoſe Perſons, who detained as Captives thoſe who had freed themſelves out of the Hands of the *Barbarians*. In the ſeventh he ordains, That ſuch Offenders ſhould not be received ſo much as into the number of Hearers (this was the firſt Degree of Penance) who joining themſelves with the *Barbarians*, had fallen upon the Chriſtians, either by Murdering them, or ſhewing the Infidels where they were fled for ſhelter. In the eighth, he decrees the ſame Puniſhment againſt thoſe who ſhould be convicted to have broken open any ones Houſe during the Ravage of the *Barbarians*; but then he moderates this Rigour in favour of thoſe who

who should make a voluntary Confession, and these he places in the third degree of Penitents. 'Tis also under this Class, that in the ninth Canon he ranges those who kept back the things which belonged to others, which they found in the midst of the Field, or in their Houses, as soon as they were convicted of it: But if they confessed the Fact, he believed them not to be unworthy to communicate at Prayers, which was the last degree of Penance. In the tenth, he exhorts those that were willing to restore their Neighbours Goods, to do it without making any sordid Gain, by exacting any thing for what they had discovered, kept or found, or for any other reason whatever it might be. The last Canon is in explication of the different degrees of Penance. Weeping and Groaning, says he, consist in standing without the Church Porch, where the Sinner ought to beg earnestly of those who go in, to pray to God for him, and this is the first degree. The second degree is that of Hearers, and is performed in the Church porch, where the Sinner is to tarry with the *Catechumens*, and go out with them, after having heard the Holy Scripture, as being unworthy of Prayer. In the Substration, which is the third degree, the Party offending is admitted into the Body of the Church, but must go out with the *Catechumens*. Lastly, the fourth degree is that of standing up when the Person may tarry in the Church with the Faithful, without being obliged to go out of it with the *Catechumens*; and this is followed with the participation of the Sacraments. *Morinus* questions whether this last Canon belongs to *Gregory Thaumaturgus*, and conjectures, that it has been added by one of the Modern *Greeks*, to explain the Letter of this Saint. This Conjecture seems to be well grounded. *S. Gregory Thaumaturgus.*

There goes likewise, under the name of this Father, a Discourse about the Soul, addressed to one *Tatian*, which contains the Decision of several Questions concerning the Nature of the Soul, and follows the Principles of the *Peripatetics*, but in truth it has not the least resemblance of S. *Gregory*'s Style; and besides, it seems to be the product of the following Age, when *Aristotle*'s Philosophy began to be in some Reputation. To be short, it is rather the work of a Philosopher, than of a Bishop.

I am no less satisfied, that the Sermons which carry the name of S. *Gregory Thumaturgus*, do really belong to another Author; for besides, that none of the Ancients have ever mentioned them, they are altogether of a different Style, which is so far from approaching the Elegance and Politeness so familiar to S. *Gregory*, that it is mean and childish. Secondly, The Author of these Sermons speaks of the Mysteries of the Trinity and Incarnation, in such terms as shew, that he lived after the rise of the Heresies of the (*a*) *Arians* and *Nestorians*. He often affects to make use of the word Θεοτόκος when he speaks of the Virgin *Mary*, and bestows excessive Praises upon her, which were not customary till after the Council of *Ephesus*. Lastly, it is evident, that these Homilies were composed when the Church enjoy'd Peace, and celebrated it's Festivals with great Solemnity.

The three Sermons upon the Annunciation resemble the Style of *Proclus* of *Constantinople*, as it has been observed by him who has made some Notes upon the Homilies of that Author. The last of the three has also been attributed to S. *Chrysostome*, but the difference of the Style shews that it is not his.

The fourth Sermon is upon the Baptism of JESUS CHRIST, which Festival was anciently celebrated on the day of *Epiphany*; it is more eloquent than the three preceeding ones, and appears to be composed by another Author, who nevertheless was not S. *Gregory Thaumaturgus*, for the very same reason we have offered before; there we find the term Θεοτόκος, and that of *Consubstantial*.

(*a*) *The* Arians *and* Nestorians.] For Example, in the first of these Homilies, it is said, that JESUS CHRIST is born of the Virgin, that he is God and Man without Confusion, and without Change, perfect in the Divinity, and the Humanity, like his Father in all, and consubstantial to us. In the second, there are extraordinary Praises of the Virgin, whom he calls Θεοτόκος, which was not begun to be commonly practised till after the Synod of *Ephesus*. The Trinity is there called *Consubstantial*.

S. DIONYSIUS *of* Alexandria.

DIonysius, (*a*) who had formerly been a Disciple of *Origen*, and Catechist of the Church of *Alexandria*, succeeded *Heraclas* in the Episcopal See of that Church, in the Third (*b*) Year of the Empire of *Philippus*, and 247 of the Nativity of our Saviour. He was one of the most Learned and most Illustrious Bishops of his Age; and being consulted from all parts upon matters of Religion, wrote a vast number of Letters to the most famous Bishops of the Church, besides several Works against the Hereticks, and some Treatises of Divinity and Discipline. S. *Jerom* has composed a Catalogue of all his Works, and *Eusebius* has enriched his History with several Passages that he has *S. Dionysius.*

(*a*) *Dionysius.*] He is Sirnamed the Great, by the Ancients. *Euseb.* S. *Basil. Ep. ad Amphil. Maximus* and *Metaphrastes* give him this Name. He had formerly been a Rhetorician, if we may believe *Maximus* upon the fifth Chapter of the *Hierarchia Cœlestis*. He was unquestionably descended of a good Family. See *Eusebius*, *Lib.* 7. *Ch.* 11. and the Notes of *Valesius*.

(*b*) *The third Year.*] 'Tis so set down in *Eusebius*'s History, *Lib.* 6. *Chap.* 35. and in his Chronicon 'tis the Fifth. But the Account of his History is the truest; for he supposes in his Chronicon, that *Philip* reigned Seven years, whereas he was Emperour but Five.

S. *Dionyſius.*

borrowed out of him. The Fragments that are yet extant in *Euſebius* and S. *Athanaſius*, make us greatly regret the Loſs of his Writings, as Works that would have been of infinite Advantage and Uſe in the Explication of the Doctrin of the Church. The Catalogue of them, as it is ſet down by S. *Jerom*, being without any order, we ſhall therefore endeavour to make another of all the Volumes of this *Dionyſius*, whereof we have any knowledge, according to the order of time in which they were written, not forgetting at the ſame time to take notice of thoſe Fragments that are to be found in *Euſebius* and in S. *Athanaſius*.

The firſt Letter which he wrote, is directed to *Fabius*, Biſhop of *Antioch*, immediately after the Perſecution of the Emperor *Decius*; that is to ſay, at the end of the year 250. *Euſebius* has preſerved two Fragments of it in the Sixth Book, *Chap.* 41. & 44. of his Hiſtory. In the firſt, he gives an Account of the horrid Cruelty of the Perſecutors that fell ſo ſeverely upon the poor Chriſtians of *Alexandria*, as well towards the end of the Empire of *Philippus*, as alſo after *Decius* had publiſhed his Edict againſt them; and he gives us a Narrative of the Martyrdom of ſeveral Perſons. In the Second, he relates the Hiſtory of an Old Man, whoſe Name was *Serapion*, who having fallen away in the time of Perſecution, was enjoyn'd a courſe of Penance, till being ready to die, he ſent a young Boy to fetch him the Body of Jeſus Chriſt, that he might die in the Communion of the Church.

He deſcribes the Perſecution of *Decius* in his Letter againſt *Germanus*, though it was not writ till long after; and he particulary relates what happen'd to himſelf; how, having been forcibly hurried away out of *Alexandria* by ſome Soldiers againſt his Will, he was conducted to a Town called *Taposiris*, where being reſcued by a Company of Country Fellows that fell upon his Guards, he was obliged to abſcond for a while, being only accompanied by ſome Prieſts.

(c) This is that Perſecution, which he mentioned in the Fragment of a Letter to *Domitius* and *Didymus*, related by *Euſebius* towards the end of the Eleventh Chapter of his Hiſtory, *Lib.* 6. It was alſo about the end of this Perſecution, when he was yet in Exile, that he wrote a Letter concerning Penance to the Brethren in *Ægypt*, wherein he delivered his own Opinion, as to the manner with which they ought to treat thoſe that had fallen away; and he there diſtinguiſhes between the different degrees of Offences, He likewiſe wrote at the ſame time a Book upon the ſame occaſion to *Conon* Biſhop of *Hermopolis*, a Letter to his Clergy at *Alexandria*, one to the Chriſtians of *Laodicea*, where *Thelymidres* was Biſhop, and one to the *Armenians*, over whom *Meruzanes* was Paſtor, which treated of *Penance*; and a ſmall Treatiſe of Martyrdom to *Origen*.

After peace was reſtored to the Church in the Year 251. *Dionyſius* having received a Letter from *Cornelius* Biſhop of *Rome* againſt *Novatian*, who had alſo written to him himſelf, he anſwered both one and the other. His Letter to *Novatian*, whom he calls *Novatus*, is taken notice of by *Euſebius* in his 7th Book, *Chap.* 45. He adviſes him, if he had a mind to perſwade the World that he was Ordained againſt his Will, as he publickly affirmed, to return back to his Duty, and uſe all his Endeavours to re-eſtabliſh Peace and Concord. His Letter to *Cornelius* is plainly what they called in the Language of thoſe times, a Letter of Communion. He informs him, that he was ſummoned to a Synod of *Antioch*, by *Helenus* Biſhop of *Tarſus*, by *Firmilian* of *Cappadocia*, and *Theoctiſtus* of *Paleſtine*, in which they reſolved to confirm the Diſcipline of *Novatus*; that word was ſent him, that *Fabius* Biſhop of *Antioch* was dead, and *Demetrian* elected in his room; that *Alexander* Biſhop of *Jeruſalem* died in Priſon. To theſe Letters he added one to the Chriſtians at *Rome*, concerning Peace and Penance; and another to the Confeſſors to diſſwade them from the Faction of *Novatian*. Afterwards he wrote another to the *Romans*, which he ſent by *Hippolytus*, wherein he diſcourſes of the Duty and Function of Deacons; and two more to the Confeſſors of *Rome*, after they had entred into the Unity of the Church. Theſe are the Letters which he wrote under the Pontificate of *Cornelius*, and are mentioned by *Euſebius* in the laſt Chapter of his Sixth Book.

Under the Pontificate of Pope *Stephen*, that ſucceeded *Cornelius* in the beginning of the Year 255. *Dionyſius* wrote a Letter to him, in which he acquaints him, That all the Eaſtern Churches where at laſt agreed to condemn the rigorous Novelty of *Novatus*, and ſpeaks to him of the Queſtion concerning the Validity of the Baptiſm of Hereticks, that was in Agitation between him and S. *Cyprian*. After the Death of *Stephen*, which happened in the Year 257. he wrote another upon the ſame Subject to *Sixtus* his Succeſſor, and begs of him to conſider the Conſequence of that buſineſs, and not to purſue it with the heat of his Predeceſſor, who had written Letters to *Helenus*, to *Firmilian*, and to all the Biſhops of *Cappadocia*, and *Cicilia*, wherein he ſent them word, that he would not Communicate any more with them, becauſe they re-Baptized Hereticks; which, he ſays, was determined in the Councils of the Biſhops. In the ſame Letter he ſpeaks againſt the Error of the *Sabellians*, that aroſe in *Ptolemais* a City of *Pentapolis*; againſt which, as he tells him there, he had written a long Letter, or rather a Diſcourſe which he ſent him. He wrote likewiſe to *Dionyſius* and *Philemon*, Presbyters of the Church of *Rome*, about the Baptiſm of Hereticks. In his Epiſtle to *Philemon*, he tells him, That his Predeceſſor *Heraclas* cauſed the Hereticks to abjure their Errors, without Baptizing them a-new; that this was the Cuſtom of his Church; but nevertheleſs that he had been informed, that the *Africans* had for a

(c) *This is that Perſecution.*] *Euſebius* refers it to the Perſecution under *Valerian*; but the Circumſtances agree with what happened to him under the Perſecution of *Decius*, and not what he ſuffered under the Perſecution of *Valerian*, in which he was not carried away by Violence. One needs only conſulting the two Fragments of his Letter to *Germanus*, where he gives an Account of what befell him in theſe two Perſecutions, to be perſwaded in the matter.

long

long time observed the contrary, and that it was Established in the East in a very numerous Assembly of Bishops held at *Iconium* and *Synnada*, and in many other places; that matters standing thus, his Advice was, that their Customs and Decrees ought not to be reversed, since it is written, That we must not remove the Land-mark which our Fathers have given us. This is the true Opinion of *Dionysius* concerning this matter, and S. *Jerom* wrongfully accuses him to have been of S. *Cyprian*'s Party, since he tells us in expres Terms, That we ought to follow the Judgment of the Church in this Point. He says the same thing in his Letter to *Dionysius*, who was afterwards Bishop of *Rome*, and delivers his Sentiments there very boldly against *Novatian*. Lastly, He wrote a Letter, which is the Fifth, to *Sixtus*, concerning the Baptism of Hereticks, in which he maintains, That if a Man has been Baptized amongst Hereticks, with Ceremonies wholly different from those of the Church, and comes at last to discover it, after he has continued in the Church a long time, participating of the Prayers, and Communicating as others, without having been Baptized, he needs not be Baptized anew, since he has received the Body of Jesus Christ several times, and answered *Amen* with the rest of the Faithful. *Eusebius* seems to mention a sixth Letter, written upon the same occasion to the same Pope; where, as he tells us, he has examined this Question more copiously, though perhaps it is not different from this last. S. *Dionysius*.

After *Sixtus*'s Death, *Dionysius* of *Alexandria* wrote a Letter concerning *Lucian*, to *Dionysius* that succeded Pope *Sixtus*, towards the end of the Year 258. 'Twas in this, or rather in the following Year, that he wrote his Letter against *Germanus*; in which, after he has described the Persecution he suffered in the time of *Decius*, he relates what happened to him under that of *Valerian*; how the Prefect *Æmilianus* prohibited him to hold any more Assemblies of Christians; how having refused to obey his Orders, he was sent along with his Presbyters, to a Village near *Cephro* in *Lybia*; how these Proceedings did not hinder the Christians from holding their ordinary Assemblies. Lastly, how he preached the Gospel, and converted great Numbers of Pagans to Christianity, whilst he tarried at *Cephro*.

While he continued in this Exile, he wrote some Paschal Letters; that is to say, Letters in form of Homilies upon the Festival of *Easter*; in which, according to the ancient Custom, he ascertains the time of that Feast. He sent one of them to *Flavius*, another to *Domitius* and *Didymus*, which I imagine to be different from the first that is addressed to the same Persons; wherein he proves, That the Feast of *Easter* ought not to be celebrated till after the vernal Equinox. He composed a Canon or Table of Eight Years. He likewise wrote another to the Church of *Alexandria*, and to many others. Peace was no sooner restored to the Church, but he returned back to *Alexandria*; tho' he was immediately obliged to depart from thence, by reason of a Sedition that arose in that City (*d*).

It was during this Retreat, that he wrote a Letter to *Hierax*, a Passage out of which *Eusebius* has borrowed, that gives an Account of a Riot that happened at that time. He likewise wrote another Letter to his Church, which he sent to them on *Easter*-Day.

A Pestilence (*e*) that succeeded this War, obliged S. *Dionysius* to comfort and encourage his Congregation with another Letter, in which he describes that admirable Charity wherewith the Christians relieved and buried those that were seized with the Plague, in a very lively manner.

In short, during the whole time of his Retirement, he never ceas'd to write to his Brethren, and did them more good by his Letters, than he could have done by his Presence. *Eusebius* mentions another Paschal Letter of his concerning the Sabbath, and one concerning Spiritual Exercises, and a third to *Hermammon*, written in the Seventh Year of *Galienus*, which fell out in the Year 264. some Fragments of which he has preserved in *Lib.* 7. *c.* 1. 10. and 23. And yet S. *Dionysius* was not only content to exhort, or instruct the Faithful by his Letters; but he applied himself vigorously to confute and extinguish the Errors that sprung up in his time.

An *Ægyptian* Bishop named *Nepos*, understanding the Promises of the Gospel in a gross sense, and maintaining the Reign of Jesus Christ upon Earth for a Thousand Years, with an inflexible Obstinacy composed a Book which he Entituled, *A Confutation of the Allegorists*, where he endeavoured to prove his Opinion out of the *Apocalypse*. He brought over abundance of People to this Opinion in that part of *Ægypt* that was called *Arsinoe*, which unhappily proved an occasion of Schism and Division in those Churches. *Dionysius* happening to be there, judged it expedient to examine this Doctrin publickly: And because they generally set up *Nepos*'s Book as an unanswerable Treatise, he confuted it *Viva voce*, and afterwards wrote two Books against it, Entituled, *Of the Divine Promises*. In the First, he delivers his own Opinion upon this Question. In the Second, he answers all the Reasons urged by *Nepos*, and his Testimonies drawn out of the *Revelations*. Saying upon this last Head, That some Persons have rejected the *Apocalypse*, as being the Book of the Heretick *Cerinthus*, who admitted of no other Beatitude, but that which consisted in carnal Pleasures; that as for himself, he durst not entirely reject it, since it was esteemed by a great many Christians, but that he was perswaded it

(*d*) *Arose in that City.*] 'Tis undoubtedly that Commotion, that was occasioned by *Æmilianus*, Governour of *Alexandria*, who caused that City, and likewise all *Ægypt*, to revolt from the Emperor *Galienus*; as *Pollio* reports it. This *Æmilianus* was a different Person from him that took up Arms in *Mœsia*, and marched against *Gallus* and *Volusianus* some years before. These two *Æmilians* are distinguished in the Epitome of *Aurelius Victor*.

(*e*) *A Pestilence.*] This Pestilence began in the time of *Gallus* and *Volusianus*, but it broke afresh under *Gallus*; as is observed by *Aurelius Victor* and *Pollio*. *Dionysius* of *Alexandria* speaks of the latter Pestilence, and S. *Cyprian* of the former. Thus those Persons that imagined they spoke of the same Infection, are mistaken.

had a hidden meaning, which could not be comprehended by any body; that he acknowledged that Book to be written by an Author inſpired by the Holy Ghoſt, though he did not believe it to have been written by S. *John* the Evangeliſt, but by another of the ſame Name; as he endeavours to prove by the difference of the Style and Thoughts. *Euſebius* has preſerved conſiderable Fragments of this Book, from whence we have drawn the above-mentioned Paſſages. See the Third Book of his Hiſtory, *Chap.* 28. and *l.* 7. *Ch.* 24. and 25.

S. *Dionyſius.*

Another Error, that *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria* oppoſed and ſtifled, if I may uſe the Expreſſion, in its Cradle, was much more conſiderable. There were ſeveral Biſhops in *Pentapolis* that embraced the Error of *Sabellius*, who confounded the Three Perſons of the Holy Trinity. This Opnion was ſo deeply rooted and eſtabliſhed in thoſe Quarters, that the Son of God was ſeldom mentioned in their Churches. *Dionyſius*, to whom this Province belonged, by vertue of the Preheminence of the Patriarchal See of *Alexandria*, to preſide and watch over all the Churches of *Ægypt*, ſent his Legates to that place to undeceive the People that were in an Errour; but being not able to go thither himſelf in Perſon, he was conſtrained to write to them to confute this Hereſie. His firſt Letter was addreſſed to *Ammon* Biſhop of *Berenice*, the Second to *Teleſphorus* and *Euphranor*, and the Laſt to *Ammon* and *Euporus*. The End which he propoſed to himſelf in writing theſe Letters, was to perſwade theſe People, who had not been very well inſtructed, that the Father was not the Son, and that He was not the Father, but the Son that was Incarnate, and Died for us. But that happened to *Dionyſius* in this Affair, that uſually happens to moſt Men; that while he oppoſed and attack'd one Error, he ſpoke very favourably of the contrary: Thus going about to prove, that the Son was a diſtinct Perſon from the Father, he chanced to ſay, That he was the Work of the Father; That he was with reſpect to the Father what a Vine is to the Vine-dreſſer, a Ship to the Builder. And laſtly, That the Son did not exiſt before he was made. Theſe expreſſions, that ſeemed to eſtabliſh an oppoſite Error to that of *Sabellius*, which afterwards was taken up by *Arius*, gave occaſion to ſome well-affected Catholick Perſons, to carry a Complaint to *Dionyſius* Biſhop of *Rome*, againſt the Biſhop of *Alexandria*. But he being advertiſed of the matter, wrote Four Books which he preſented to the Pope; wherein he refutes not only the Error of the *Sabellians*, but alſo that which was attributed to himſelf; and having deſired the Pope to ſend him all the Objections that were urged againſt him, he wrote a Treatiſe which he called, *A Refutation and an Apology*; becauſe he refutes the Errors of other Men, and likewiſe Juſtifies himſelf. S. *Athanaſius*, from whom I have borrowed this Account, relates divers other Paſſages, that were extracted out of this Work, in a Book which he wrote about the Opinion of *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria*; in which, he invincibly proves againſt the *Arians*, who had the Confidence to make uſe of his Authority, That his Notions of the Trinity were very conformable to thoſe of the Church, though he did not much approve of the term Conſubſtantial.

To conclude, *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria* a little before his Death, defended the Divinity of Jeſus Chriſt againſt *Paulus Samoſatenus* Biſhop of *Antioch*: For, being invited to the Synod that was held at *Antioch* againſt that Heretick in the Year 264. and not being able to go thither, by reaſon of his Old Age and Infirmity, he wrote ſeveral Letters to the Church at *Antioch*, wherein he explains his own Opinion, and refutes the Error of *Paulus Samoſatenus*, whom he looked upon as ſo great a Criminal for advancing this Error, that he would not even condeſcend to Salute him in his Letter, conſidering him already as an Heretick, and one that was ſeparated from the Church; as we find it obſerved by the Fathers of the Council of *Antioch*, and by *Euſebius* after them, in his Seventh Book, *Chap.* 27. and 29.

Baronius thinks that this Letter of *Dionyſius*, is the ſame with that which *Turrianus* publiſhed, which is inſerted in the firſt Volume of the laſt Edition of the Councils, *P.* 850. But he is miſtaken; for that Letter which the Fathers of the Council of *Antioch* ſpeak of, was written to the Church of *Antioch*; whereas we find this is addreſſed to *Paulus Samoſatenus*, as appears by theſe firſt words: *We Anſwer what you demand of us, that we may oblige you to ſpeak your Thoughts plainly and openly.* From whence it is manifeſt, That this Letter, if it is not Suppoſititious, was written ſoon after the Firſt Synod of *Antioch*, when *Paulus Samoſatenus* promiſed to renounce his Opinion; and in all appearance ſeem'd to have chang'd it effectually. But it's probable enough, that this Letter, which is cited by ſome of the Ancients, and which was unknown to the World before *Turrianus*'s time, was never writen by *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria*. For in the firſt place, The Fathers of the Second Council of *Antioch* tell us plainly, That *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria* would by no means ſalute *Paulus Samoſatenus*: What reaſon is there therefore to imagine, that he wrote to him twice, as this Letter ſuppoſes? Secondly, The Style of this Letter is extreamly different from that of the other Letters writ by *Dionyſius*. In the third place, the Author of this Letter approves of the Word *Conſubſtantial*, and expreſly tells us, That the Fathers called the Son of God by that Name. Now it is certain, that both *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria*, and the Synod of *Antioch*, diſallowed that term; and in the time of S. *Dionyſius*, a Man could not ſay, that the Fathers commonly made uſe of it. And if S. *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria* had ever uſed it, is it to be believed that S. *Athanaſius* would have forgotten or omitted ſo memorable a Paſſage, when he was writing in his Defence?

It is not to be imagined, that we have given a Catalogue of all the Works of *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria*; for he compoſed ſo great a Number, that notwithſtanding all the Diligence that *Euſebius* uſed in drawing a perfect Catalogue, he is forced to ſay at laſt, *and ſeveral other Letters.* Now the Letters of this Father, were Treatiſes, and his Treatiſes were written in the way of Letters; for after this manner he wrote ſome Books concerning *Nature* to a young Gentleman named *Timotheus*; a Book *of Temptations* to *Euphranor*, and ſeveral Letters to *Baſilides*; in one of which, he tells him that he had compoſed

composed a Commentary upon the beginning of *Ecclesiastes*. We have only now one of his Letters to *Basilides*, Printed in the first Tome of the Councils, where he treats of some matters relating to Discipline. 'Tis divided into Four Canons; in the First of which, he discourses about the Fast, which the Ancient Christians observed before *Easter*; and tells us, That some Christians fasted Six days before *Easter*; others Two, others Three, after an extraordinary manner; That we ought not to break our Fast before Midnight; and that those that were able to hold on till *Easter*-morning, were more generous; That there were some Persons, who, though they did not fast at all, nay, had spent the Four first days of the last Week in sumptuous and delicate Entertainments, yet imagined they did Wonderful things in fasting only two days: But that they were not to be compared with those that fasted several. In the second Canon he says, That Women ought not to enter into the Church, or receive the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ while they have their Courses, but to offer their Prayers to God at Home; since none by right ought to enter the *Sanctum Sanctorum*, that is not pure in Body and Spirit. In the Third, he particularly Counsels those that are superannuated, to abstain from the use of Marriage, that they may the better attend their Devotions. In the Fourth, he leaves those Persons that have had an Illusion in the Night-time, at liberty to receive or forbear the Eucharist; following the Dictates and Motions of their own Conscience. S. *Dionysius.*

Anastasius of *Nice*, in his 23d Question upon *Genesis*, cites a Passage drawn out of a Book of *Dionysius* of *Alexandria* against *Origen*; but there is no ground to believe that it was written by our *Dionysius*, who was so far from being his Adversary, that he was both his Disciple and Defender. He died in the Year 264, after he had held the See of *Alexandria* Seventeen years, and had one *Maximus* for his Successor. The Style of this Author is Pompous and Lofty; he is excellent in his Descriptions and Exhortations; in his Polemical Discourses he falls upon his Adversaries with all the Vigour imaginable; he perfectly well understood the Opinion, the Discipline and Precepts of the Church; he had sound piercing Judgment; he was very moderate, very discreet, and ready to take Advice. In short, the Loss of his Works is one of the most considerable Losses we could have sustain'd in this kind.

THEOGNOSTUS.

THEOGNOSTUS of *Alexandria*, is an *Author*, (unknown to *Eusebius* and S. *Jerome*) whom S. *Athanasius* cites with Commendation, and whose Books were extant in *Photius*'s time, who read them over. We don't precisely know the time when he liv'd, though we cannot doubt but he was some time after *Origen*, and long before the Council of *Nice*. *Photius* informs us, That he composed Seven Books, Entituled, *Hypotyposes*; that is to say, *Instructions*; and he gives us this Account of that Work: In the first Book he treats of the Father, and endeavours to shew, 'That he 'is the Creator of all things, against the Opinion of those that suppose Matter to be Eternal. In the Second Book he advances some Arguments, whereby he pretends it necessarily follows, that the Father had a Son; but speaking of this Son, he says, 'That he is a Creature above all Creatures that 'have Reason: He likewise attributes to the Son of God several other Qualities of the like Nature, as 'Origen has done: Whether he was of the same Opinion, or whether he speaks after that manner, ra-'ther by way of Disputation, than a Design to propose his own true Doctrin; or in short, whether he 'was somewhat mistaken in the Truth, and that to accommodate himself to the weakness of his Audi-'tors, who having no Knowledge of the true Religion, were not capable of comprehending a perfect 'Instruction, he supposed it most expedient to give them an imperfect Knowledge of the Son of God. 'than not to speak of him at all. But though a Man may follow this Method in a Dispute, or in a 'Discourse, when he is constrained to say the same things often, that are not altogether conformable 'to his own Opinion of the matter; yet 'tis a Weakness to make use of this Pretence, to excuse those 'Errours that are published in any Book, where we are obliged to speak the Truth to all the World. 'In the Third Book, speaking of the Holy Ghost, he brings some Arguments to prove, that there is an 'Holy Ghost; but in the rest he falls into the same Extravagancies with those of *Origen* in his Book 'of *Principles*. In the Fourth Book he talks erroneously about Angels and Dæmons, and assigns small 'Bodies to them. In the Fifth and Sixth, he treats of the Incarnation, and uses all his Endeavours to 'demonstrate after this manner, That it was possible for God to make himself Man. This Book 'likewise is full of several groundless Fancies: As for Example, when he has a mind to prove that 'the Son of God is circumscribed in Place by our Imagination; though in Truth he cannot be known 'there. In the Seventh Book, which he wrote concerning the Creation of God, he discourseth of 'matters of Religion after a manner conformable to the Doctrin of the Church, and especially of the 'Son of God, of whom he treats in the Last Part. His Style is elevated, and very Ἀπέρτλος καὶ ἔοικὸς 'His Discourses have the Beauty of Old *Athens*, but without Affectation, so that in his Compositions 'he does not go very far from the ordinary manner of Conversation; and yet he avoids saying mean 'things. *Theognostus*

Thus I have shewn you what *Photius* has informed us of this Author. S. *Athanasius* calls him an Admirable Man, Studious and Eloquent; and is so far from accusing him for having any Unorthodox Sentiments about the Divinity of the Word, that he cites him as a witness of Consubstantiality. 'Learn, says he, O *Arians*, ye Rebels to Jesus Christ, that the Eloquence of *Theognostus* has made use 'of the Word Substance; for behold after what manner he discourseth in his Second Book of *In-*

structions:

Theognoſtus

'*ſtructions*: The Subſtance of the Son is not a ſtrange Subſtance; he was not produced of nothing, but 'was begotten of the Subſtance of the Father, as the Ray is of the Light, or a Vapour of Water; 'for the Vapour is not Water, nor is the Ray Light; but neither one nor the other is a Stranger to that 'which produces it: Thus the Son is at it were the gentle running of the Subſtance of the Father; yet 'ſo as that the Father ſuffers no Diviſion: For as the Sun is not diminiſhed, though it produces Rayes 'continually; ſo likewiſe the Father is not diminiſhed in begetting the Son, who is his Image. This Paſſage, and the Authority of S. *Athanaſius*, ought to convince us, that *Photius* has wrongfully accuſed *Theognoſtus* to have erred concerning the Divinity of the Son, upon the ſcore of a few Expreſſions that did not agree with thoſe of his own Age; without taking notice, that though the Ancients have ſpoken differently as to this Point, yet the Foundation of the Doctrin was always the ſame; and that it is an horid Injuſtice to require them to ſpeak as nicely, and with as much precaution, as thoſe that lived after the Birth and Condemnation of Hereſies. But 'tis an ordinary Fault with *Photius*, who lived in an Age when theſe Myſteries were illuſtrated, and in which People talk'd with a great deal of exactneſs, to condemn the Ancients almoſt all along with too much Severity.

The ſame S. *Athanaſius* in another Work concerning the Explication of theſe words in the Goſpel; *He that blaſphemes againſt the Holy Ghoſt ſhall receive forgiveneſs of his Sin, neither in this World, nor in that to come*; tells us, that *Origen* and *Theognoſtus* have written, that the Sin againſt the Holy Ghoſt was falling away after Baptiſm. And after he has delivered the Paſſage out of *Origen*, he likewiſe adds that out of *Theognoſtus*, who ſays, 'That he who has paſſed only the Firſt or Second Bounds is leſs cul-'pable; but he that paſſes the Third, has no hopes of Pardon. That the Firſt and Second Bound is the Knowledge of the Father, and that the Third is Baptiſm, which makes us Partakers of the Holy Ghoſt; which is confirmed by theſe Words of the Goſpel, *I have ſtill many things to tell you*, &c. after which, continues he, 'Our Saviour levels, if I may ſo ſay, his Diſcourſe in favour of thoſe who cannot com-'prehend the moſt perfect things; whereas the Holy Ghoſt dwells in thoſe that are perfect. But we 'muſt not therefore conclude, That the Doctrin of the Holy Ghoſt ſurpaſſeth that of Jeſus Chriſt, but 'that our Saviour abaſeth himſelf in favour of thoſe that are not altogether perfect; whereas the Holy 'Ghoſt is the Seal of Perfection, which we receive in Baptiſm: Thus it is not that the Holy Ghoſt is 'more excellent than the Son, becauſe the Sin which is committed againſt him, is without hopes of 'Remiſſion; but it is, that theſe imperfect Men, that is to ſay, thoſe that are not baptized, may ob-'tain Forgiveneſs of their Sin; whereas thoſe that have once taſted the Celeſtial Gifts, and once are 'touched, have no more excuſe, nor means to avoid Puniſhment. S. *Athanaſius* afterwards confutes this Explication, which appears to be very agreeable to the Opinion of *Novatian*, and gives another Interpretation, which is far more Natural.

ATHENOGENES.

Athenogenes.

TO *Theognoſtus* we may joyn the Martyr *Athenogenes*, who compoſed a Hymn, before he was caſt into the Fire, wherein he ſpeaks of the Trinity; as S. *Baſil* aſſures us in the 29th Chapter of his Book *of the Holy Ghoſt*.

DIONYSIUS *Biſhop of* Rome.

Dionyſius.

Dionyſius Biſhop of *Rome*, who preſided in that See, from the Year 258. to the Year 270. writ a Letter againſt the *Sabellians*, a Fragment whereof remains ſtill preſerved by S. *Athanaſius* in his Book concerning the Deciſion of the Council of *Nice*; in which, diſcourſing againſt the *Sabellians*, he falls upon the contrary Doctrin, that was afterwards maintained by the *Arians*. He proves that the Word was not Created, but Begotten of the Father from all Eternity, and diſtinctly explains the Myſtery of the Trinity. This Fragment is plainly taken out of a Letter written by *Dionyſius*, in the Name of the *Roman* Synod, at the time when *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria* was accuſed of falling into the oppoſite Errour to that of the *Sabellians*.

MALCHION.

Malchion.

Malchion, a very Eloquent Man, was, after he had taught the prophane Sciences with a great deal of Reputation in the City of *Antioch*, ordained Presbyter of that Church, for the Purity of his Faith and his Doctrin. He had a famous Diſpute againſt *Paulus Samoſatenus* in the Second Council of *Antioch*, held in the Year 270. in which after he had clearly diſcovered the Errours which that Heretick endeavoured to conceal, he prevailed with the Council to condemn him. This Conference was taken in Writing by ſome Notaries, and was extant not only in the time of *Euſebius* and S. *Jerome*, who mention it, but alſo in the time of *Leontius*; that is to ſay, towards the end of the Sixth

Sixth Century: He speaks of it in his First Book against the *Nestorians*, and recites some Fragments of it in the Third Book. However it is not certain that they are genuine any more than the Fragments of another Letter of the Council of *Antioch*, mentioned by *Eusebius*. S. *Jerome* tells us, that he was likewise Author of a Letter written in the Name of that Council, against *Paulus Samosatenus*, and spoken of by *Eusebius* in the Seventh Book of his History, *Chap.* 30. *Malchion.*

ARCHELAUS.

ARchelaus Bishop of *Mesopotamia*, published a Dispute in the Syriack Language, which he had with a Heretick of the *Manichean* Party, that came out of *Persia*; and S. *Jerome* assures us, that in his time it was Translated into Greek. This Author flourished in the time of the Emperour *Probus*. There is a Fragment of this Writing in the Sixth Catechetick Lecture of S. *Cyril* of *Jerusalem*. [This Dispute it self, translated into Latin by an Ancient Hand, was published by *Valesius* at the end of his Edition of *Socrates* and *Sozomen* at *Paris*, 1668. It is imperfect. *Bigotius* found it in the *Ambrosian* Library at *Milan*, and communicated it to *Valesius*.] *Archelaus.*

ANATOLIUS.

ABout the same time, under the same Emperour, and under *Carus* his Successor, *Anatolius* also flourish'd, born at *Alexandria*, and Bishop of *Laodicea* in *Syria*; a Man of profound Learning, very well skilled in *Arithmetick*, *Geometry*, *Physick*, *Astronomy*, *Grammar*, and *Rhetorick*. *Eusebius* and S. *Jerome* assures us, that the greatness of his Spirit, the force of his Eloquence, and the depth of his Knowledge, abundantly appear in a Book of his concerning *Easter*; and that he shew'd the Dexterity of his Address and Politicks in the Siege of *Alexandria*, which by his Prudent Counsels he saved from an entire Destruction that threatned it. *Eusebius* in the last Chapter of his Seventh Book, has preserved a Fragment of this Treatise about *Easter*, concerning the time wherein that Festival is to be celebrated. This same Author likewise composed Ten Books of *Arithmetick*, and left behind him several Monuments of his Learning and Exactness; particularly in those things that concerned the Holy Scriptures. *Anatolius.*

Ægidius Bucherius hath given us an entire Version of the Treatise about *Easter* by *Anatolius*, which he Copied out of an ancient Manuscript. He pretends that it was done by *Ruffinus*, and that it answers the Treatise of *Anatolius*. And indeed, the Fragment cited by *Eusebius*, is to be found intirely in Latin, and the Passages cited by *Bede* are there word for word. But it would be no strange thing, for an Impostor to insert a Passage mentioned by *Eusebius*, that was so easie to find, and for this Work to be forged since *Bede's* time. Though I am of Opinion, That this Canon is ancient, though full of Errours, and perhaps a little corrupted by him that Translated it.

VICTORINUS.

VIctorinus Bishop of *Passaw* (*a*), a City of the ancient *Pannonia*, situate upon the *Drave* in *Styria*, and not of *Poictiers* in *France*, passeth for a very indifferent Author. (*b*) S. *Jerome* says of him, That he did not understand Latin so well as Greek; that the Style of his Works is simple and mean, *Victorinus.*

(*a*) *Bishop of* Passaw, *a City of the Ancient* Pannonia, *and not of* Poictiers *in* France.] Monsieur *Launoy* has written a Dissertation on purpose, to prove that he was not Bishop of *Poictiers* in *France*, but of a City in *Pannonia* called *Petabion* or *Petavion*, now called *Passaw*. He quotes in this Dissertation Five several places of S. *Jerome*, where mention is made of this *Victorinus*, twice in his Catalogue, once against *Vigilantius*, once against *Helvidius*, and once upon the Thirty sixth Chapter of *Ezekiel*; we find in the ancient Editions *Petabionensis*, or *Petavionensis*, or *Pictabiensis*, or *Pictabionensis*; and that he is also called by this Name in the Martyrologies of *Usuardus* and *Ado*, and in some other Ancient Writers, as well as in the first Edition of the Councils by *Merlinus*; and in the Edition of the Commentary upon the *Apocalypse* attributed to this Author. And he concludes from all these Authorities, and from several other Reasons that he produceth, that this *Victorinus* was not Bishop of *Poictiers*, but of a certain City in *Pannonia* called *Petabion* or *Petavion*, and now *Passaw*. He likewise observes in another small Dissertation, that there were five Authors of this Name. The First is the Defender of the Opinion of *Praxeas*, whereof *Tertullian* makes mention. The Second is our Author. The Third is a Rhetorician of *Rome*, of whom S. *Austin* speaks in the Eighth Book of his Confessions, *Chap.* 2. The Fourth it mentioned by *Gennadius*, who was of *Marseilles*. And the Last is an Orator, Surnamed *Lampadius*, mentioned by *Photius*, Cod. 101. See this Dissertation.

(*b*) *St.* Jerome *saith of him, that he did not understand Latin so well as Greek.*] These Passages of S. *Jerome*

Victorinus. S. *Jerome* are in this Catalogue: *Non æque Latine ut Græce noverat; inde opera ejus grandia ſenſibus, viliora ſunt compoſitione verborum.* And in his Commentary upon *Iſaiah*, Lib. 1. *Imperitus ſermone, non tamen ſcientia.* Epiſt. ad Magnum: *Victorino Martyri in ſuis libris licet deſit eruditio, non deeſt tamen eruditionis voluntas.*

though the Senſe is very high; that he had no Notion of Style, though he underſtood the Holy Scriptures very well; that he had no Learning, but that he had great Inclinations that way. His Works, whereof S. *Jerome* has compoſed a Catalogue, are, beſides a Treatiſe againſt all Hereſies, ſome Commentaries upon *Geneſis*, *Exodus*, *Leviticus*, *Iſaiah*; and as far as the Viſion of the Four-footed Beaſts in *Ezechiel*; *Eccleſiaſtes*, the *Canticles*, and the (c) *Revelations*.

We have in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, a Commentary upon the *Apocalypſe* by *Victorinus*, with a Preface attributed to S. *Jerome*. It is ſaid in this Preface, That *Victorinus* was of the ſame Opinion with *Papias* and *Nepos*, touching the Reign of the Thouſand Years; and the very ſame thing is likewiſe obſerved by S. *Jerome* in his Catalogue: Nevertheleſs we find the contrary in this Commentary, and that Opinion ſeems to be plainly rejected there, as belonging to the Heretick *Cerinthus*. There is alſo mentioned in this Book an Epitome of *Theodorus*, who reckoned Twenty Four Books of the Old Teſtament. Now this *Theodorus*, having lived under *Juſtinian*, we muſt of neceſſity conclude, that the Author of this Commentary lived ſince that time; however, 'tis far more probable that this Citation of *Theodorus* has been added ſince, becauſe the Author of this Commentary lived before *Juſtinian*'s Age. For he believed with the Ancients, that the Souls of Men ſhould not be happy till after the Day of Judgment; and that *Nero* was Antichriſt; which Opinions were no where maintained in *Juſtinian*'s time. 'Tis likewiſe very probable, that they have altered ſomewhat of what he ſays in his Commentary concerning the Reign of the Thouſand Years; beſides that, he formerly rejects only the Errour of *Cerinthus*, who believed no other Beatitude but that of a Temporal Reign. 'I don't 'believe, ſays he, that the Reign of the Thouſand Years will be at the end of the Judgment; or if 'there is one, we ought to believe that it ends after the Thouſand Years are compleated. Thus we cannot be certainly aſſured, that this Commentary does not belong to *Victorinus*; on the contrary, 'tis ſomewhat probable that it is his.

(c) *And upon the Revelations.*] He likewiſe wrote ſome other Works, and made a Commentary upon St. *Matthew*, as S. *Jerome* tells us, *Præfat. in Matth.* And in his Catalogue he ſays, That he compoſed ſeveral other Works.

PIERIUS.

Pierius. PIerius, a Prieſt and Catechiſt of *Alexandria*, Inſtructed the People of that Church under the Empire of *Carus* and *Diocleſian*, at the ſame time when *Theonas* was Biſhop of that place. He compoſed ſeveral ſorts of Treatiſes, that were extant in S. *Jerome*'s time, with ſo muh Eloquence, that he was called the young *Origen*. It is certain, he lived a very auſtere Life, and embraced a voluntary Poverty. He was excellently well skilled in *Logick* and *Rhetorick*. The Perſecution being ended, he came to *Rome*, where he continued a conſiderable time. He wrote a great *Homily* upon *Hoſea*, which he recited on *Eaſter*-Eve, wherein he takes notice, that in his time on *Eaſter*-Eve the People tarried in the Church till after Midnight. *Photius* tells us, That in this Homily he diſcourſed about the Cherubims that *Moſes* placed over the Ark. The ſame Author read another Work compoſed by *Pierius*, but he does not acquaint us with the Title of it, that contained a dozen Volumes; in which according to the Teſtimony of *Photius*, he has ſome particular Opinions different from thoſe of the Church. His Doctrin upon the Trinity is Orthodox concerning the Perſons of the Father and the Son, though he uſes the Word *Subſtance* and *Nature* to ſignify a Perſon. But his manner of ſpeaking about the Holy Ghoſt is dangerous, and ſcarce Orthodox; becauſe he ſays, That the Glory of the Latter is leſs than the Glory of the Father and the Son. *Photius* moreover adds, That he wrote a Book upon S. *Luke*'s Goſpel; in which he proves, That the Diſ-reſpect ſhewn to Images, falls back upon that which they repreſent. As for his Style, he tells us, It is clear, ſmooth and eaſie; that it is by no means elaborate, but flows equally and gently, as in Diſcourſes compoſed *Extempore*; and that it is full of Enthymems.

METHODIUS.

Methodius. METhodius, Biſhop of *Olympus* or (a) *Patara* in *Lycia*, and afterwards of *Tyre* in *Paleſtine*, (who ſuffered Martyrdom at *Chalcis*, a City of *Greece*, towards the end of *Diocleſian*'s Perſecution in the Year 302, or 303.) compoſed in a clear elaborate Style, a large Work againſt *Porphyrius* the Philoſopher; an excellent Treatiſe about the Reſurrection againſt *Origen*; another about the *Pythonyſſa* againſt the ſame; a Book Entituled, *The Banquet of Virgins*; one about *Free-Will*; Commentaries upon

(a) *Or Patarah.*] S. *Jerome* tells us, he was *Bishop* of *Olympus*; *Suidas* adds, *or of* Patara. Though we are not therefore to think that there were two *Methodius's*. But it is probable that *Patara*, which was a City of *Lycia*, was likewise called *Olympus*; because it was built upon a Mountain so called. *Methodius* likewise calls himself *Eubulus*, and that is the Name he uses in his *Banquet of Virgins*. *Eusebius* does not speak of this Author, because he wrote against *Origen*. S. *Jerom* reports, That some Persons said, he suffered Martyrdom in the time of *Decius* and *Valerian*; which Account is followed by *Suidas*. But S. *Jerom*, and the Martyrologies after him, relate, that he suffered Martyrdom at *Chalcis*, towards the End of the last Persecution. *Methodius.*

upon *Genesis* and the *Canticles*, and several other Pieces that were extant in S. *Jerom's* time. At present, besides *The Banquet of Virgins* that was published entire not along ago by *Possinus* a Jesuit, we have several considerable Fragments of this Author cited by S. *Epiphanius* and *Photius*, and others, found in Manuscripts, and collected together by Father *Combesis*, who has Printed them, together with the Works of *Amphilochius* and *Andreas Cretensis*. But afterwards *Possinus* found *The Banquet of Virgins* entire in a Manuscript belonging to the Vatican Library, and Translated it into Latin, and sent it into *France*, where it was Printed in the Year 1657. Revised and Corrected by another Manuscript. We cannot doubt, that this is the true genuine Work of *Methodius*; as well because it carries all the Marks of Antiquity in it, that a Book can possibly have; as also because it contains Word for Word all the Passages that *Photius* has cited out of this Work of *Methodius*, and another place cited by S. *Gregory Nyssen*. 'Tis written by way of Dialogue, in which he introduces a Woman named *Gregorium*, who tells her Friend *Eubulus* all the Conversation that passed in a Meeting of Ten Virgins, which she learnt of *Thebpatra*. It was composed by *Methodius*, in imitation of a certain Book, very much resembling it, written by *Plato*, and Entituled, *The Banquet of* Socrates. After that *Gregorium* and *Eubulus* have exchanged the usual Complements, and *Gregorium* has given a short Description of the Place, where these Ten Virgins were assembled; she feigns that *Arete*, in whose Garden they were met, requests each of them to make a Discourse upon Virginity; which she repeats one after the other.

The first is that of *Marcella*, who enlarges very much upon the Greatness and Excellence of Virginity. She makes it appear how choice a thing Virginity is; and that it is a difficult thing to preserve it amidst so many Thousand Temptations we meet with: That it is necessary to meditate incessantly upon the Holy Scripture, in order to keep it unspotted and undefiled: That Virginity was scarce so much as known under the ancient Law, when Men were permitted to Marry even their own Sisters, and to take several Wives: But that God by little and little has taught Men, in the first place to preserve their Chastity, and afterwards to embrace Virginity: That Jesus Christ came into the World to instruct them in this Virtue by the Influence of his own Example; that he is the Prince of Virgins, as well as the Prince of Pastors; that the Company of Virgins has the first place in his Kingdom, tho' they are the least in number: And this she justifies by a Passage out of the *Revelations*, Chap. the 14th.

Since this Conversation of *Marcella* might seem to throw some Dis-reputation upon the Sanctity of Marriage, *Theophila* proves in the second place, that Jesus Christ in making the great Excellencies of Virginity known to the World, did not design thereby to banish Marriage, and entirely abolish so Sacred an Institution. She says, That the Ecstasie of *Adam* denotes and signifies the Passion of Marriage; that God is the Author of Generation, and that he forms the Infants that come into the World. Here *Marcella* interrupts the Series of her Discourse, and enquires of her, How it comes to pass; if Infants are conceived and born by the Will of God, that he permits the Children of Adulterers to come into the World; that these Children thrive, and are often more perfect in their Body and Mind, and also become better Christians than others: That nevertheless, Experience daily acquaints us with the truth of this Assertion; so that we ought to understand this Saying in the Scripture, *The Children of Adulterers shall be consumed by Fire*, only of those that corrupt the Word of God. *Theophila* returns this Answer to the Objection, That God is not the Author of Adulterers, though he forms the Infants that are born of such Copulations; and this she illustrates by the Example of a Man that makes Earthen Vessels in a place enclosed with four Walls full of Holes, through which he is furnished with Clay, of which he makes his Work: Now if those that serve him are mistaken in taking one hole for another, and it so happen that his Work is not such as it ought to be, the fault would lie neither in the Workman himself, nor in the Clay, but in those that had made a wrong Application of the matter; That after the same manner, we ought not to cast the Sin of Adulterers either upon God that makes Men, or upon the Matter of which they are made, or upon the Power that is given to Men to beget Children, but upon the Wicked Inclinations of those Persons that use these things in a dishonest manner; that every thing in the World is really Good in it self, but becomes Ill through the ill use and management of it. She continues afterwards to prove, by the admirable Beauty and Harmony that so visibly appears in the Contexture of our Bodies, that God is the Author of them. She observes that all Infants, even those that are begotten in Adultery, have their tutelar Angels to guard them immediately after their Conception: that the Soul is in its Nature immortal; that it is not generated by our Parents, but proceeds from God who inspireth it. In short, after she has thus answered this Objection, she concludes, That it is permitted for Men to Marry, tho' Virginity is a more perfect State than Marriage.

The Third Discourse goes under the Name of *Thalia*, who applies the words of *Adam* to his Wife in *Genesis*, to our Blessed Saviour Jesus Christ, and his Church; and following the Opinion of the Apostle, she adds, That the Word was the Wisdom of God; who existing before all Ages, communicated himself after a very particular manner to the first Man; but that Man having violated and transgressed

Methodius. the Commandments of God, became Mortal and Corruptible; and that it was necessary for the *Word* to make himself Man, to deliver him from the Curse and Tyranny he had rendred himself obnoxious to, and save him from Corruption by his own Death and Resurrection. That it is upon this account that the Son of God came into the World, to unite himself to the Church, as to his Spouse, which through this means became his Flesh and his Bone; that he died for her; that he purified her by Baptism, and by his Holy Spirit; that these words, *Increase and Multiply*, are accomplished and fulfilled every day in the Church, which encreases in Greatness and Beauty by the Communication of the Word, and by the Union it maintains with him; that *Catechumens* are as it were Infants, that are as yet in their Mothers Belly, that being perfectly instructed, they are born through Baptism, and at last become perfect full-grown Men; that we ought not therefore to abuse these Words, and employ them, to oppose Virginity, to which S. *Paul* exhorts the Faithful, not allowing Marriage it self, and second Marriages in particular, but as a Remedy for Incontinence; like one that should desire a Person that is Sick and Indisposed to eat on a Fast-day, and say to him, *It were to be wished that you were able to Fast, as all of us have done to day, for you know eating is forbidden; but since you are sick, it is expedient for you to eat, that you may not die.*

In the Fourth Discourse, that goes under the Name of *Theopatra*, it is maintained, That nothing is more efficacious than Virginity, to make a Man enter again into Paradise, and enjoy a blessed Immortality.

In the Fifth, *Thalusa* endeavours to demonstrate, That the most excellent Gift we can present to God, and the most worthy of Him, is to embrace Virginity; and she gives several Cautions and Advertisements to Virgins how to preserve their Virginity without Spot or Blemish.

Agatha, that manages the Conference after *Thalusa*, undertakes to prove in the Sixth Discourse, that Virginity ought to be accompanied with Vertue and good Works; and to this purpose she explains the Parable of the Ten Virgins.

Procella afterwards begins the Seventh Discourse, wherein she shews the Excellency of Virginity; because of all Vertues, this is that which has the Honour to be the Spouse of Jesus Christ. She explains a certain place out of the Sixth Chapter of the *Canticles*, ver. 7. and 8. *There are threescore Queens, and fourscore Concubines, and Virgins without number. My dove, my undefiled is but one.*

Thecla, assuming the Discourse after this, observes, That the Greek word that signifies Virginity, only by adding one Letter to it, denotes an Union with God, and a frequentation of Heavenly Things. She takes occasion from thence to shew, That Virginity elevates us up to Heaven, and makes us despise the Vanity of things below; and having cited a place in the *Revelations*, Chap. 12. concerning a Woman that is there described, she explains it of the Church. In short, after she has drawn some Allegories from Numbers, she exhorts all Virgins to persevere in their Virginity, and to resist the Attacks of the Serpent; that is to say, the Temptations of the Devil. From thence she launches out into other matter, and shews that Men are free Agents, and that they are not necessitated to do good or ill by the Influences and Configurations of the Stars, deriding the Effects that the Astrologers attribute to the Constellations because of their Names. 'For, says she, if there was any such thing as fatal Ne-'cessity from the beginning of the World, it was to no purpose for God to place the Stars of Men, and 'the Stars of Beasts in order; and that if there was not a necessity at that time, wherefore should God 'establish it, since the World was then in its full perfection, and in a time which they called *the Golden* '*Age*? She afterwards demonstrates, That if we were necessitated by the Fatality of our Nativity under such and such a Constellation, it would follow, that God who is the Author of the Stars, and of their Motion and Disposition, would likewise be the Author of Sin and Iniquity. She adds, That Laws being contrary to things that are done by a fatal Necessity, it is impossible that these Laws should be made by mere Fatality. 'For, says she, it is not to be supposed that this Fatality would destroy it self. Now, if those that had a share in making these Laws, were not subject to this fatal Necessity, why should we not pass the very same Judgment upon others? Besides, if such a Fatality really took place, it would be Injustice either to recompence the Good, or punish the Bad; or rather, there would be neither Good nor Evil in the World, since every one would be constrained to Good or Evil. Afterwards to explain the Cause of Evil, she says, There are two contrary Motions in us; one of which is called the *Concupiscence of the Flesh*; the other, the *Concupiscence of the Spirit*; that This is the Original of all Good, and the Other the Cause of all Evil.

After this, *Tysiana* taking up the Discourse, explains in the Ninth Discourse a place of *Leviticus*, v. 36. Chap. 23. where mention is made of the Feast of the Seventh Month; that is to say, the Fifteenth of *September*, which is the *Scenopegia, or Feast of Tabernacles*. She reprehends the *Jews* for stopping at the bare Letter of Scripture, without penetrating into the hidden mysterious Sense; and for taking the Figures of things to come, as Marks of things that were already past. She instances in the *Paschal Lamb*, which they did not comprehend to be a Type of Jesus Christ, who at the Day of Judgment shall save Souls marked with his own Blood; That the Law was the Figure of the Gospel; That these Shadows and Representations are no more, but that we shall have a perfect Knowledge of all things when we shall be raised up from the Dead; That Man was created Immortal, but that his Sin causing him to incline towards the Earth, God made him Mortal, lest he should continue a Sinner everlastingly; That for this reason he separated the Soul from the Body; that so the Sin, which is in the Body, being dead and destroyed, he might raise it up again immortal, and delivered from the tyranny of Sin; That we ought to adorn this Body, which may be called a Tabernacle, with Faith, with Charity, Vertue, and particularly with Chastity; That those that live chastly in the state of Marriage, adorn it

in

in part, but not so perfectly as those that have made a Profession of Virginity; That those Persons who have thus adorned and set out the Tabernacle of their Bodies in this Life, shall enjoy after the Resurrection a Thousand Years of Repose and Felicity upon the Earth with Jesus Christ, that afterwards they shall follow him to Heaven; and that this is the promised Beatitude, in which there shall be no more Tabernacles; that is to say, in which our Bodies shall be changed, and become incorruptible, and Men shall be made like Angels. *Methodius.*

Lastly, *Domnina*, to shew the Excellency of Virginity, falls into a very obscure Allegory upon a place of Scripture taken out of the Book of *Judges*. After her Harangue is ended, *Arete*, assuming the Discourse, tells them, That to be truly a Virgin, it is not sufficient barely to preserve and keep Continence of Body, but that it is likewise necessary to purifie ones self from all Sensual Desires; That we actually dishonour and sully Virginity, when we abandon our selves to Pride, or permit a Spirit of Vanity to possess us, because we have preserved our Bodies chaste; That this is to do like the Pharisees, who made every thing appear clean without, while they were full of Impurities within; That we ought to be Virgins both in Body and Spirit, and that we must watch and labour incessantly, lest Idleness and Negligence give an open entrance to other Sins. After this Discourse, all of them sing their Prayers, and several times repeat, 'I preserve my self chaste for thee, O my divine Spouse, and desire to walk 'before thee with a burning Lamp. At last *Gregorium* and *Methodius*, Surnamed *Eubulus*, who entertained themselves with the Discourses of these Virgins, discuss this Question, *viz.* Who were the most perfect Virgins, either those that feel no Motions of Desire, or those that feel them, and though they are assaulted and tormented by them, yet heroically resist and extinguish them? *Gregorium* gave the preference to the first: But *Methodius* shews her by the Example of Mariners, Physicians and Wrestlers, that those Virgins who preserve themselves chaste in the midst of those violent Agitations and Tempests that are excited by their Passions, who have the Art to cure the various Diseases of Concupiscence, and cannot only resist, but also defeat the disorderly Motions of the Flesh, deserve a great deal more than those that have no Appetites and Inclinations to struggle with.

This Dialogue is full of Allegories and Citations out of Scripture, explained in a mystical Sense; and the Doctrin contained in it is exceeding Orthodox. He does not condemn, or speak dishonourably of Marriage, even when he is setting out Virginity to the greatest Advantages; a Moderation seldom to be found in the Ancients. *Photius* tells us, That this Book has been corrupted by the Hereticks; and that there are some Expressions in it, which the *Arians* use. And indeed he tells us in the Seventh Discourse, That the Son who is above all Creatures, made use of the Testimony of the Father, who alone is greater than he. But if by reason of this single Expression, we must immediately cry out, that this Dialogue has been abused by the *Arians*, we must likewise say the same thing of the Gospel of S. *John*; and there is no greater difficulty in giving a good Sense to this Expression in *Methodius*, than in the Gospel; and so much the rather, since in the same place, and indeed as often as he speaks of the WORD in this Dialogue, he says, That he was before all Ages: And towards the end of the following Discourse, which is the Eighth, explaining these Words of the Psalmist, *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.* 'We ought to observe, cries he, that he says, *Thou art my Son*; being 'willing to have it known that he had from all time the quality of the Son, that he will never cease to 'have it, and that he who was begotten, was, and ever will be the same. As for what concerns the 'following Passage, *this day have I begotten thee*; it is to shew, that he who was before all Ages in Hea-'ven, was born in time for the good of the World. A little after he takes occasion to speak of the 'Hereticks, who have erred concerning the Trinity. Some of them, says he, as *Sabellius*, have erred 'concerning the Person of the Father, who maintained, that it was the Almighty that suffered: Others 'concerning the Son, as *Artemas* and some others, that affirm, he was only a Man in outward appear-'ance: Others concerning the Holy Ghost, as the *Ebionites*, who pretend that the Prophets spoke of 'themselves: For I will not speak of *Marcelion*, *Valentinus* and *Helcesaites*. These Words demonstrate, that we may very well defend *Methodius* from the Imputation of any Error concerning the Trinity. I cannot spend any more time to observe, that he taught the Opinion of the Millenaries in this Treatise, or to give an exact relation of his Doctrin, which may be learnt out of the Abridgment we have made of his *Banquet of the Virgins*. The Treatise of *the Resurrection* was written against *Origen*'s Opinion, who believed that Men were not to be raised up again from the Dead in the Flesh. This Book also was composed in form of a Dialogue between *Aglaophon*, who maintained *Origen*'s Assertion, and *Proclus*, and *Methodius* or *Eubulus*, who dispute against him. S. *Epiphanius* has cited a large Fragment of it in his Account of the Heresie of *Origen*; and Father *Combefis* has added some other Fragments to it, taken out of a Manuscript of *Sermondus*. He first of all proves under the Person of *Proclus*, That Man was created Immortal; that Death was occasioned by his Sin, of which it is the Punishment; That Sin was caused by the Envy of the Devil; and that the Devil himself, who was created in Righteousness like to the other Angels, fell through the Sin of Envy, and an inordinate Passion he had for Women; That our first Parents had a real Body and real Flesh before their Transgression; That the Fig-leaves wherewith they covered themselves, denote that after the Death of Man, Sin shall be entirely rooted out of the Heart: For, tho' Men's Sins are blotted out by Baptism, yet nevertheless there remains a Root still, that shoots up young Branches in this Life: So that all we can do to hinder these Branches from spreading, is to root them up, and prune them often with the Pruning knife of the Word of God. He tells us, that Man is like a cast Statue, which having been disfigured by some Accident, the Workman that made it, casts it anew before he erects it again; That after the same manner, God Almighty who made Man, was willing that his Work which was disfigured by Sin,

Methodius. ſhould be deſtroy'd by Death, that ſo he might re-eſtabliſh him by the Reſurrection; That it is a folly to imagine a Reſurrection of the Soul, ſince the Soul does not die; That Air, Earth, Heaven and the World ſhall not be deſtroy'd at the Day of Judgment, but that they ſhall only be purged and renewed by the Fire of Heaven; That Men ſhall not change their Nature at the Reſurrection, and that they ſhall not be transformed into Angels, but that they ſtill have Body and Fleſh, though immortal and incorruptible. All this is extracted from the words of *Proclus*. S. *Epiphanius* afterwards cites thoſe of *Methodius*, who continues to refute *Origen*'s Error about the Reſurrection, and who likewiſe endeavours to prove in the ſame place againſt the ſame Author, That the Body cannot paſs the Chains and Priſon of the Soul; That the Paradice where *Adam* lived was upon Earth; That Man does not conſiſt of the Soul alone, as *Plato* believed, but that the Body and Soul are the two parts of him; That 'tis Fabulous to ſay, that Souls were thrown headlong down from Heaven in their Bodies, or that they paſſed through Vortices of Elementary Fire, and through the Waters of the Firmament before they came to the Earth. And at laſt he makes ſeveral curious uſeful Remarks upon the Scriptural Notion of Fleſh, and of the Sin that dwells in our Bodies, explaining at the ſame time ſeveral places of the Apoſtle. *Photius* has cited theſe Explications all along, and added beſides, what the ſame Author has delivered about thoſe Perſons that were raiſed up to Life before Jeſus Chriſt, about the Apparitions of the Dead, and the Parable of *Dives* and *Lazarus*; in which he concludes, that Souls keep the Form of their Bodies in another World, and are there puniſhed and rewarded before the Day of Judgment. There ſtill remains a certain Paſſage of it, which is ſuppoſed to belong to the ſame Work quoted by S. *John Damaſcene*, in his Third Oration *concerning Images*; wherein he ſays, 'That Chriſtians make 'Golden Images repreſenting Angels for the Glory of God. But I very much queſtion whether this Paſſage belongs to *Methodius*; or if it does, it muſt be taken in another ſenſe than that in which S. *John Damaſcene* underſtood it; and that by *Angels*, *Principalities* and *Powers*, he means the Kings of the Earth, as the Words that immediately precede ſeem to intimate.

The Treatiſe of *Free-Will* was compoſed in Form of a Dialogue or Diſpute between a *Valentinian* and a *Catholick*. The former affirms, That Matter which is Eternal, was the cauſe of Evil, or of Sin. On the other hand, the Orthodox Chriſtian makes it appear, that there could not be two Eternal Principles; that if Matter were Eternal, yet Evil would not be Eternal, becauſe the Qualities of Matter could not be Eternal; that Matter is not the cauſe of Evil; and that God is not the cauſe of Evil, becauſe Evil conſiſts not in a real thing, but in the ill uſe that we make of our Liberty: that Man having been created with a Liberty either to obey, or not to obey the Commandments of God he ſins, when uſing this Liberty the wrong way, he does things contrary to the Law of God.

Theſe are the Works of *Methodius*, which S. *Jerom* mentions. *Photius* has made an Extract of a Treatiſe *about created Things*, written by *Methodius*. In the Firſt, he ſays, That theſe Words of Jeſus Chriſt, *Caſt not Pearl before Swine*, ought not to be underſtood of Doctrin, but of Vertues; and that the meaning is not, that we muſt conceal Myſteries from the Infidels, but that we muſt not prophane the Chriſtian Vertues; ſuch as Chaſtity, Temperance and Juſtice, with the Pleaſures of the World that are ſignified by the Swine. In the Second, he confutes thoſe that thought the World had no beginning; an Opinion which he attributes to *Origen*. In the Third, he ſays, That the Church is ſo called, becauſe it calls Men to fight againſt Pleaſures. [In the Greek *Eccleſia*, which ſignifies a *Church*, *or any Aſſembly of Men*, comes from καλέω, *to call*; becauſe the Publick Aſſemblies were convened by publick Cryers, who called the People together.] In the Fourth, he ſays, That there were two Vertues or Powers that concurred to the Creation of the World; the Father that created it of nothing, and the Son that poliſhed and compleated the Work of the Father. *The Son*, ſays he, *who is the almighty Hand of the Father*. In the Fifth he aſſerts, That *Moſes* was the Author of the Book of *Job*; and he explains the firſt Words of the Book of *Geneſis*, In principio, *in the beginning*, of the Wiſdom of God. He obſerves, that God the Father begot the Word, or the Wiſdom which was in Him before the Creation of the World; that this Wiſdom being a Principle without Beginning, became the Principle of all Things; which is a Catholick way of ſpeaking, and far remote from the *Arian* Opinion; though it does not ſeem to be altogether conformable to the Expreſſions of our Age. To conclude, In the laſt Fragment he cites a Paſſage of *Origen*, who would endeavour to prove by Allegories, That the World exiſted long before the Six Days, that preceded the formation of *Adam*. *Methodius* looks upon this as a trifling Opinion.

Theodoret, in his firſt Dialogue, cites a Paſſage taken out of a Sermon of *Methodius* concerning the Martyrs; where he ſays, that Martyrdom is ſo admirable, and ſo much to be deſired, that Jeſus Chriſt the Son of God would honour it himſelf; and that he who was equal to his Father, was willing to Crown Humane Nature, to which he himſelf was united with that excellent Gift.

The Sermon compoſed upon the Nativity of Jeſus, and upon his being preſented in the Temple, entituled, *Simeon and Ann*, publiſhed by *Pantinus* in the Year 1598. and afterwards Printed by Father *Combefis* among the reſt of the Works of *Methodius*, is neither cited by any of the Ancients, nor mentioned by *Photius*, though it is written in *Methodius*'s Style. The Author of it endeavours to confute the Errors of *Origen*, and calls himſelf the Author of the *Banquet of Virgins*, in the beginning of his Diſcourſe, which ſhews that it belongs to *Methodius*. Though we muſt own that he ſpeaks ſo clearly of the Myſteries of the Trinity, of the Incarnation, of the Divinity of the Word, whom he calls in ſeveral places *Conſubſtantial to the Father*, of the Hymn called the *Trifagion*, of the Virginity of *Mary* even after her Delivery, and of Original Sin, that it gives us ſome reaſon to doubt, whether ſomething has not been ſince added to this Sermon. Beſides, the Style of it is more ſwelling, and fuller of Epithets than that of *Methodius*.

Beſides,

Beſides all this, Father *Combefis* upon the Authority of a Manuſcript in the King's Library, has reſtored to *Methodius* another Sermon upon *Palm-Sunday*, that was formerly Printed under the Name of S. *Chryſoſtom*, by Sir *Henry Savil*, upon the Authority of another Manuſcript. It is certain, that it approaches nearer to the Style of *Methodius* than of S. *Chryſoſtom*; but he explains the Myſtery of the Trinity ſo clearly in one place, and oppoſes the Hereticks ſo very plainly, that there is ſome reaſon to believe, that either this place has been ſince added, or that this Homily was not written by *Methodius*. Father *Combefis* has likewiſe collected ſome other Fragments attributed to *Methodius*, cited by S. *John Damaſcene*, and by *Nicetas*, drawn out of his Books againſt *Porphyry*. But beſides, that we cannot intirely depend upon the Authority of theſe two Authors, who are not very exact, theſe Fragments having nothing conſiderable, and we think it not worth the while to ſay any thing more concerning them. We ſhall not take any notice of ſome Latin Prophecies about Antichriſt attributed to *Methodius*, that are Printed in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, ſince it is agreed on all Hands that they are not his. *Methodius.*

The Style of *Methodius* is *Aſiatick*, that is to ſay, diffuſe, ſwelling, and full of Epithets. His Expreſſions are Figurative, the turn of his Sentences affected, he is full of Compariſons, and far-fetched Allegories, his Thoughts are myſterious, and he ſays a few things in abundance of Words. Setting theſe things aſide, his Doctrin is ſound, and free from ſome Errors that were common to the Ancients; particularly concerning the Virginity of *Mary*, concerning Original Sin, concerning Guardian Angels, and ſeveral other Points; as may be obſerved in the Abridgment that we have made of his Works.

PAMPHILUS.

Pamphilus, a Presbyter of *Cæſarea* in *Palæſtine*, and (*a*) Friend of *Euſebius*, ſuffered Martyrdom, during *Maximine*'s Perſecution. He wrote almoſt nothing himſelf, unleſs it be a few Letters to his Friends; but he took extraordinary pains to gather the (*b*) Books of ancient Writers, and particularly thoſe of *Origen*, for whom he had a particular Eſteem. He tranſcribed ſeveral Volumes with his own Hand, and among the reſt, his Twenty Five Books of Commentaries upon the Prophets, and that very Tranſcript was to be ſeen in S. *Jerom*'s time. *Pamphilus* when he was in Priſon compoſed (*c*) Five Books with *Euſebius* in defence of *Origen*, and *Euſebius* added a Sixth after his Death. *Pamphilus.*

(*a*) *Friend of* Euſebius.] *Euſebius* wrote the Life of *Pamphilus*, and was from him Surnamed *Pamphilus.*

(*b*) *The Books of ancient Writers.*] He laboured along with *Euſebius* to copy out exactly, and to correct the Verſion of the *Septuagint*, that was in the *Tetrapla*, and *Hexapla* of *Origen*, intending to publiſh it by it ſelf.

(*c*) *Five Books with* Euſebius.] S. *Jerom* in his Catalogue of the Eccleſiaſtical Writers, makes him the Author of the Apology for *Origen*; but he afterwards retracted what he had ſaid in his Apology againſt *Ruffinus*. The truth is, The five firſt Books were compoſed by *Pamphilus* and *Euſebius* together; and the laſt, which *Ruffinus* quoted, was *Euſebius*'s alone. See *Photius*, Cod. 118.

LUCIAN.

Lucian, a Presbyter of *Antioch*, applied himſelf vigorouſly to the Study of Scripture, and publiſhed a new Edition of the Verſion (*a*) of the Septuagint, which was afterwards called *Lucian*'s Edition. He was a Man of great Eloquence, and wrote ſeveral ſmall Treatiſes *concerning Faith*, and ſome Letters. Among others, he wrote one, when he was in Priſon, addreſſed to a Chriſtian of *Antioch*; the end of which Letter is preſerved in the Chronicle of *Alexandria*, and is as follows: 'All the 'Martyrs that are with me, Salute you. I ſend you word that Biſhop *Anthimus* died a Martyr. *Lucian* is accuſed to have been the firſt Author of the *Arian* Opinion: And indeed, all the Heads of that Party were his Diſciples. He ſuffered Martyrdom at *Nicomedia*, under the Perſecution (*b*) of the Emperor *Maximinus*, and was Buried at *Helenopolis*, a City of *Bythinia*. *Lucian.*

(*a*) *Of the* Septuagint.] The Verſion which he Corrected, was the common Verſion of the *Septuagint*. Upon this account, S. *Jerom* (*Præfat. in Paralipomena*) diſtinguiſhes between three different Editions of the Verſion of the *Septuagint*. The firſt, was that of *Euſebius* and *Pamphilus*, which he calls *Palæſtine*, that was taken out of the *Hexapla* of *Origen*, who corrected it by an ancient Verſion, and added ſeveral things borrowed from the Verſions of *Theodotian*, *Aquila* and *Symmachus*. The Second was that of *Alexandria*, whereof *Heſychius* was Author, who likewiſe corrected the common Verſion of the *Septuagint*. The Laſt, that of *Lucian*. This gave occaſion to S. *Jerom* to ſay, That *Totus Orbis hac inter ſe trifaria varietate compugnat.*

(*b*) *Of the Emperor* Maximinus.] *Euſebius*, l. 9. c. 6. *Hierom. in Catalog.* And therefore *Baronius* is miſtaken, when following the Acts of his Martyrdom, he ſays, That he ſuffered under *Maximian*; for 'tis a common miſtake among the Greeks to take *Maximian* for *Maximin*.

PHILEAS.

PHILEAS.

Phileas.

PHileas, deſcended of a Rich and Powerful Family in the City of *Thmuis* in *Ægypt*, after having paſſed through ſeveral Offices and Honours, and acquired to himſelf the Repuration of an extraordinary Philoſopher, was elected Biſhop of the City where he lived, and had his Head cut off for the Faith of Jeſus Chriſt, under the Emperor *Maximinus*. Before he ſuffered Martyrdom, he wrote a famous Letter to the Inhabitants of the City of *Thmuis*; in which he deſcribes the Puniſhments which the Chriſtians were forced to endure in the City of *Alexandria*. He deſcribes the Conſtancy with which they ſupported themſelves, and exhorts his Flock to keep up the Religion of Jeſus Chriſt after his Death, which he foreſaw would ſhortly happen. *Euſebius* in the Eighth Book of his Hiſtory, Chapter the Tenth, has preſerved a Fragment of this Eloquent Letter, which S. *Jerom* ſcruples not to call a Book. He likewiſe tells us, that they had the Anſwers which he made to the Judge, who would have obliged him to offer Sacrifice. We have the Acts of his Martyrdom, that were Printed at *Antwerp*: But they are corrupt, as moſt of the reſt are; and ſome things are inſerted which are taken out of *Euſebius* and *Ruffinus*.

ZENO *Biſhop of* Verona.

Zeno Biſhop of Verona.

'TIS commonly believed, that there was one *Zeno*, Biſhop of *Verona*, that ſuffered Martyrdom under the Empire of *Galienus*, and ſome Sermons are attributed to him, that were publiſhed by *Guarinus*, Printed at *Venice* and *Verona* in the Years 1508 and 1586. and afterwards inſerted into the *Bibliotheca Patrum*. But this Author being wholly unknown to all Antiquity, his Works have been abſolutely rejected; nay, ſome have doubted, whether it be true, that there ever was a Biſhop of *Verona* of that Name, that ſuffered Martyrdom under the Emperor *Galienus*. S. *Gregory* the Great is the firſt that ſpeaks of *Zeno*, as a Martyr; but before him S. *Ambroſe*, in a Letter written to *Syagrius* Biſhop of *Verona*, makes mention of one *Zeno*, the Predeceſſor of this *Syagrius*, who ſeems to have govern'd the Church of *Verona* in the time of *Conſtantius*, or *Julian* the Apoſtate. The Teſtimony of S. *Ambroſe* has obliged thoſe that poſitively maintain that there was one *Zeno* Biſhop of *Verona*, a Martyr under the Empire of *Galienus*; it has obliged them, I ſay, to diſtinguiſh between two *Zeno*'s Biſhop of *Verona*; one put to Death under *Galienus*, and another that lived in the time of *Julian* the Apoſtate. But it is better to own frankly that 'tis a miſtake to believe, that there was one *Zeno* Biſhop of *Verona* in the time of *Galienus*. S. *Gregory* does indeed give the Name of Martyr to *Zeno* of *Verona*, but he does not tell us under what Emperor he ſuffered Martyrdom: And perhaps he might beſtow that Title upon him, becauſe he ſuffered ſome Perſecution under *Conſtantius*, or *Julian* the Apoſtate. Be that as it will, *Molanus* obſerves, That heretofore in the *Roman* Martyrology, they placed him among the conſiderable Biſhops that were Confeſſors: And *Onuphrius Panvinus* adds, That the Church of *Verona* anciently honoured him under that Quality, and that *Lippomanus* Biſhop of *Verona*, was the firſt that procured him the honour of a Martyr.

'Tis very certain, that the Sermons which we have under the Name of *Zeno*, cannot belong to him whom they ſuppoſe to have ſuffered Martyrdom under *Galienus*; for this Author in his Fifth Sermon ſpeaks of the Divinity of Jeſus Chriſt againſt the Hereticks that affirmed the *Word to be God*, but did not believe him to be Eternal as the Father, and ſuppoſed there was a time *when He was not*; which viſibly demonſtrates, That the Hereſie of the *Arians* was then on foot. Neither can theſe Sermons belong to that *Zeno* of *Verona*, who lived under *Conſtantius* and *Julian*; becauſe they are borrowed out of other Authors. There are Four Sermons of them that are (*a*) intirely S. *Baſil*'s. All the Homilies upon the *Pſalms* are taken word for word out of the Commentaries (*b*) of S. *Hilary*; which ſhews, That theſe Sermons attributed to *Zeno* of *Verona*, are a Collection of Sermons (c) ſtoln out of ſeveral Authors, and heaped together without any Choice. Some are ſhort, others are long; ſome are well written, and in an elevated Style; others ill, and in a mean pitiful one; ſome are clear, others obſcure. In ſhort, nothing can be imagined to be more unequal. In the Sermon of *Continence*, he reckons more than 400 Years ſince S. *Paul* wrote his Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*; and yet in other Homilies, he ſpeaks of Temples, Martyrs and Catechumens. All theſe things ſet it paſt Diſpute, that theſe Sermons attributed to *Zeno* of *Verona*, and unknown to all Antiquity, are a Collection of Sermons taken out of ſeveral Authors of different Times and different Countries, put together indiſcreetly by ſome ignorant Copier.

The ſame Cenſure ought in all probability to be paſſed upon the 18 Sermons cited by *Turrianus* under the name of *Euſebius* of *Alexandria*. This Author is unknown to the Ancients; neither was there a Biſhop of *Alexandria* (*d*) of this Name, for the Three firſt Ages of the Church: Therefore theſe Sermons belong to a more modern Author.

(*a*) *Intirely S.* Baſil's.] The Sermons of S. *Baſil* upon theſe Words, *Attende tibi*, *& de Livore & Invidia*, are entirely ſtoln; and the two other Homilies about Faſting and Temptation, are part of the two longeſt of S. *Baſil*.

(*b*) Of

(*b*) *Of S.* Hilary.] These Sermons upon the 126, 127, 128, 129 and 130 *Psalms*, belong to *S. Hilary*. Those upon the 49. 79 and 100 *Psalms*, might be his also; because we have lost the Commentaries of this Father upon the *Psalms*.

(*c*) *Stoln out of several Authors.*] Some of the long ones are taken out of Greek Authors, and the short ones out of the Latin Writers, and Fragments of Homilies.

(*d*) *A Bishop of this Name.*] *Eusebius* indeed, *Lib. 7. Chap.* 11. of his History, gives a good shop of Character of one *Eusebius*, a Deacon, that lived with *Dionysius* of *Alexandria*, who was afterwards Bishop of *Laodicea*; but this Man ought rather to call himself *Eusebius* of *Laodicea*, than *Eusebius* of *Alexandria*. *Zeno* Bi- *Verona.*

ARNOBIUS.

THough *Arnobius* and *Lactantius* lived the better part of their time in the Fourth Century of the Church, yet we shall nevertheless join them to the Authors of the Third, because they wrote with the same Spirit, and after the same manner; that is to say, they did not employ themselves in writing against the Heresies that rose in the Fourth Age, but only in confuting the Pagans in imitation of the Ancients. *Arnobius.*

Arnobius was Professor of Rhetorick at *Sicca*, a City of *Numidia* in *Africk* (*a*) under the Emperor *Diocletian*. He was first a Pagan; but as S. *Jerom* tells us in *Euseb. Chron.* being desirous to be converted, that he might more easily prevail with the Bishops to admit him among the Faithful, he composed, when he was but a Catechumen, Seven Eloquent Books against the Religion he had then left, and these Books were as Pledges or Hostages that procured for him the Favour of that Baptism he so earnestly sollicited. Now though it must be confessed, that he did not perfectly understand the Christian Religion when he wrote these Books, in which some Errors are to be found, yet he confuted the Absurdities of Paganism with singular Dexterity, and vigorously defended the principal Articles of our Religion.

He begins his First Book with confuting that Popular Calumny, which the Pagans so industriously advanced against the Christians, *viz.* That they were the Authors of all the Calamities and Miseries that afflicted the World. He shews, that this is a groundless and unreasonable Fancy, that there were Plagues and Famines, and Wars before our Saviours appearance, and that nothing had been changed since his coming: That he was so far from being the Author of their Miseries, that on the contrary, he brought abundance of Good unto the World; That Miseries proceed from Natural Causes, and that it often happens, that those things which in the common acceptation of Mankind pass for Misfortunes, don't prove so in effect; That if the Christians were the Cause of these Calamities, the World would have had no Interval without them ever since the appearance of Jesus Christ; That if the Pagan Deities sent these Miseries to Men for the Punishment of the Christians, they were unjust as well as weak; That the Christians worship the true God, and apprehend no dangers from false ones; That they adore Jesus Christ, but don't consider him as a Man that suffered Death for his own Transgressions, but as a real true God, who took the Humane Nature upon him to manifest himself to the World, to teach Mankind the ways of Truth, and to accomplish all those things for which he appeared upon Earth; That he died, and afterwards was raised up from the Grave, to satisfie all Men that the Hopes of their Salvation were certain. He proves the Divinity of Jesus Christ by the Examplar Holiness of his Life, by the Innocence of his Manners, by the great number of Miracles and Prodigies that were wrought by him, and by others that had Commission from him, by the Signs that appear'd upon the Earth at his Death; and then he shews, that we cannot reasonably question the Truth of these things, because the Evangelists, who have delivered them in writing, were Persons of great Integrity and Simplicity; That there is no reason to imagine they were so Vain, or indeed so Mad, as to pretend they saw those things that they never did see; especially since they were so far from reaping any Advantages from such Inventions, that they thereby exposed themselves to the Hatred of all the World.

In his Second Book, he demonstrates that Jesus Christ was wrongfully Persecuted, since he had done nothing to deserve the hatred of any one, since he was no Tyrant, and destroy'd no Body, since he acquired no Riches for himself, and did no manner of Injustice to the meanest Person. He likewise shews, that the Pagans had no certain Principles whereby to judge which was the true or false Religion; that they were very much in the wrong, for laughing at the Credulity of the Christians; since in the generality of things that have a relation to Human Life, Men usually manage themselves by the belief which they repose in particular Persons; That Jesus Christ merited a great deal more than all the Philosophers in the World, because of the Miracles which he wrought; That the Pagan Philosophers believed the same things that are received by the Christians; as for Instance, The Immortality of the Soul, the Resurrection of the Body, and Hell Fire. He takes occasion from thence to discourse of the Nature of Souls, he pretends that they are of a middle quality between a Spirit and a Body; that they are by Nature Mortal; but that God of his Goodness immortalizes the Souls of those who repose their Confidence in him. He confutes *Plato*'s Notions concerning the Souls Immortality, and it's Excellency, Dignity, Exile or Imprisonment in the Body. He supposes that it is Corporeal and *ex traduce*; That Man is but very little different from the Beasts; That his Soul is mortal by Nature, but that it becomes immortal by the Grace of God: Opinions unworthy of a Man that had been perfectly instructed in the true Religion. What he at the same time observes, that in the Matters of Religion we ought

not

Arnobius. not to indulge a fond Curiosity, nor endeavour to penetrate into the Reasons of God Almighty's Conduct, nor judge of it by our own Light, is infinitely more worthy of a Christian. 'Jesus Christ, says 'he, was God, and I ought to tell you so, though you are not willing to understand it, yet he is God 'and speaks unto us from God. He has commanded us not to perplex our selves with unprofitable 'Questions; let us therefore leave the Knowledge of these things to God, and not amuse our selves in 'a vain pursuit after them. And yet he does not forget to answer those Questions that were ordinarily proposed by the Pagans concerning Jesus Christ. Now they often demanded the reason, why our Blessed Saviour (since his Coming was so absolutely necessary for the Saving of Souls from Death) would suffer so long an Interval of time to pass before he came to deliver them. *Arnobius* replies, 'Is 'it possible for Man to know after what manner God dealt with the Ancients? Who has told you that 'he never relieved them any other way? Do you know how long it is since Men have been upon the 'Earth, or in what place the Souls of the Ancients are reserved? Who has informed you that Jesus 'Christ did not deliver them by his coming? Forbear then to torment your selves about these things, 'and meddle not with those Questions which 'tis impossible for Human Reason to resolve: Be persuaded that God has shewn Mercy to them; Jesus Christ perhaps had taught you how, and when, and 'after what manner it was done, if it would not have afforded matter to your Pride. But wherefore 'continued the Pagans, did not Jesus Christ deliver all Mankind? He invites, he calls upon all the 'World, says *Arnobius*; he rejects no body, he readily receives those that come to him; he only requires that Men would desire and wish for him; but he constrains and forces no Man, for otherwise 'it would be Violence, and not Grace. But are none but Christians delivered from Death? No, assuredly; for Jesus Christ alone has Power to effect it. But, say the *Pagans*, this is a new upstart Religion; and why should we quit that of our Ancestors for it? Why not, reply'd *Arnobius*, provided it 'is better? Did we never change our ancient Customs? Did we never alter our old Laws? Is there 'any thing in the World which had not a beginning at first? Ought we to esteem a Religion for the Antiquity of it, or rather for the sake of the Divinity which we honour? Within less than Two Thou'sand Years, none of the Gods that are now worshipped by the Pagans, were in being, whereas God 'and his true Religion has been from all Ages. Jesus Christ had his Reasons why he appeared when he 'did, though they are unknown to us. But why does he suffer those that worship him to be Perse'cuted? And why, replies *Arnobius*, do your Gods suffer you to be afflicted with Wars, with Pesti'lence and Famine, *&c.* As for us, 'tis not to be admired that we suffer in this Life, for nothing is 'promised to us in this World: On the contrary, all the Evils and Calamities which we suffer here, 'make way only for our Deliverance.

In the Three following Books, *Arnobius* falls upon the Pagan Religion, and shews, that the Christians had very great reason to reject a way of Worship so very Foolish, Extravagant and Impious.

In his Sixth and Seventh Books, he demonstrates that the Christians did very wisely not to Build Temples, or trouble themselves with the Pageantry of Statues, Images and Sacrifices, and that it is a ridiculous piece of Folly to imagine, that God dwells in Temples, that the Images are Gods, or that the Divinities are contained in them. Or lastly, That we honour the true God, when we Sacrifice Beasts, burn Incense, or pour out Wine in Adoration of him.

Thus we have considered the Subject of the Seven Books of *Arnobius*, that are written in a manner worthy of a Professor of *Rhetorick*. The turn of his Thoughts very much resembles that of an Orator, but his Style is a little *African*, that is to say, his Words harsh, ill-placed, unpolisht, and sometimes scarce Latin; and 'tis likewise evident that he was not perfectly acquainted with the Mysteries of our Religion. He attacks Paganism with a greater share of Skill and Vigour, than he defends Christianity, and discovers the Folly of That, better than he proves the Truth of This. But we ought not to be surprized at it, for 'tis the ordinary Fate of all new Converts, who being as yet full of their former Religion, know the weakness and blind-side of it better than they understand the Proofs and Excellencies of that Persuasion which they have newly embraced. I will say nothing concerning the Latin Commentary upon the *Psalms*, that carries the Name of *Arnobius*, because it is a certain truth, in which all the Learned World agrees, that this *Arnobius* is a different Person from him of whom we have been speaking; that he is of a later Date, and lived after the Council of *Chalcedon*, since he mentions the *Pelagians* and *Predestinarians*.

The Books of the Senior *Arnobius* were first published by *Faustus Sabæus*, and Printed at *Rome* by *Theodorus Priscianensis* in the Year 1542. out of a Manuscript belonging to the *Vatican* Library, but with abundance of Faults that were to be found in that Manuscript. *Galienus*, who afterwards set out another Edition of them at *Basil*, in 1546 and 1560. by *Frobenius*, took the liberty to Correct them upon his own bare Conjecture, and to insert his own Emendations into the Text. *Thomasinus* printed them at *Paris* 1570. *Canterus* Corrected the Edition of *Galienus*, and was the first Man that wrote Annotations upon *Arnobius*: His Edition was Printed by *Plantin* at *Antwerp* 1582. in *Octavo*. *Elmenhorstius* published a larger Comment upon him, and reviewed his Seven Books out of an ancient Manuscript. They are likewise Printed with *Heraldus*'s Notes, in the Year 1583 and 1603. at *Paris* 1605, and at *Hamburgh* 1610. *Stewechius*, a Learned Man, took pains also with the same Author, and printed him at *Doway* 1634. in *Octavo*. *Thysius* afterward revised his Edition, and caused it to be printed at *Leyden* by *le Maire*, with the Notes of several others, 1652 and 1657, in *Quarto*. Lastly, *Priorius* printed the Books of *Arnobius* against the *Gentiles*, at the end of S. *Cyprian*'s Works, at *Paris* by *Dupuis* in 1666.

(a) *Under the Emperor* Diocletian.] He wrote his Books toward the end of the Third, or the Beginning of the Fourth Century; for in his First Book he expressly tells us, That it was Three Hundred Years, more or less, since the Christians began to appear in the World.

LACTAN-

LACTANTIUS.

Lactantius.

L*ucius Cælius* (*a*) *Firmianus*, Surnamed *Lactantius*, was (*b*) Converted in his Youth to the Chriſtian Religion: He Studied *Rhetorick* in *Africk* in the School of *Arnobius*, but far ſurpaſſed his Maſter in Eloquence. Whileſt he was there, he writ a Book, Intituled, *Convivium*, or *The Banquet*; which acquired him ſo great a Reputation in the World, that he was ſent for to *Nicomedia* to teach *Rhetorick* there. But meeting with few Scholars there, becauſe it was a Grecian City, where they had no very great value for the Roman Eloquence; he gave himſelf altogether to the writing of Books. St. *Jerome* informs us, That he wrote a Poem in *Hexameter* Verſe, wherein he gave a Deſcription of his Voyage; and another Piece which he called, *The Grammarian*; but imagining, that he was obliged to employ his Learning and Time upon a better and higher Subject, he entred the Liſts in behalf of Religion. The Firſt Treatiſe, which he compoſed after this manner, was that about the *Work of God*: He afterwards undertook his Seven Books of *Inſtitutions*, (*c*) about the Year of our Lord 320, in which he ſtrenuouſly defends the Chriſtian Religion, and likewiſe Anſwers all thoſe that had written againſt it. After he had finiſhed them, he abridged them, and added the Book concerning the *Anger of God* to the reſt.

He likewiſe wrote Two Books to *Aſclepiades*, the Eight Books of Epiſtles; Four to *Probus*, Two to *Severus*, and Two to *Demetrianus*; but all theſe Books that were extant in St. *Jerome*'s time, are loſt at preſent. We have only recovered one Small Treatiſe *concerning Perſecution* mentioned by S. *Jerome*, which *Baluzius* has lately Publiſhed under the Title of *De Mortibus Perſecutorum*. He Promiſes ſeveral other Works of the ſame Author, as his *Diſputes againſt the Philoſophers, againſt the Jews, and againſt the Hereticks*; but there is no reaſon to believe that *Lactantius* ever compoſed theſe Pieces, ſince St. *Jerome* doth not mention them; at leaſt, that they were contained in his Epiſtles.

Conſtantine afterwards took him to be Tutor to his Son *Criſpus*, to inſtruct him in all manner of Learning. In the midſt of all theſe Honours he was ſo very Poor that he often wanted Neceſſaries, being very far from making any purſuits after Pleaſure. This is all that we know of the Hiſtory of this great and excellent Perſon; but even this very Circumſtance alone, as we find it related in *Euſebius's Chronicon*, may paſs for an extraordinary and magnificent Commendation of him, and ought to inſpire us with no mean Idea of his Piety. For he muſt certainly have been a very Vertuous Man, that could live poorly in a Court, that could neglect the Care even of Neceſſary things in the midſt of Plenty and Abundance, and had not the leaſt taſte of Pleaſures, when he reſided amongſt Perſons that were overwhelmed in them.

We are now to conſider the Subject of the Seven Books of *Lactantius*, which beſides the general Title of *Divine Inſtitutions*, have each of them a particular Inſcription, that acquaints us with the Matter whereof it Treats. The Firſt is Intituled, *De falſa Religione*, of *falſe Religion*; The Second, *De Origine Erroris*, of *the Original of Error*. The deſign of *Lactantius* in theſe Two Books is to demonſtrate the falſity of the Pagan Religion. In the firſt, after he has informed his Reader of the Reaſons that moved him to undertake ſuch a Work, and has made his Addreſſes to the Emperour *Conſtantine*, he ſhews that there is a Providence in the World, and that it is God who Rules and Governs it. He particularly enlarges upon this Second Propoſition, and makes it evident by ſeveral Arguments, by the Authority of the Prophets that have Eſtabliſhed it, and by the joint-Teſtimonies of the Poets, of the Philoſophers, of *Mercurius Triſmegiſtus*, of the *Sybils*, and the Oracle of *Apollo*, that there is only one God that Governs the World: And laſty, towards the latter part of this Book, he demonſtrates the Falſity of the Pagan Religion, by ſhewing that the Gods to whom they paid their Adoration, were Mortal Men; and not only ſo, but for the moſt part wicked and profligate Wretches. In the Second Book he goes on to confute the Pagan Religion, and directs his Diſcourſe chiefly againſt the Idols and Repreſentations of their Deities; and plainly proves, that it is the higheſt Degree of Madneſs and Stupidity to pay Adorations to them as Divine Beings. After this, coming to aſſign Reaſons for the Prodigies and Oracles, which the Pagans attributed to their Idols, he riſes as high as the Creation of the World, to furniſh himſelf with a fit occaſion of diſcourſing about the Nature of Dæmons, to whom he aſcribes all thoſe wonderful miraculous Effects. Laſtly, he ſhews, That the principal Cauſe of the Errors and Malice of Men is owing to the perpetual Temptations and Snares of the Devil; as alſo to the abandoning of *Cham* and his Poſterity.

(*a*) *Lucius Cælius.*] This is his proper Name. There are ſome Manuſcripts where he is called *Cecilius*. 'Tis ſuppoſed that he was Surnamed *Firmianus* from his Country, and *Lactantius* from the ſweetneſs of his Elocution; but this is not certain.

(*b*) *Converted in his Youth.*] See the Seventh Book of his Inſtitutions, Chapter the laſt, the Third Chapter of his Epitome, *l.* 2. *c.* 10. where he ſeems to reckon himſelf in the Number of thoſe, who after they had acknowledged their Error, were converted to the Truth. S. *Jerome* tells us, That he was the Diſciple of *Arnobius*.

(*c*) *About the Year of our Lord* 320.] *Lactantius* was at *Nicomedia* at the time of *Dioclesian*'s Perſecution in the Year 302. as he himſelf tells us, *Lib.* 5. of his *Inſtit. Chap.* 2. He tarried there till the Perſecution was over; afterwards he went to *France*, where he wrote his Book of *Inſtitutions*: for he ſpeaks of the Perſecutors in the Beginning of his Firſt Book, as if he were then in another Country; he therefore wrote it in the time of the Perſecution carried on by the Emperour *Licinius*, which began in the Year 320. So that the Name of *Arians*, that is to be found in ſome Manuſcripts of his Books, might perhaps have been added ſince.

Lactantius. The Third Book is Intituled, *De falſa Sapientia, Of falſe Wiſdom*; becauſe it is chiefly levelled at the Pagan Philoſophers, the Vanity of whoſe Philoſophy he endeavours to expoſe and diſcover: From hence he draws this Concluſion, That the only Wiſdom of Man is to know and worſhip God.

The Fourth is *concerning true Wiſdom*; and 'tis in this Book chiefly that he lays open the Doctrin of the Chriſtians. In the beginning of the Book he ſhews, That the Philoſophers were not able to find out the true Wiſdom, becauſe they never ſearched after it amongſt the *Jews*, and becauſe it is inſeparable from the Worſhip and Knowledge of the true God. He afterwards explains the Doctrin of the Chriſtians with relation to Jeſus Chriſt; and evidently proves, That the Pagans themſelves acknowledged that he was the Word and Wiſdom of God exiſting before the World; That this Word was begotten of God after an incomprehenſible manner; That he deſcended from Heaven, and was born of a Virgin, according to the Predictions of the Prophets, that the Gentiles might know the true God. He then gives an Account of the Life, the Miracles, and Death of Jeſus Chriſt; and ſhews, That it was neceſſary for him to undergo the infamous Puniſhment of the Croſs.

He afterwards demonſtrates, That though the Chriſtians do acknowledge that the Son is God, as well as the Father, yet they worſhip but one God; That the Father and Son are one Spirit, and one Subſtance, and one God, which he illuſtrates and explains by the Compariſons of a Fountain and its Stream, of the Sun and its Rays, *&c.*

Towards the End, he declaims in general againſt Hereſies; and tells us, That the Catholick Church only has retained the true worſhip of God; That it is the Sourſe of Truth, the Habitation of Faith, the Temple of God; That thoſe Men who never enter into it, or who depart from it, are out of hopes of obtaining Everlaſting Salvation; That no Man ought to flatter himſelf, whileſt he continues ſtedfaſt in his Obſtinacy, ſince his Eternal welfare is concerned in the Matter, which he will be in danger of loſing, unleſs he takes particular Care; That though all the Sects of Hereticks pretend and boaſt to be the Church, yet there is but one properly ſo called, which heals the Wounds of Man by the wholſome Remedies of Confeſſion and Repentance.

In the Fifth Book, that treats *of Juſtice*, He ſhews that the Pagans have no ſuch thing as true Juſtice; That 'tis impoſſible to find it any where but in the Chriſtian Religion; That it is a great Injuſtice to perſecute the Chriſtians, becauſe of their Perſuaſion; and that though they were in an Error, yet their Adverſaries ought to recover them out of it, by the force of Reaſon and not of Puniſhments; That we cannot, and that we ought not to conſtrain Men to be of any Religion; which is a thing not to be defended by Killing of others, but by Dying for it our ſelves; not by Cruelty but Patience; That the Sacrifices which are extorted from Men by Violence, neither ſignifie any thing to thoſe that offer them, nor to thoſe that cauſe them to be offered, nor to the Gods themſelves; That 'tis a ſurprizing thing that the Pagans could ſuffer the Superſtitions of the *Egyptians*, and Atheiſm of the Philoſophers, and yet ſhould bear ſuch an incurable hatred to the Religion of Jeſus Chriſt: In ſhort, That though God ſometimes permits Truth and Juſtice to be perſecuted; yet he never fails at laſt to puniſh Perſecutors with the utmoſt Severity.

The Sixth Book treats of *the true worſhip of God.* He diſtinguiſheth between Two ſorts of Worſhip, True, and Falſe; and Two ſorts of Ways, One that leads to Hell, and the Other that leads to Heaven. He tells us, That this laſt is a difficult Way, that we muſt paſs through Poverty, Ignorance, and a long Series of Sufferings before we can arrive at Virtue; That the Philoſophers ſearch'd after it to no purpoſe, ſince they neither knew what was Good, or what was Evil; having no Knowledge of God, who was the Author of Good, nor of the Devil, who is the Author of Evil; That the Law of God is made clear and manifeſt to us; That this Law contains two Principal Heads; The Firſt of Piety; The Second of Humanity. That Piety conſiſts in worſhiping God, and that Humanity which is alſo called Mercy and Charity, conſiſts in our mutually aſſiſting one another to our utmoſt Endeavours, ſince we are deſcended from the ſame Father; That if we would acquit our ſelves of this Duty, we ought to beſtow Alms, to relieve the Sick and Neceſſitous, to protect Orphans and Widows, to redeem Captives, and bury the Dead; and that the Apprehenſion of becoming poor, ought not to hinder us from giving conſiderable Alms, becauſe they blot out and efface our Sins.

He afterwards diſcourſes about the Paſſions, and demonſtrates, contrary to the Sentiments of the Philoſophers, That Mercy or Compaſſion is not a Vice, but a Virtue; and that Fear and Love, which are Vices when they carry a Man to Earthly things, are Vertues when they move him towards Heaven. From hence, he proceeds to the Precepts of Juſtice that are leſs general, ſuch as are the following ones; Not to Lye, not to be guilty of Uſury, not to exact Gifts from the Poor, not to revenge our ſelves of our Enemies, to ſpeak well of thoſe that revile us, to moderate our Paſſions, and to refrain from the purſuit of Senſual Pleaſures. After he has thus ſhewn the way of Juſtice, he ſays, That if it ſhould happen that a Man ſhould forſake this way by falling into ſome Sin; yet he ought not to deſpair, but turn away from his Evil Practices, and ſatisfie God, who knows our ſecret Thoughts. In one word, That the Sacrifice, which we are to preſent, ought to be Spiritual, and that we ought to offer him the Purity of our Hearts, and the Praiſes due to his Divinity.

The Laſt Book of his Inſtitutions treats about *Happineſs, and a happy Life.* He ſhews, that this ſuppoſes the Immortality of the Soul, which he demonſtrates by ſeveral Arguments; and likewiſe that this Mortal Life can never be Happy, unleſs we take care to preſerve Juſtice. He afterwards diſcourſeth of the End of the World, which he imagines muſt happen Six Thouſand Years after

its

its Creation, *(d)* and of the Signs that shall precede it, amongst which he reckons the Destruction of the *Roman* Empire, and of the last Judgment; wherein he tells us, God shall, as it were, weigh both Good and Evil; and that those who have committed more Evil than Good, shall be condemned to Everlasting Punishment; That on the contrary, those who are altogether Just, shall not in the least manner feel the Divine Fire; but that those who are in a middle condition, shall be examined by it, and so purified from their Sins; That after this Solemn Trial is over, Jesus Christ shall Reign a Thousand Years upon Earth with the Just, and when that Course of Time is finished, the World shall be renewed, all Mankind shall be raised again, and God shall make the Just like to Angels, that they may be in his Presence, and serve him during a happy Eternity; but that he will throw the Wicked head-long into Everlasting Fire. He concludes all, with exhorting Mankind to be Converted and Repent while they have an Opportunity of so doing; that so they may put themselves in a Condition of fearing nothing at that Great and Terrible Day. "We cannot carry any thing along with "us, says he, but the Innocence of our Lives. Those only shall appear rich before God, that bring "along with them, if I may use the Expression, the Vertues of Mercy, of Patience, of Charity, "and of Faith. This is the Inheritance which cannot be ravished from us, and which we cannot "transmit to any one besides: And who are they that desire to acquire these Blessings? Let them "that are Hungry come to the Celestial Bread of the Word of God that they may be everlastingly "satisfied. Let them that are Thirsty come to quench their Thirst with the Water of this Heavenly "Fountain; Let no Man ground his hopes upon his Riches, or his Power; for these things are not "able to make us happy for ever; but let us bind our selves to the observation of Justice, which "will accompany us even to God's Tribunal, where we shall certainly receive the recompence, "which he has promised us. *Lactantius.*

The Epitome or entire Abridgment of these Seven Books composed by *Lactantius* himself, is lost: what is extant, begins at the End of the Fifth Book, the rest was lost in S. *Jerome*'s time. This Abridgment contained the very same things with the Books themselves, only more succinctly treated, and thrown into a narrower compass.

In the Book *of God's Anger*, *Lactantius* endeavours to prove, that God is capable of Anger, as well as of Mercy and Compassion.

In the Book *of the Work of God*, he establisheth Providence by demonstrating the Excellence of his Principal Work, which is Man; for which Reason, he makes an Elegant Description of all the Parts of his Body, and the Proprieties or Faculties of his Soul.

The Book of *Persecution*, or rather *of the Deaths of the Persecutors*, lately published by *Baluzius*, and quoted by S. *Jerome*, was writ immediately after the end of that Persecution, which was begun in the Year 303, under *Diocletian*, and ended 313, by the Death of *Maximinus*, when *Licinius* and *Constantine* were Masters of the Empire. 'Tis written to a Confessor, whose Name was *Donatus*, who suffered several times courageously for the Christian Religion during that Persecution. The Subject which *Lactantius* proposes to himself in this Treatise, is to shew, That the Emperours who persecuted the Christians, died all miserably. He there describes and relates the several Persecutions which the Church suffered; and likewise the exemplary Punishments which God deservedly inflicted upon these persecuting Tyrants. After he has in a few Words briefly run over the Sufferings of the Church under the Emperours *Nero*, *Domitian*, *Decius*, *Valerian*, and *Aurelian*, and given an account of the Tragical Deaths of these bloody Princes; he enlarges more copiously upon the following Persecution. He gives a particular Account of the History of *Diocletian*, *Maximian*, *Galerius*, *Severus*, *Maxentius*, and *Maximinus*, and tells us how they came to be Emperours, and what was the occasion of the Divisions, and Wars that were raised between them. He represents in lively colours the horrid Cruelties which they exercised upon the poor Christians, and how by the visible Chastisement of God Almighty, they came to a lamentable End. This small Treatise is writ with a great deal of Flame and Elegance, and is exactly agreeable in the Historical Part to the Revolution of the *Roman* State under these Emperours. We find several Matters of Fact related there, which were unknown to us before, and many other Passages are illustrated, and set in a better light. He there discovers the Policy and Designs of all these Emperours; And lastly, makes it visibly appear, that the Hand of God was upon them to punish them for their Cruelty and ill Usage of the Christian Professors. There are few things in this Book that relate to the Doctrin of the Christians, but he seems to take notice, that S. *Peter* came not to *Rome* till the Beginning of *Nero's* Reign: And he likewise tells us, That as the Emperour *Maximinus* was offering Sacrifice, one of his Officers made the Sign of the Cross, and thereupon to their great trouble, the Dæmons disappeared.

Besides these Works, whereof we have already discourst, there are Three Poems attributed to *Lactantius*, which are not mentioned by S. *Jerome*, nor are to be found in the Ancient Manuscripts; and therefore in all probability they are none of his.

The First, is a Poem *concerning the History of the Phœnix*; but the Author of this Piece was certainly no Christian but a Pagan; for he not only describes the Deluge like a Heathen, and contrary to *Moses*'s Account, but he also speaks of *Phœbus*; as if he owned and acknowledged him for a God. The Second Poem *concerning Easter*, is addressed to one *Felix* a Bishop, and was composed by a Christian Author, who lived after *Lactantius*; 'tis attributed to *Venantius Fortunatus*, upon the Testimony and Authority of some Manuscripts in the *Vatican* Library. The Third is *about the Passion of Jesus Christ*, but is not to be found in any ancient Manuscript of *Lactantius*; besides, it does not in the

(d) Six Thousand Years after its Creation.] So that he seems to have thought that there were no more than 200 Years to reckon from his own time to the Day of Judgment.

Lactantius. leaſt come up to the Purity and Eloquence of his Style, and beſides he mentions the Adoration of the Croſs. There are likewiſe ſome *Arguments upon* Ovid's *Metamorphoſis*, and *Notes upon the Thebais* of *Statius*, that ſome Perſons have attributed to *Lactantius*, but they really belong to *Lactantius Placidius*, a Grammarian. They are quoted by *Boetius* and *Sedulius*.

Lactantius is the moſt Eloquent of all the Eccleſiaſtick Authors that wrote in Latin; His Style is Pure, Equal and Natural; in a word, it is extremely like *Cicero*'s, and he Juſtly deſerves the Name of *the Chriſtian Cicero*, not only for the cleanneſs and purity of his Language; but alſo for the Turn of his Phraſe, and his Way of Writing, which is ſo conformable to that of *Tully*, that the moſt accurate Criticks have been troubled to find out any difference between them: Nay, there have been ſome Perſons in the World, as we are informed by (*e*) *Picus Mirandula*, who made no difficulty at all of preferring his Style to *Cicero*'s.

Be that as it will, we are very certain that *Lactantius* abundantly ſurpaſſeth *Cicero* in his Thoughts, becauſe the Matter of that Religion, which he ſo handſomly defends, does infinitely excel the Maxims and Doctrin of the Philoſophers. He confutes Paganiſm with all the Ardour and Spirit imaginable, and he likewiſe ſolidly eſtabliſhes the Chriſtian Religion. He diſcourſes of God after a very ſublime exalted manner; He explains the Divinity of the Word, and the Myſtery of the Incarnation in an Orthodox Way; He deſcribes the Creation of the World, and the Day of Judgment, by as lively and ſolemn a repreſentation as any Body have ever yet uſed; but at the ſame time it muſt be acknowledged, that he has ſometimes inſerted falſe, uncertain and fabulous things into his Diſcourſes. He is full of admirable Precepts of Morality; he lays down Deſcriptions of all the Vertues clearly and perſpicuouſly, and with an invincible Eloquence exhorts Mankind to the Practice of them; he ſhews them the way of Juſtice, and deterrs them from purſuing the Paths of Iniquity; he teaches them to honour God with a true ſincere Adoration, and to be throughly Penitent for their Sins. We ought however to own that he has handled Theology after a very Philoſophical manner; but that he did not examine all our Myſteries to the bottom, and that he has committed ſeveral Miſtakes.

Pope *Damaſus* writing to S. *Jerome*, is pleas'd to ſay, That he took no great pleaſure in reading *Lactantius*'s Books; becauſe he frequently turned over ſeveral Pages, where he diſcourſeth of things that have no manner of Relation to our Religion.

S. *Jerome* paſſes this Judgment of him, That he was better able to deſtroy and confute the Errours of the Gentiles, than to maintain the Doctrin of the Chriſtians; He is accuſed of doubting whether the Holy Ghoſt was the Third Perſon, and to have ſometimes confounded him with the Son, and ſometimes with the Father; but it may be alledged in his defence, That he meant nothing elſe, but that the Name of the Spirit in Scripture, is common to the Father and Son. But whatever the Matter is, we find no Footſteps of this Errour in any of his Works that are now remaining, though in ſome places he takes occaſion to ſpeak of the Holy Ghoſt. He ſeems to have been of Opinion, That the Word was generated in time; but it is an eaſie matter to give a Catholick ſenſe to that Expreſſion, as we have ſeen it done to others, and we may be with Juſtice allow'd to do ſo, ſince he plainly eſtabliſhes the Divinity of the Word in that very place. His Opinion concerning Angels, that being ſent to guard and protect Men, they were afterward ſeduced by the Temptation of the Devil, and that falling in Love with Women, they begot Terreſtrial Dæmons upon them; as it is properly peculiar to him, ſo it is an erroneous Imagination without any Grounds to ſupport it. What he ſays about the End of the World, The Reign of a Thouſand Years, The Fire of Judgment which will prove Men that have been Sinners, is common to him with divers other Authors; as alſo what he delivers about the ſtate of Souls after Death, being kept in a Common Priſon in expectation of the Day of Judgment, pretending that God created them all before the Creation of the World. I take no notice of ſeveral other Errors of leſs Conſequence, and ſome harſh Expreſſions, which may be (*f*) interpreted in a favourable ſenſe.

The Works of this Author have been Printed often. The Firſt Edition that appeared, was at *Rome* 1468. in *Folio*, by *Conradus Leweynheim*. The Second at *Rome* 1470. was Reviſed by an *Italian*

(*e*) *Picus Mirandula.*] Picus lib. de Hiſt. Divinæ Philoſophiæ, c. 7. *Quis apud nos non videat eſſe Ciceronem, ſed Chriſtianum, hoc eſt, aliquem, qui eum ad lineam vivumq; expreſſerit? Quis enim non advertit Lactantium Firmianum æquaſſe ipſum, & forte præcelluiſſe in. Eloquendo?*

Idem, lib. 3. Epiſt. 10. *Lactantius Ciceronis ſtilum effigiavit, vel ut quibuſdam placet, ſupergreſſus eſt; mihi videtur rebus & ſententiis crebrior, nec numeris injucundior, nec ſibi æquabilitate & candore poſterior. Has quippe virtutes viribis maximus & æmulatus, & aſſecutus eſt; hunc nec æqualem poſter imomorderunt, nemo elumbem & fractum, Aſiaticum & redundantem nemo cauſatus eſt.*

(*f*) *Interpreted in a favourable ſenſe.*] In the Firſt Book, Chapter the 7th. he ſays, That God made Himſelf. His meaning is, That he is of Himſelf, and was not Created. He tells us, *Lib.* 4. *Cap.* 14. That *Jeſus Chriſt* is never called *God*, leſt it ſhould be thought that there were two Gods. In the Fourth Book, Chap. 13th. he ſays, That the Son of God was made Man, that he might be Ἀπάτωρ, as well as he was Ἀυτάτωρ. which is a vain Conceit. He ſays, *Lib.* 2. *Cap.* 9. That Darkneſs is from the Devil, who imitates God; and in the Second Book, Chapter the 12th. That Man was compoſed of two Natures that ſtrive together; words that carry a Tincture of the *Manichean* Doctrin, unleſs they be favourably interpreted. In the Sixth Book, Chap. 1[illegible]. He ſays, That Alms blot out the Sins of the Fleſh: And he ſeems in the ſame place to maintain, That they who ſin without Paſſion and without Surprize, ſhall never obtain Forgiveneſs for their Sins. In the Seventh Book, Chap. 5. & 14. He ſpeaks of Immortality after ſuch a manner, as might make us believe, that he was perſwaded that the firſt Man was created Mortal. He falls into horrible groſs Miſtakes in his Chronology; as for inſtance, when he tells us, *Lib.* 4. *Cap.* 5. that *Moſes* was 500 Years, and *Solomon* an Hundred and Fifty before the taking of *Troy*. In the Third Book, Chap. 23. He denies that there are any ſuch things as *Antipodes*.

lian

Lactantius.

lian Biſhop. The Third was at *Venice* 1472, and it was afterwards Printed in the ſame City in the Years 1483. 1490. 1493. By *Bennalius* in 1509. 1511. 1515. By *Mauritius* in 1521. and 1535. At *Paris* by *Petitus* in 1509.

At *Rome* in 1574. in 1583. and 1650. At *Florence* in 1513. At *Baſil* in 1521. 1523. 1546. and 1563. Twice in 1556. At *Lyons* in 1532. 1540. At *Antwerp* by *Plantin* in 1539. 1582. and in 1570. 1587. and in 1553. 1556. At *Geneva* in 1613. At *Leyden* in 1662. At *Amſterdam* in 1652.

Eraſmus, Thomaſius, Iſæus, Barthius, Thiſius, Thaddenſis, Galæus, have wrote Notes upon this Author, that are joined together in this laſt Edition.

The laſt Edition is that which was Printed at *Amſterdam*, with the Commentaries of ſeveral Authors. I have been aſſured by a very Learned Man, That it is not only far from being the beſt, but that it is one of the worſt Editions that ever came out of this Author.

[Since the Edition of *Amſterdam*, Dr. *Spark* ſet out an Edition of *Lactantius* at *Oxon*, to which he annexed his Book *De mortibus Perſecutorum*, with Notes of his own, and a Diſſertation of Mr. *Dodwell's De Ripa Striga*; to explain a difficult Paſſage in that little Book. Before this Edition came out, it was Printed by it ſelf at *Oxon* in *Twelves*, in the Year 1680. Corrected in many places by the Biſhops of *Oxford* and S. *Aſaph*, and by Dr. *Iſaac Voſſius*, who endeavoured to ſupply the *Lacunæ*, which were in *Baluzius's* Manuſcript Copy, from whence theſe Editions were taken. The *Cambridge* Edition 1685. in *Octavo*, of this little Book was taken from theſe. Since it was Publiſhed again by it ſelf at *Abo*, with ſome Notes of *Cuperus* at the End, by *Toinardus*.]

COMMODIANUS.

Commodianus.

HERE are Two Authors of the Fourth Century, whoſe Works have the ſame Character and Genius with thoſe that were compoſed by the Writers of the Three firſt Centuries.

The Firſt is called *Commodianus*: He is no where mentioned by the Ancients; but in reading his Poetry, 'tis an eaſie matter to ſee that it is not Suppoſititions. *Gelaſius* places his Books amongſt thoſe which he calls *Apochryphal*, becauſe the Millenary Opinion is here maintain'd, and *Gennadius* ſpeaks of this Author in the following Words. "*Commodianus* giving up himſelf to the Study of "Humane Learning, read alſo the Books of the Chriſtians. This gave him a favourable Opportunity "of embracing the Faith. Being now become a Chriſtian, and deſirous to offer to Jeſus Chriſt the "Author of his Salvation a Preſent befitting a Man of Learning, he wrote a Treatiſe againſt the Pa-"gans in Verſe, which is compoſed in a middle Style, neither Verſe, nor Proſe: And becauſe he had "but ſlightly turned over our Authors, he was able to confute the Pagan Religion with more eaſe, "than to eſtabliſh that of the Chriſtians. Hence it is that he ſpeaks of the Divine Recompences af-"ter a groſs manner, following in this the Opinion of *Tertullian, Lactantius* and *Papias*. But his "Morals are Excellent, and he perſuades Men to embrace a voluntary Poverty." This is the Opinion of *Gennadius* concerning this Author, who lived in the Beginning of the Fourth Age, in the time of Pope *Sylveſter* (*a*). He calls himſelf *Commodianus* (*b*), and by way of Alluſion *Gazæus* (*c*), and gives himſelf the Title of *the Beggar of Jeſus Chriſt*. He tells us, That he was once engaged in the Errors of the Heathens; but that he was converted by reading the Law of the Chriſtians. His Work is entituled, *Inſtructions*; and is compoſed after the Faſhion of Verſe: I ſay after the Faſhion of Verſe, becauſe he neither obſerves Meaſure, nor Cadence in it; but only takes care that every Line ſhall compriſe a finiſhed ſenſe, and ſhall begin with an Acroſtick, in ſuch manner, that all the Letters of the Title of every *Strophe* are to be found one after another at the beginning of each Verſe; and thus by taking all the firſt Letters of the Verſe, we find the entire Title.

His Stile is harſh, his Words barbarous, and his Thoughts are ſeldom elevated. The Author appears to have been a Good Man, very ſimple, very humble, very charitable, throughly affected with the love of Jeſus Chriſt, zealous for his Religion, auſtere in his Morals, an enemy to Vice, far removed from the Pleaſures of the World, and a ſingular good Monk, as *Rigaltius* has obſerved of him. Though after all, we muſt own, that he was not very Ignorant; for there is a tolerable ſtore of Prophane Learning in his Work, and we meet there with ſeveral Remarks upon the Pagan Deities that are exceeding Curious and Rare, as well as Entertaining. He ſeems to have had a great deal of good Senſe, of Quickneſs, and Chriſtian Morality: This Treatiſe was for a long time buried in Obſcurity, and was lately found in our days. *Sirmondus* had it Copied from an old Manuſcript, and *Rigaltius* made uſe of this Copy, and Printed it ſeparately in the Year 1650. We may divide it into Three Parts. The Firſt, which contains Thirty ſix *Strophes*, is addreſſed to the *Gentiles*; whom he exhorts to embrace the Religion of Jeſus Chriſt, after he has expoſed the Falſhood of the Divinities which they Adored. The Second is directed to the *Jews*; whom he likewiſe perſwades to embrace the Chriſtian Religion, ſhewing them, that the Law was merely Figurative. He there ſpeaks concerning Anti-

(*a*) *In the time of Pope* Sylveſter.] Chap. 33. He exhorts the Pagans to join themſelves to the Congregation of *Sylveſter*; which Plainly ſhews, that he lived at that time, and wrote in *Rome* or in *Italy*, though his ſtyle is *African*.

(*b*) *Commodianus*] At the end of his Work he tells us, That his Name may be found out by ſearching after it in his Verſes; now if we take the firſt Letters of every Verſe in the Laſt *Strophe*, and put them together, we ſhall find *Commodianus Mendicus Chriſti*.

(*c*) *Gazæus.*] In all Probability he is ſo called *a Gaza*, as he is named *Commodianus a Commodis*.

chriſt;

Commodianus.

chriſt, the leſt Judgment, and the Reſurrection. The Laſt is addreſſed to the Chriſtian Catechumens, to the Faithful, and to the Penitents, to whom he gives admirable Inſtructions in Morality. It begins at the Forty ſixth *Strophe*.

We find in this Author moſt of the Errors of the Ancients. He is of Opinion that the Dæmons were Angels, that were debauched with the love of Women; and that the Giants came from this Illegitimate Commerce; That the World will end after Six Thouſand Years; That *Nero* was Antichriſt; That there will be Two Reſurrections, That of the Juſt before the Reign of the Thouſand Years, and the General One at the Day of Judgment; That the Juſt after the Firſt Reſurrection, ſhall live a Thouſand Years upon the Earth; That after that time, all Men ſhall be judged, the wicked thrown head-long into Fire, and the whole face of Nature changed. His Moral Inſtructions are very Excellent. He recommends to the Conſideration of the Catechumens to lead a Life free from Sin. He adviſes the Penitents to pray Night and Day, to live after an auſtere manner, that they may obtain Remiſſion of their Sins. He exhorts the Faithful to avoid all Evil, and to baniſh from their Hearts the very Motions of Hatred, aſſuring them, That Martyrdom will ſtand them in little ſtead, if they have an Averſion towards their Brethren. He repreſents to Apoſtates the greatneſs of their Sin, and admoniſhes all Chriſtians in General, that being Souldiers of Jeſus Chriſt, they ought continually to wage War with their Paſſions. He prohibits them to appear at the Prophane Shows. He adviſes Chriſtian Women to be Modeſt, to avoid Luxury and Magnificence of Apparel. He gives incomparable Inſtructions to Miniſters and Prieſts, that they may acquit themſelves worthily in their Miniſtry, and perſuades them to lead a Life unblameable, and exempt from Avarice; but above all, to relieve the Neceſſities of the Poor. He counſels the Rich not to value themſelves the more highly upon the ſcore of their Riches, but to communicate part to the Indigent; to aſſiſt and viſit thoſe that are in Sickneſs, and to Comfort thoſe that labour under Affliction. He ſays, That we ought not to lament the Death of our Children or Relations. He condemns all Funeral Pomps, and proud Interments. He powerfully reprehends thoſe Perſons that don't obſerve Silence in the Church. "The Prieſt of the Lord, ſays he, has ſaid, Lift up your Hearts "to God; you anſwer, That you have; and yet immediately forget the Word. He prays to the "Lord in behalf of the People, and in the mean time you are entertaining one another with ſtories; "you Laugh, you ſpeak Evil of your Neighbours, you talk inconſiderably, as if God were abſent, "even he that has made all, that ſees all, and underſtands all. He adviſes thoſe that Pray to God, to purifie their Hearts, before they addreſs themſelves to Him by way of Prayer. In a word, The laſt Part of his Inſtructions contains excellent Exhortations, to incline Chriſtians to the Love and Practice of Vertue, to turn them away from Vice, and his Remonſtrances concerning the corrupt Manners of the Chriſtians, and the Irregularities of his own time, carry a very near reſemblance to thoſe of our Age.

JULIUS FIRMICUS MATERNUS.

Julius Firmicus Maternus.

THIS Author, of whom none of the Ancients have made mention, has written a Treatiſe, Intituled, *Of the Errors of Prophane Religions*, which he has addreſſed to the Emperors *Conſtantius* and *Conſtans*, the Sons of *Conſtantine*. The Style and Matter of this Book abundantly convince us, that it is no Spurious Piece, and the Title it carries, gives us an occaſion to Conjecture, that it was writ after the Death of *Conſtantine*, the Eldeſt Son of *Conſtantine* the Great, which happened in the Year, 340, and before that of *Conſtans*, who was Slain by *Magnentius* in the Year 350; for it being addreſſed to *Conſtantius* and *Conſtans* there is reaſon to believe that *Conſtantine* their Eldeſt Brother was already dead, and 'tis very evident that *Conſtans* was then alive. We don't know what the Author was, of what Country, or of what Profeſſion. (a) *Baronius* believes that he was Biſhop of *Milan*; but without any ſolid Foundation. There are Eight Books of Aſtronomy that bear the ſame Name. Now ſome Perſons are of Opinion that they were compoſed by another Author. (b) *Labbe* maintains, that they belong to the ſame Man; but we cannot poſitively aſſert either one or the other. This Treatiſe *De Errore Prophanæ Religionis* was Printed at *Venice* in the Year 1499. At *Baſil* by *Hervagius* in 1533. At *Strasbourgh* in 1562. And afterwards with *Wouverus*'s Notes by *Frobenius* in 1603. Afterwards it was joyned with *Minutius Felix*, and Printed at *Amſterdam* in 1645. And in 1652. At *Leyden* in 1562, in *Quarto*. 'Tis likewiſe to be found in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*. And laſtly, it was put at the end of the laſt Edition of S. *Cyprian*, which was Printed at *Paris* 1666. The

(a) Baronius *believes, that he was Biſhop of* Milan.] *Baronius* imagins that he was Biſhop of *Milan* in the time of *Julius*, and that he aſſiſted at a Council, held at *Rome* under that Pope. There is indeed mention made of one *Maternus* a Biſhop of *Milan*, who ſuffered in *Dioclefian*'s time in the Martyrologies of the 18th of *July*. But he that was the Author of this Treatiſe, never took upon him the Quality of a Biſhop; and we don't find it related in any Authors of Credit and Reputation in the World, that there ever was a Biſhop of *Milan* of that Name. On the contrary, it appears by S. *Athanaſius*, That in the time of *Julius* there was no Biſhop of that Name at *Milan*: And the *Roman* Council, of which *Baronius* is to be underſtood, is a Chimerical Council invented by *Iſidorus*.

(b) Labbe *maintains, that they belong to the ſame Man.*] *Poſſevinus* and *Simlerus* diſtinguiſh them, and call the laſt the Younger of the two. *Labbe* pretends, that he lived in the Years 334 and 337, and according to this Computation, he might perhaps be the Author of the Treatiſe, *De Errore Profanæ Religionis*.

Author

Author of it discovers the Original of all the several Religions amongst the Pagans, and shews the absurdity of them. In the first place, he shews how prodigiously Men have debased themselves in making Gods of the Four Elements. Secondly, he lays open the Extract and Rise of the fabulous Deities, giving an Historical Account of those things which the Poets have so disguised in Fiction. In the Third place, he demonstrates the Absurdity and Impiety of the Pagan Theology, where several Persons have had the good luck to drop into an Almightyship, only for being more exquisitely villainous than the rest of their Fellow-Creatures. In the fourth place, he takes occasion to refresh their Memories with several particulars relating to their Gods, as how they have been slain, wounded and ill-used by Men. Fifthly, he pretends that the Religion of the *Ægyptains* derived its Original from *Joseph*, and that their God *Serapis* is the same with the above-mentiond Patriarch, who is so called, because he was the Son of *Sarah*. (This Reason in my Opinion appears to be weak, and ill-grounded.) Sixthly, he observes, that Men have Deified abundance of things which they either love, or have frequent occasion for; and thus they call Eating and Drinking their *Dii Penates*, or their Housheld Gods: Thus *Vesta* is the Domestick Fire we daily use, and the same Judgment may be passed of several others, and for this Reason it has happened, that the Names of their Gods denote, the Proprieties of Natural Things. In a word, he Describes and Enumerates the Prophane Signs, or Mysterious Words that are used by the Pagans in their Way of Worship, and he applies them to Jesus Christ with a great deal of Wit. To say the Truth, This Treatise is exceeding Elegant, and is abundantly stored with a great deal of Profound Learning; the Author of it shews a considerable Stock of Knowledge, Wit and Eloquence; he frequently Exhorts the Emperours to destroy the Pagan Temples, to suppress their Religion, and to make use of strong and violent Remedies, to cure Men of their Maladies, and retrieve them from their Extravagancies and Errors. At the same time he Exhorts all Men to feed and nourish themselves with the Bread of Jesus Christ, which is his Word and his Doctrin, (for he does not speak of the Eucharist in this place, as some Persons have vainly imagined) to embrace the Light, and come to the Marriage of the Celestial Bridegroom. He tells us there, that God made himself Man to save us, and restore us to that Immortality, which we lost and forfeited by the Fall of *Adam*; that if he had not assumed a Body in the Womb of the Virgin, and suffer'd an ignominious Death for the sake of Mankind, all the Jews, even those of the Old Testament, had never been in a Capacity of obtaining Salvation. He teaches us, that the Soul is Immortal and Spiritual, and that the Dæmons were frequently disturbed and ejected out of the Bodies of those Persons, whom they had possessed, by the powerful Prayers and Intercessions of the Christians. He acquaints us with several Figures or Types of the Cross, drawn out of the Old Testament. Lastly, to speak a Word or Two concerning his Morals; he severely declaims and inveighs against those that disguise themselves in Female Habits. These are the Principal and most considerable Heads that are discoursed of in this Treatise. As for his Astronomical, and Mathematical Books, they are divided into Eight Parts. That Work was first Printed by *Aldus Manutius* at *Venice*, in the Year 1499. Reviewed by one who calls himself *Pascennius*, and afterwards Printed in the same place in 1501. Lastly, It was Published at *Basil* by *Hervagius*, and Corrected by *Bucherius* in the Year 1551.

Julius Firmicus Maternus.

Of the COUNCILS *that were Held in the* First Ages *of the Church.*

THE Canons and Acts of the Councils, ought to be reckoned among the Works of the Ecclesiastical Authors, since they are the Works of Several Persons assembled in the same place to deliberate upon the Affairs of the Church, that concern either the Faith, or the Discipline, or the Manners of Christians. These Kinds of Assemblies were used in the First Ages of the Church, and the Apostles were the first Authors of them. For the Christians of the Primitive Church, having had some Disputes, Whether they were obliged to Circumcise and Follow the Law of *Moses*; The Apostles and Priests convened at *Jerusalem*, to Examine and Resolve upon this Matter, and at last concluded, That it was not necessary to impose these Burdens upon Christians; but only enjoyned them to abstain from Meats offered to Idols, from Blood, and from things Strangled, and from Fornication. (*a*) This was the First, and Only Council, to speak properly, that was held by the Apostles themselves.

Councils.

(*a*) *And only Council of the Apostles.*] They usually reckon Four. The first concerning the Election of St. *Matthias*; Acts 1. The Second concerning the Election of Deacons, *Acts* 6. The Third, that whereof we now speak, *Acts* 15. The Fourth, *Acts* 21. Where the Priests of *Jerusalem* declare, that the Converted *Jews* might observe the Law, and Exhort St. *Paul* to make a Vow. But in strictness of Speech, only the Third of these Assemblies deserves the Name of a Council. The two First were not held upon the account of any Controversie; nothing was there decided; the Christians found themselves Assembled together, but were not expressly Summoned. In short, they were Assemblies of all the Christians, and not of the Apostles only. The fourth was rather a familiar Conversation, than a Synodical Deliberation; and they only give some Council and an Advertisement to St. *Paul*, without deciding any Matter. And thus 'tis the Third Assembly alone, that deserves to be called a Council. The Council of *Antioch* is spurious, as we have elsewhere shewn.

Afte

Councils. After their Example, when any Difference aroſe in the Church, or when it was neceſſary to make any Regulations; the Biſhops, and oftentimes the Prieſts themſelves met together, to decide the controverted Queſtions, and appoint Laws for the better Government and Diſcipline of the Church. 'Tis true indeed, that in the Three Firſt Ages of the Church, theſe Aſſemblies were more rare, and leſs remarkable, than they were in the following Centuries; as well becauſe the continual Perſecutions of the Emperours hindered the Biſhops from meeting freely and in Publick; as alſo becauſe the Tradition of the Apoſtles being as yet freſh in Mens Memories, it was not ſuppoſed neceſſary to Summon a Council for the Eſtabliſhing of every Truth, and Condemnation of every Error. Hence it is, that we don't find (*b*) in any credible Authors, that any Councils were held to Condemn the firſt Hereticks, ſuch as were the *Simonians*, the *Carpocratians*, the *Baſilidians*, the *Gnoſticks*, &c. The Errors of theſe Hereticks were looked upon with horror by all the Chriſtians, who conſidered the Authors of them; and likewiſe thoſe that maintained them, as Perſons already Excommunicated, and ſeparated from the Church, without the Solemnity and Trouble of Convening a Synod to Excommunicate them by Name. In ſhort, every Biſhop inſtructed his own People in the True Faith of the Church, and confuted all ſorts of Errors by the Authority of Scripture, and Tradition.

The firſt Councils, that are mentioned in Antiquity, are thoſe that were held under the Pontificate of Pope *Victor*, to adjuſt the celebrated Controverſie about keeping *Eaſter*; and ſome others that were Aſſembled almoſt at the ſame time to ſuppreſs the growing Faction of the *Montaniſts*. *Euſebius* mentions the laſt in the Fifth Book of his Hiſtory, *Chap.* 15. and *Tertullian* aſſures us, That in his time the *Montaniſts* alſo met together (*c*) for themſelves. As for what relates to the Synods that were convened upon the Diſpute concerning the Celebration of *Eaſter*, though the Number of them is uſually reckoned to be great, yet *Euſebius* mentions but Three; one of which was held in *Paleſtine*, another in *Aſia*, and a Third at *Rome*. And then, as for what concerns the Churches of *France*, of *Pontus*, of *Corinth*, and of the *Eaſt*, he barely tells us, That the reſpective Biſhops there, wrote to Pope *Victor* about this Matter, without ſpeaking of any Council Aſſembled in theſe places.

Agrippinus, towards the Beginning of the Third Century, held a Council in *Africk*; where it was Ordained that Hereticks ſhould be Re-baptized.

There were likewiſe Two Councils held in *Arabia*, under the Emperour *Gordianus*; one againſt *Berillus* Biſhop of *Boſtra*, who maintain'd, That Jeſus Chriſt was not a different Perſon from the Father, before he made himſelf Man; and the other againſt the *Arabians*, who affirmed, That the Souls of Men were Mortal.

We don't know at what time the Councils of *Iconium* and *Synnada* were Aſſembled, that Decreed, It was Neceſſary to re-baptize Hereticks.

I ſhall ſay nothing more of the Councils held in *Africk*, and at *Rome* in St. *Cyprian*'s time; becauſe I diſcourſed largely about them, when I had occaſion to conſider the Writings and Life of that Father.

Dionyſius Biſhop of *Rome* Summoned a Council, in which he Eſtabliſhed the Divinity of the Word, and the Myſtery of the Trinity againſt the Errors of the *Sabellians*, and that which was afterwards the Error of the *Arians*. He wrote a Letter upon this Occaſion to *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria*. S. *Athanaſius* mentions this Synod.

In the time of Pope *Stephen*, a Council was held at *Antioch*; where the Biſhops Condemned the Practice of the *Novatians*. S. *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria* ſent word to *Sixtus*, that he was invited thither: *Euſebius* Lib. 7. Hiſt. c. 8. S. *Epiphanius* in his Account of the Hereſie of the *Noetians*, mentions Two Synods that were aſſembled in *Aſia* againſt *Noetius*, and gives us an Account of ſome Words of that Heretick, and of the laſt Synod.

But of all the Councils that were Summoned in the Three Firſt Centuries, the moſt Celebrated and Famous, are the Two Councils of *Antioch* Aſſembled againſt *Paulus Samoſatenus*, Biſhop of that City, who maintained, That the Word was not truly United to the Humanity in the Perſon of Jeſus Chriſt; and who likewiſe, according to the Teſtimony of ſome Authors, denied, that the Word was a diſtinct Perſon from the Father. The Firſt Council aſſembled againſt him, was held at *Antioch* about the Year 264. *Euſebius* tells us, That the principal Biſhops who aſſiſted there were, *Firmilian* Biſhop of *Cæſarea* in *Cappadocia*, *Gregory* and *Athenodorus* Biſhops of *Pontus*, *Helenus* Biſhop of *Tarſus*, *Nicomas* Biſhop of *Iconium*, *Himenæus* of *Jeruſalem*, *Theotecnus* of *Cæſarea*; without mentioning an Infinite Number of others, as well Biſhops as Prieſts. He ſays, That S. *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria*, being invited to this Synod, could not come thither, but that he acquainted them with his Judgment concerning this Matter by way of Letter, where he diſdained to ſalute the Author of that Hereſie. In all appearance *Firmilian* preſided in this Synod; for the Biſhops of the Second Council ſay in their Letter, *That* Paul *having Promiſed to renounce his Opinion*, Firmilian *gave Credit to his Proteſtation, and hoping that this Affair might terminate calmly, without any prejudice or diſhonour done to the Church, judged it convenient to defer paſſing Judgment.* And this plainly

(*b*) *In any Credible Authors.*] The Author publiſhed by *Sirmondus* under the Name of *Prædeſtinatus*, mentions ſome Councils that were held againſt the Ancient Hereticks; but he is a Modern Author, and does not deſerve Credit upon his own Authority.

(*c*) *For themſelves.*] Tertull. in lib. *De Jejun. Agunt̃ur præcepta per Græcias illas certis in locis Concilia, per quæ & aliora quæque tractantur.* Some Perſons underſtand this Paſſage of the Councils of the *Catholicks*; but he ſpeaks of thoſe held by the *Montaniſts*, as the following words plainly ſhew.

proves

proves, that *Firmilian* held the chief place in the Synod, and that they followed his Advice. Now they did not pass Sentence against *Paulus Samosatenus* in this Synod, because he had promised to quit his Erroneous Doctrin; but it seems he kept not his Word, but relapsed a little time after into his old Error; So a Second Council was held against him in the City of *Antioch*, in the Year 270, where we find Seventy two Bishops. *Paulus Samosatenus* was here convinced of his Errors by a Priest, whose Name was *Malchion*, and afterwards he was deposed by the Council, and *Domnus* Elected into his Place. The Bishops of this Council soon after wrote a Synodal Letter to *Dionysius* Bishop of *Rome*, and to all the other Bishops in the World, to give an Account of their Condemning *Paulus*, and Electing *Domnus* in his Room. This Letter is to be seen in *Eusebius. Lib. 7. Hist. Cap.* 30. They there give an ample Relation of what pass'd in the First Synod; in which *Paulus Samosatenus* having solemnly Promised to change his Opinion, *Firmilian* thought it convenient to defer passing Judgment upon him; That the aforesaid Bishop was upon his Journey, with a Design to come to the Synod, but died by the way. After this, they proceed to lay open the Manners of *Paulus*, and accuse him of enriching himself by Publick Extortion, Rapine and Sacriledge; they reproach him for his insupportable Arrogance, and Cruel Temper; they complained of him for taking upon him the State of a great Lord, as appeared by his numerous Retinue, by his sitting in an high Tribunal, by his ill Treatment of those Persons that did not make their Court to him, and would not commend him, when they sang Praises to God; by his commanding Hymns to be sung in his own Praise, and ordering himself to be publickly commended in the Sermons, by his living too familiarly with Women, and using his Clergy and People after a Tyrannical insolent manner. In short, After they have accused him of all those Vices that are ordinary and common to Bishops of great Sees, they say they condemned him principally because he revived the Error of *Artemas*; teaching, That Jesus Christ was a mere Man, and that he did not exist before he was born of the Virgin *Mary*; and that having deposed him, they chose *Domnus* in his Room. All which they take notice of, that for the time to come, all Communicatory Letters might be addressed to him only. *Councils.*

There is also another Letter attributed to this Council, addressed to *Paulus Samosatenus*, which contains a Profession of Faith. *Baronius* ascribes it to the first Council; but it being writ a little before *Paulus*'s Deposition, as manifestly appears by the Title, and by its carrying the Name of *Himenæus* in the Front, who presided in the Second Council, and not *Firmilian*, who presided in the First; we ought to conclude, that it belongs to the Second Council. But we have a great deal of reason to believe that the Letter published by *Turrianus* is Supposititious, as well as that of S. *Dionysius* of *Alexandria* to *Paulus Samosatenus*; as we have already shewn in another place.

Baronius attributes besides to this Council, a Profession of Faith, set down in the Council of *Ephesus* in the Third Part, and assigned in that Place to the Council of *Nice*. I don't know what reasons *Baronius* had to incline him to this Opinion; but it seems past dispute to me, that it does not belong to this Council at *Antioch*: for certain it is, that the word Consubstantial was there rejected, whereas it is to be found in this Profession, as it is set down in the Council of *Ephesus*, under the Name of the *Nicene* Council; although it no more belongs to that, than it does to the former: But the truth is, 'Tis a Profession of Faith drawn up by some Bishops, to reconcile the Decisions of those two Councils, and to explain in what sense the word Consubstantial was rejected by the First, and approved by the Second.

Thus I have given a Catalogue of the Councils held in the Three first Ages of the Church, that are mentioned by Authors that deserve Credit. I don't in the least question, but that there were abundance of other Assemblies convened in this time: but then there is no reason to admit those, that are only spoken of by Modern Authors, such as the *Prædestinatus* published by *Sirmondus*, the Author of the Synodical Book, *Bede*; and some others of the same Character.

Of false Decretals Attributed to the first Popes.

THE Falsity of the Decretals that are attributed to the first Popes before *Siricius*, is so well known at present, that it would not be necessary to speak any thing concerning them in this place: If the Subject of my Book did not oblige me in a few words to run over the Principal Reasons, which prove them to be suppositious. I begin with them that are general and common to all the Decretals, and I shall afterwards descend to those that are more particular. *Of False Decretals, &c.*

1. (*a*) All these Decretals were unknown to all the Ancient Fathers, to all the Popes, and all the Ecclesiastical Authors, that wrote before the Ninth Century. Now what rational Man can believe that so vast a Number of Letters composed by so many holy Popes, that contained so many important Points in Relation to the Discipline of the Church, cou'd be unknown to *Eusebius*, to S. *Jerom*, to S. *Augustin*, to S. *Basil*, and in short, to all those Authors that have spoken of the Writings of the Popes, or have written concerning the Discipline of the Church? Cou'd it possibly happen, that the Popes, to whom these Letters are so very favourable, wou'd never have cited and alledged

(*a*) *All these Decretals were unknown to the Ancient Fathers.*] Except that of S. *Clement* to S. *James* Translated by *Ruffinus*, all the rest were absolutely unknown, and no Author ever cited any of them before the Ninth Age of the Church.

Of Falſe Decretals &c.

them, to raiſe their Reputation? Who wou'd ever imagine that the Deciſions of theſe Decretals ſhould be never ſo much as quoted in any Council, or in any Canon? He that will ſeriouſly conſider with himſelf, that ſince theſe Decretals have been impoſed upon the World, they have been cited in an infinite number of places by Popes, by Councils, and often copied by the Canoniſts, will be eaſily perſwaded, that they wou'd have gain'd a mighty Reputation, and been quoted very often by Antiquity, if they had been Genuine and True. (*b*) The firſt Man that publiſhed them, if we may believe *Hincmarus*, was one *Riculphus* Biſhop of *Mentz*, who died about the Beginning of the Ninth Century. 'Tis commonly believed, that he brought them from *Spain*, ſince the Collection carries the Name of *Iſidorus*; but 'tis certain, (*c*) it could never be compoſed by *Iſidore* the Great, Arch-biſhop of *Sevil*; and there is great Reaſon to believe, (*d*) that it was no *Spainard*, but rather ſome *German* or *Frenchman* that begun this Impoſture. It likewiſe (*e*) ſeems probable, that ſome of theſe Decretals have been foiſted in ſince *Riculphus*'s time, and it is no leſs credible, that *Benedict* a Deacon of the Church of *Mentz*, who made a Collection of Canons by the Order of *Autgarius* Biſhop of *Mentz*, and Succeſſor of *Riculphus*, put the laſt hand to this Collection of falſe Decretals attributed to one *Iſidorus* (*f*) Surnamed the *Merchant* or *Sinner*, who is a different Perſon from the famous Biſhop of *Sevil*. (*g*) We read in Hiſtory, that about this time, a certain Man named *Iſidore*, the Brother of *Eulogius*, came from *Spain* along with ſome Merchants, and withdrew himſelf to *Mentz*. Now 'tis very probable, that this Man's Name was ſet to the Collection of Decretals, and likewiſe occaſion'd the Belief, that they were brought from *Spain*.

Secondly, The Impoſture of theſe Letters is invincibly proved from hence, becauſe they are made up of a Contexture of Paſſages of Fathers, of Councils, of Letters of Popes, of Canons, and Ordinances of Emperors, which have appeared from the Third Age of the Church down to the midſt of the Ninth: (*h*) It is viſible, that all theſe Paſſages drawn out of ſeveral places have been woven together by ſome Impoſtor, that had a Genius not large enough to compoſe the Letters himſelf.

Thirdly, The Scripture cited in all theſe Letters follows the vulgar Tranſlation of S. *Jerom*, which demonſtrates that they are ſince his time, and conſequently don't belong to the Popes whoſe Names they carry, that lived long before.

Fourthly, The Matter of theſe Letters is not at all agreeable to the Age, when the Popes to whom they are attributed, lived: There is no mention made in any of them, either of Perſecutions or Martyrs, or of the Doctrin of the Church in oppoſition to the firſt Hereticks, or of the Duty of Biſhops, or of the Care that ought to be taken of the Flock of Jeſus Chriſt: But they ſpeak of the Queſtions of Doctrin againſt the *Arians*, and the *Eutychians*, and of ſeveral Matters of Diſcipline, which ſuppoſe that the Church had been long Eſtabliſhed.

Fifthly, Theſe Letters are full of Anachroniſms; the Conſulſhips and Names of Conſuls are ill placed, and out of order; nay, more, the true Years of the Popes don't agree oftentimes with the Account that is to be found in theſe Letters.

Sixthly, The Style of theſe Letters is Extremely barbarous, they are full of Soleciſms, and we frequently meet with ſome Words in them, that were only uſed in the lower Ages. It is worth a

(*b*) *The firſt that Publiſhed them, if we may believe* Hincmar, *was one* Riculphus.] 'Tis in the Twenty fourth Chapter of his Book againſt *Hincmar* of *Laon*, where it is ſaid, that *Riculphus* brought the Book of Epiſtles, as it was collected by *Iſidore*, out of *Spain*, and diſperſed them in that Country. *Benedict* the Deacon tells us in the Preface before his Collection, that he drew theſe Decretals out of the Archives of the Church of *Mentz*, from whence *Riculphus* had formerly taken them, and where they were found by *Autgarius* his Succeſſor.

(*c*) *Not by* Iſidore *Archbiſhop of* Sevil.] He died in 636. and the Author of theſe Decretals has taken ſome Paſſages out of the Council of *Toledo*, held in the Year 675, as alſo out of the *6th.* Council celebrated *A. D.* 681. and out of *Gregory* the Second, and *Gregory* the Third, *Boniface* of *Mentz*, and ſeveral others who lived after *Iſidore* of *Sevil.*

(*d*) *There is reaſon to believe, that it was no* Spaniard, *but rather ſome* German *or* Frenchman.] 'Tis exactly the Style of the *French* or *Germans* about the Ninth Age. The greateſt part of theſe ſpurious Letters are directed to *Germans* or *French.* The Author of them cites a Letter of an Abbeſs of *France*, to *Boniface* of *Mentz*, and another of the ſame Biſhop. Beſides, This Collection was firſt ſeen in *France*, being diſcovered at *Mentz*.

(*e*) *Some of theſe Decretals have been forged ſince* Riculphus.] He died in 814, and there are ſome Letters amongſt them, where we find ſome Fragments out of the Council of *Paris* held in 829. *Benedict* was the firſt that expoſed theſe Letters to the World; and he tells us, they had been found by *Autgarius* in the Archieves of the Church of *Mentz*, where *Riculphus* placed them, having before brought them out of *Spain*. All this perhaps is only his own Invention.

(*f*) *Surnamed the Merchant or Sinner.*] Both theſe Titles are to be found in the Preface. *Iſidorus Peccator, ſive Mercator, ſervus Jeſu Chriſti.*

(*g*) *We read in Hiſtory, that one named* Iſidore.] 'Tis *Eulogius* himſelf, ſome of whoſe Letters are preſerved in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*; in which he teſtifies that he had two Brothers, and one of them was named *Iſidore*, who retired to *Mentz*, and came thither along with ſome Merchants. Upon this Account poſſibly they might call that *Iſidore Mercator*; perhaps alſo this is the *Peccator*; a Title, which they frequently gave themſelves in that Age, and which *Eulogius* took often himſelf.

(*h*) *'Tis viſible that all theſe Paſſages drawn out of different places have been patched together by ſome Impoſtor.*] It is viſible that the Authors themſelves never borrowed thoſe Paſſages out of theſe Letters. For, 1. Who will believe that an infinite Number of Writers would take long tedious pieces out of theſe Letters, and never cite them? 2. Theſe Paſſages being very long and tedious, it does not appear probable, that they copied them out of theſe Letters. 3. They are the exact Stile of theſe Authors: Now who can imagine that the ancient Popes wrote ſo many different Stiles? 4. They are likewiſe out of their place in theſe Letters: Any Man may readily diſcover, that they are added and patched to the reſt of the Diſcourſe; whereas in the Books of the Fathers, from whence they are taken, they are in their proper Natural place.

Man's

Man's while to obſerve, that all theſe Letters are of the ſame Style; now I deſire to know how it cou'd poſſibly happen, that ſo many different Popes living in different Ages, ſhould all write the ſame Style? This ſets it beyond diſpute, that all theſe Letters were compoſed almoſt in the ſame time, and by the ſame Perſon; or at leaſt by one that purſued the ſame Train of Thoughts. *Of False Decretals, &c.*

Now ſince theſe Letters firſt appeared in an unlearned dark Age, what wonder is it if they were received with little Conteſtation? And yet *Hincmar* Archbiſhop of *Rheims* with the (*i*) French Biſhops, even at that time made great difficulty of acknowledging them. But a ſhort time after they acquired ſome Authority, being ſupported by the Court of *Rome*, whoſe pretenſions they mightily favoured.

After having thus repreſented the Reaſons that prove in general, that all the Decretal Epiſtles of the Popes before *Syricius* are Spurious; I ſhall now deſcend to particulars, and endeavour to ſhew in few Words, that every Epiſtle carries undeniable Signs of its being an Impoſture, along with it.

The Firſt, and that which ſeems to bear the greateſt Authority, is the Epiſtle of S. *Clement* to S. *James*, the Brother of our Lord; the Firſt Part whereof was formerly Tranſlated by *Ruffinus*. *Iſidore* has added a Second to it, and they are both of them equally Suppoſititious. The firſt, becauſe it ſuppoſes that S. *Clement* wrote that Letter after the Death of S. *Peter*; whereas it is a Truth that has been conſtantly received, that S. *James*, to whom it is written, died before S. *Peter*. Secondly, 'Tis there ſaid, That S. *Clement* immediately ſucceeded S. *Peter*, which is contrary to the Ancients, who place S. *Linus* and *Cletus*, or *Anacletus* between them two. Thirdly, the Weſt is there ridiculouſly called the darkeſt part of the World. Fourthly, It is compoſed to juſtifie *the Itinerary, or Book of the Voyages of S.* Peter, which is Apocryphal. The Second Part, that was compoſed by *Iſidore*, is yet a more evident Cheat: For, 1. It was unknown in the time of *Ruffinus*, and therefore has been invented ſince. 2. It is full of Texts of Scripture that follow the Tranſlation of S. *Jerome*: And we likewiſe meet ſeveral Paſſages there Copied out of S. *Cyril* of *Alexandria* againſt *Theodore* of *Mopſveſtia*, out of *the rule of S.* Benedict, out of *the Expoſition of the Creed* by *Venantius Fortunatus*, out of S. *Gregory*, and *Iſidore* of *Sevil*. In ſhort, it ſpeaks of *Arch-Prieſts* and *Primates*, and we find abundance of Words and Expreſſions in it, that are unworthy of the time of S. *Clement*.

The Second Epiſtle of S. *Clement* directed to S. *James*, has likewiſe all the ſame Marks of Forgery. In the firſt place it makes mention of *Sacraments*, of *the Habits in which the Prieſts celebrate the Holy Sacrifice of the Maſs*, of *the Pall*, of *Sacred Veſſels*, of *Chalices*; things that ſeem not to have been in uſe in the time of S. *Clement*. Secondly, It ſpeaks of the *Oſtiarii*, or *Door-keepers*, *Arch-deacons*, and other Eccleſiaſtical Officers, that were not then introduced into the Church. Thirdly, The Letter is writ in a barbarous Stile. Fourthly, The Author alledges the Authority of his Anceſtors. Fifthly, It ordains ſeveral Practices of little or no Conſequence to be obſerved under pain of Excommunication for Six Years. Sixthly, It ſuppoſes that S. *Clement* inſtructed S. *James* in the Actions of our Bleſſed Saviour, and the Diſcipline of the Church. Seventhly, It alledges S. *James* his own words, *Work out your Salvation with fear and trembling*, under the Name of S. *Peter*'s. This Letter is full of divers Paſſages taken out of the Author of the Recognitions, out of S. *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, S. *Proſper*, *Laurentius*, *Juſtinianus*, and S. *Gregory* the Great. Laſtly, The Scriptures there cited, follow S. *Jerome*'s Tranſlation. The Inſcription of the Third Letter of S. *Clement* alone, is enough to diſcover the falſity of it. It is directed, *To all Suffragan Biſhops, Prieſts, Deacons, and others of the Clergy: To all Princes great and ſmall, and to all the Faithful.* Now in S. *Clement*'s time there were no great or ſmall Princes that were of the Church. Secondly, This Letter mentions Sub-Deacons, an Order not then eſtabliſhed in the Church. Thirdly, It is for the moſt part wholly compoſed of Paſſages drawn out of the Books of Recognitions: We ought to reject the Fourth for the ſame Reaſons.

The Fifth is directed to S. *James*, in the Name of S. *Clement* Biſhop of *Rome*, and Succeſſor of S. *Peter*: Now S. *James* died before S. *Peter*, from whence it neceſſarily follows, that this Epiſtle cannot have been written by S. *Clement*. 2, The Author of this Letter ſeems to approve the Doctrin of the *Nicolaitans*; who taught, that Women ought to be kept in common, and the place where he maintains this Errour, is borrowed out of the Book of Recognitions, in which a Platoniſt is introduced, diſputing upon this occaſion. In ſhort, the Author of this Letter tells us, he was preſent at the Death of *Ananias*, and S. *Clement* was not as yet Converted, when S. *Peter* inflicted that terrible Puniſhment upon *Ananias*. We muſt add to all the foregoing Arguments, this weighty Conſideration, that all theſe Letters are of a different Stile from that of the Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*, which is undoubtedly S. *Clement*'s. There were indeed ſome other Letters formerly aſſigned to this Saint, but they were different from thoſe which we have examined here; for S. *Epiphanius*, who mentions them, aſſures us, that he there commends Virginity, and ſpeaks very advantageouſly of the Prophets. Now there is nothing that looks like this in the above mentioned

(*i*) *The* French *Biſhops made great Difficulty of acknowledging them.*] *Hincmar* rejected them, as having no Authority. *Nicholas* the Firſt, in *Epiſt.* 42. to the Biſhops of *France*, endeavours to confute thoſe that rejected them; but ſince that time, they have been received and inſerted into a Collection of Canons, though Learned Men always queſtioned the Truth of them. However at preſent no body dares undertake to defend them, the Impoſture being ſo abominably groſs, that all People may diſcover the Cheat at firſt ſight. They may ſerve as a remarkable Example both of the Credulity of the preceeding Ages, and the intolerable Impudence of Impoſtors.

Of Falſe Decretals, &c.

Epiſtles that are chiefly ſtoln out of *the Itinerary of S.* Peter, an Apocryphal Work, forged by the Hereticks.

The firſt Epiſtle attributed to Pope *Anacletus*, is viſibly Spurious: For, 1. He calls himſelf in this Letter, the Defender of S. *Clement*; now according to S. *Irenæus*, *Euſebius*, S. *Jerome*, and ſome other ancients, *Anacletus* ſucceeded S. *Peter* and not S. *Clement*. 2. The Author of this Letter is pleaſed to ſay, That he received ſeveral things from his Anceſtors by way of Tradition; and could this Expreſſion poſſibly drop from a Man that lived in the time of the Apoſtles? 3. He ſays, That Appeals from Secular Judges ought to be determined before Biſhops, but this was not Cuſtomary in the time of the Apoſtles. 4. He tells us, that the Priviledges and Laws of the Church ought to be confirmed, none of which were written in *Anacletus*'s time. 5. He talks of Appeals from Eccleſiaſtical Judgments to the Holy See, and mentions the different ſorts of Eccleſiaſtical Cauſes. But theſe Queſtions were never debated under *Anacletus*, and when they came to be afterwards diſcuſſed, the Authority of this Letter was never alledged. 6. He ſpeaks not only of Primates and Metropolitans, but alſo of the *Apocriſiarii*, a Name unknown in the Roman Church till the Sixth Century. 7. The Style of this Letter is barbarous, and full of Soleciſms. 8. This Letter is compoſed of many Paſſages patched together, that are taken out of the Third Council of *Carthage*, the Letters of S. *Damaſus*, S. *Ambroſe*, S. *Auguſtin*, *Ruffinus*, *Ennodius*, *Boniface* of *Mentz*: And there is one Paſſage borrow'd from S. *Cyprian*'s Book *concerning Unity*.

Nor are there leſs Proofs to diſcover the Impoſture of the Second Letter attributed to Pope *Anacletus*. For, 1. The Author of this Letter would neither have Biſhops to be Accuſed, nor Judged. 2. He ſays, That the Apoſtles choſe the 70 Diſciples; whereas it appears by the Goſpel, that our Saviour himſelf made the choice. 3. He ſpeaks of Primates, of Patriarchs, and of Chriſtian Kings. 4. He mentions the Diviſion of the Eccleſiaſtick Provinces, which was made long after the Death of *Anacletus*. Laſtly, He inſerts into his Diſcourſe ſome Paſſages of the *Nicene* Council, of *Damaſus*, of S. *Jerome*, of S. *Auguſtin*, of S. *Gregory*, of *Iſidore* of *Sevil*, of the 5th. Council of *Orleans*, and the Vulgar Latin. We ought to paſs the ſame Judgment upon the Third Letter attributed to the ſame Pope for the ſame Reaſons.

The firſt Letter attributed to Pope *Evariſtus* contains, 1. Some things that have a relation to Clandeſtin Marriage, and ſeveral Ceremonies belonging to that Sacrament, all which can by no means agree with the time of *Evariſtus*. 2. 'Tis patched up of ſome Paſſages out of the vulgar Latin, the Letters of *Innocent*, and the Diſpute of *Ithacius* againſt *Varimadus*. 3. 'Tis dated under Conſuls, that were not in the time of *Evariſtus*'s Pontificate.

The Author of the Second Letter attributed to the ſame Pope, after he has commended ſeveral Churches and Biſhops, inſerts many Texts of Scripture following the vulgar Latin, and imitates divers Phraſes of S. *Cyprian* and the *African* Fathers. He ſpeaks of Primates, and borrows abundance of things out of *Ruffinus*, S. *Gregory*, and *Iſidore* of *Sevil*.

In the firſt Letter attributed to Pope *Alexander*, we find many things that diſcover its Novelty. 1. He mentions ſome Cuſtoms that were not uſed till after this Pope's time; as amongſt others, the Benediction of Water mingled with Salt. 2. He ſpeaks clearly and diſtinctly of the Trinity, and the Errors of the *Arians* and *Sabellians* are ſo openly rejected, that any Man in the World may ſee it was written ſince the Birth of thoſe Hereſies. 3. We there find ſome Paſſages taken out of *Ithacius*, *Clarus*, *Siricius*, *Proclus*, *Ennodius*, and *Adrian* the Firſt.

In the Second attributed to the ſame Pope, there is a Quotation out of the Council of *Laodicea*, that was held under Pope *Martin* the Firſt, and the Scriptures there cited, follow the common Verſion. The Third is compoſed of Paſſages borrow'd out of *Sixtus* the *Pythagorean*, S. *Gregory* and *Iſidore* of *Sevil*. Beſides the date of it is falſe.

In the Firſt Epiſtle attributed to S. *Sixtus*, he is called an Archbiſhop, a word not uſed in his time. 2. The Author confutes thoſe that maintain, that the Son was inferiour to the Father. 3. The Author uſes ſome words and expreſſions of *Ithacius*, of the Fifth Council of *Rome*, of *Flavian* Archbiſhop of *Conſtantinople*, of *Martin* the Firſt, of *Adrian* the Firſt, and *Sixtus* the *Pythagorean*. In fine, this Letter is dated under the Conſulate of *Adrian*; now there was no Conſul of that Name, whilſt S. *Sixtus* was Pope.

The Second attributed to the ſame Pope, mentions Conſecrated Veſſels, Appeals to *Rome*, the Grandeur of that Church. 'Tis there pretended, that all Biſhops wait for the Pope's Deciſion, and are inſtructed by his Letters: Modes of Speaking never uſed by the firſt Biſhops of *Rome*. 2. The Author borrows the better part of what he ſays concerning Pope *Sixtus* and *Zoſimus*, out of the Fifth Council of *Rome*, held under *Symmachus* and *Martin* the firſt. In a word, the date of the Conſuls is the very ſame with that of the former, and conſequently diſcovers the falſity of it.

The Epiſtle attributed to *Teleſphorus*, calls him an Archbiſhop; a Name unknown in the Firſt Ages. 2. There is a Decree in it, to enjoyn Three Maſſes on our Saviour's Nativity, a Cuſtom which is not ſo Ancient. 3. The Author ſuppoſes, that the Laity and Clergy could not accuſe one another in Judgment. 4. He has borrowed ſeveral places out of *Damaſus*, S. *Jerome*, *Proclus*, S. *Leo*, *Flavian*, and *Ennodius*, Authors of a much later date than *Teleſphorus*. 5. He makes uſe of the vulgar Tranſlation of the Bible. In ſhort, the date of the Conſuls is falſe and erroneous.

The Two Letters aſcribed to *Higinus*, are manifeſtly Spurious. The Firſt is made up of ſeveral places taken out of *Ithacius*, S. *Leo*, *Martin* the Firſt, and *Adrian* the Firſt. The Second is ſtuffed with Texts of Scripture, according to the old Tranſlation; the date of the Conſuls is equally falſe in both of them.

The

The Imposture of the First Letter attributed to Pope *Pius*, appears, 1. Because the Stile of it is rough and barbarous. 2. Because it speaks of a pretended Revelation that appeared to *Hermas*, who is supposed to be the Brother of *Pius*. 3. Because there are some Passages manifestly Copied out of the Books of *Isidore* of *Sevil*, S. *Leo*, the Fifth Council of *Rome*, *Sixtus* the *Pythagorean*, *Adrian* the First, and the Vulgar Latin. Lastly, Because the Date of the Consuls is false, as well as in the Second Letter, which is as evidently forged and spurious as the First. The *Theodosian Code* is cited there, and likewise a Decree is published in it, which Ordains, That those Clergymen who are found disobedient to their Bishop, should be delivered over to the Secular Power; which Passage does not agree with the time of Pope *Pius* the First.

The Two other Letters attributed to the same Pope, are addressed to *Justus* Bishop of *Vienna*, and are taken out of the Achieves of the Church of *Vienna*. *Baronius* pretends they are Genuine, because the Stile of them is Simple, and because they are agreeable to the History of the time of that Pope; but there are far greater Reasons to incline us to believe, that they are spurious, 1. The barbarous Stile. 2. The Name of Mass unknown to the Ancients. 3. The affected Terms; such as are, *Superbeate*, *Senatoria*, *Cubilibus æternis*, *Perseverabilem*, *Primarchus*, *Senatus pauper Christi*. 4. It mentions Habits peculiar to Bishops. Lastly, These Letters were unknown to all Antiquity.

We find several Passages in the Letter attributed to *Anicetus*, which don't agree with the time of that Pope; as for instance, what is there laid down concerning *the Ordinations of Bishops*, *Sacerdotal Tonsure*, *Archbishops*, *Primates*, *and Patriarchs*, which were not instituted till long after; besides many other things of the same Nature. 2. The Author of that Letter uses the Vulgar Latin, and Copies abundance of things out of S. *Leo*, *Adrian* the First, and the Councils of *Nice* and *Antioch*. Lastly, He is mistaken in the Date of his Consuls.

The First Letter attributed to *Soter*, is full of Passages borrowed from *Ithacius*, St. *Leo*, and the Vulgar Latin; and the Consuls there mentioned, held the Consulship some Years before *Soter* was Bishop of *Rome*.

The Second Letter attributed to the same, is a Miscellany taken out of the Council of *Laodicea*, and out of *Gelasius*, *Martin* the First, and S. *Leo*. It speaks of Monks, of Palls, &c. Besides the Date of the Consuls does not agree with the Years of this Pope's Pontificate.

The Epistle of *Eleutherus* treats of Ecclesiastical Judgments in favour of the Court of *Rome*. The Author of it pretends, That all Causes relating to the Church, ought to be determined there, and that they cannot be tried in the Province; a Practice contrary to all Antiquity. He follows the Vulgar Latin in his Quotations of Scripture, and cites a Text out of S. *John*, which he attributes to S. *Paul*. He copies several Passages out of the Popes S. *Leo*, *Felix* the Third, *Anastasius*, *Adrian* the First, *Victor* of *Carthage*, *Hilary* the Deacon, the Fourth Council of *Carthage*, the Sixth Council of *Toledo*, and the *Theodosian Code*. Lastly, The Date of the Consuls is false.

The Inscription of the First Epistle attributed to *Victor*, plainly discovers the falsity of it. 1. It bestows upon him the Quality of Archbishop of the Universal Church; a Title which the Ancient Popes never gave themselves. 2. It is directed to *Theophilus* of *Alexandria*, who lived almost 200 Years after *Victor*. 3. The Author of this Letter speaks of the Judgments of Bishops, and Appeals to *Rome*, according to the Pretensions of the Bishops of *Rome* in the latter Ages. Lastly, He uses the Testimonies of S. *Leo* and *Isidore*. The Second Letter attributed to the same Pope, is full of Passages borrowed from S. *Leo*, and the Vulgar Latin. The Third and Fourth published by *Johannes de Bosco*, and taken out of the Library of the Abby of *Fleuri*, are written in a Stile, that manifestly discovers their Novelty. The Scriptures there cited, follow the Vulgar Latin. The First is directed to *Desiderius* Bishop of *Vienna*; now we don't read that there was ever any Bishop of that Name in *Vienna*, before the time of Pope *Gregory* the Great.

The First Letter of *Zephirinus* is composed of several Passages taken out of S. *Leo*, S. *Prosper*, *Vigilius*, S. *Gregory*, *Martin* the First, *Adrian* the First, the *Theodosian Code*, *Anianus*, and *Sixtus* the *Pythagorean*. 2. We find in it the Names of Patriarch and Primate. 3. It treats about the Decisions of Bishops, and Appeals to the Holy See. 4. The Consul *Gallicanus* is named there; now there was none of that Name in the time of *Zephirinus*. Lastly, The Author of it supposes, that the 70 Disciples were chosen by the Apostles.

The Second Letter attributed to the same Pope is yet more visibly spurious. 1. The Author of it very impertinently cites the Imperial Laws in favour of the Bishops. 2. He speaks of the *Apocrisiarii*. 3. He heaps together the very Thoughts and Words of S. *Prosper*, *Adrian*, and *Paul* of *Constantinople*. 4. He cites the Canons of Pope *Adrian* as Ancient Statutes. And at last, he says, that there were false Brethren in *Africk* that plundered and spoiled the Bishops: Which cannot possibly be true, for there was no Persecution in *Africk* in the time of Pope *Zephirinus*.

The First Epistle attributed to *Calistus*, is filled with Passages taken out of the *Nicene* Council, the Fifth Council of *Rome*, S. *Prosper*, *Gelasius*, *Symmachus*, *Isidorus*, *Anianus*, and *Sixtus* the *Pythagorean*. He speaks of Ember-Weeks, that were instituted long after the time of this Pope. The Second is likewise full of Passages drawn out of the Council of *Antioch*, the Fourth Synod of *Carthage*, *Simplicius*, S. *Austin*, S. *Gregory*, *Adrian*, and *Sixtus* the *Pythagorean*. We find several new Constitutions there.

The Author of the Epistle attributed to *Urban*, gives large Commendations of a Life, where all things are held in common; He speaks of Vows, and the Revenue of the Church; he uses the Thoughts and Words of S. *Prosper*, *Eusebius*, the Council of *Paris*, *Gregory* the Fourth, the *Theodosian Code*, and the Vulgar Latin.

The

of Falſe Decretals, &c.

The Two Letters attributed to Pope *Pontian*, are made up of Paſſages taken out of the Vulgar Latin, S. *Gregory*, S. *Jerome*, *Sixtus* the *Pythagorean*: The reſt is written in a barbarous Stile.

The Author of the Epiſtle attributed to *Anteros* ſpeaks of a Biſhop of *Epheſus* named *Felix*, but unknown to the Ancients, and places one *Euſebius* amongſt the Biſhops of *Alexandria*, who is not to be found in the Catalogue of the Biſhops of that See. 2. Touching the Tranſlation of Biſhops, he eſtabliſhes ſome things, contrary to the Determinations of the Councils of *Antioch*, *Sardica* and *Chalcedon*. And beſides, he cites the Words of S. *Jerome*, *Siricius*, *Ennodius*, S. *Gregory*, *Iſidore*, *Martin* the Firſt, and *Sixtus* the *Pythagorean*.

The Author of the Firſt Epiſtle attributed to *Fabian*, ſuppoſes that *Novatus* came to *Rome* in his Papacy, though it was in *Cornelius*'s time, according to the Teſtimony of S. *Cyprian*, *Euſebius*, and S. *Jerome*. Secondly, he borrows ſeveral Paſſages out of *Ruffinus*, S. *Leo*, S. *Gregory*, *Adrian* the Firſt, and *Boniface* of *Mentz*.

In the Second Epiſtle attributed to the ſame Pope, we read, 1. That diſobedient Clerks ought to be delivered up to the Secular Arm. 2. That the Holy Chriſm muſt be made Yearly. 3. We find ſome places in it, that are Copied out of the Second Council of *Carthage*, the Fifth of *Rome*, the Council of *Antioch*, *Siricius*, S. *Jerome*, S. *Auguſtine*, *Innocent*, *Zoſimus*, *Celeſtine*, *Proclus*, S. *Gregory*, *Iſidore*, and *Adrian*. The Third is full of Paſſages drawn out of the Letters of Pope *Adrian*, the *Theodoſian Code*, *Anianus*, *Felix* the Third, S. *Gregory*, the Second Council of *Carthage*, the Council of *Toledo*, and other Publick Monuments later than *Fabian*.

The firſt Letter attributed to *Cornelius* is full of Errours; 'Tis there ſaid, Firſt, That the Bodies of S. *Peter* and S. *Paul* were removed out of the Catacombs; which appears to be falſe by the Teſtimony of S. *Gregory*, who tells us in the third Letter of his third Book, That the Body of S. *Paul* lay always near the *Porta Oſtia*, and S. *Peter*'s in the *Vatican*. Secondly, Some Paſſages are to be found in this Letter, taken out of the Epiſtles of *Martin* the Firſt, and S. *Leo*. The Second is a Collection of ſeveral things out of the *Conſtantinopolitan* Council under *Flavian*, the Firſt and Third Council of *Carthage*, the Council of *Calcedon*, the Fifth of *Rome*, S. *Ambroſe*, S. *Jerome*, and *Boniface* of *Mentz*; but nothing ſhews the Impoſture of theſe two Letters more palpably, than the difference of Stile from thoſe that truly belong to *Cornelius*, which are to be ſeen in S. *Cyprian*, with the Fragment of one in *Euſebius*. There is another Letter of his beſides, to *Lupicinus* Biſhop of *Vienna*, which is writ in a Style as different from that of the true *Cornelius*, as any of the reſt; we find the word *Maſs* in it, which was unknown to the Authors, that lived in the time of this Pope.

The Epiſtle attributed to *Lucius*, is full of Citations out of the Vulgar Latin, and of ſeveral Paſſages taken out of the Firſt Council of *Arles*, the Third of *Carthage*, that of *Milevis*, S. *Leo*, *Gregory*, *Agatho*, *Adrian*, and *Sixtus* the *Pythagorean*: Beſides, it is dated Six Months before the Election of *Lucius*.

The two Epiſtles Attributed to *Stephanus*, are filled with Citations out of Modern Authors, and Statutes, that don't all agree with the time of this Pope, and conſequently are Spurious.

For the ſame Reaſons, we muſt paſs the ſame Judgment of the two Letters of *Sixtus* the Second, the two of Pope *Dionyſius*, the three of S. *Felix* the Firſt, the two of *Eutychianus*, that of *Caius*, the two of *Marcellinus*, thoſe of *Marcellus*, the three of *Euſebius*, the Letter and Decree of *Miltiades*, and the reſt of the Letters of the Popes collected by *Iſidore*, that are full of ſeveral Paſſages taken out of the Fathers, Popes, and Councils more Modern than the very Popes, by whom they are pretended to be written; and in which many things are to be found, that don't in the leaſt agree with the true Hiſtory of thoſe times, and were purpoſely ſaid to favour the Court of *Rome*, and eſtabliſh her Pretenſions againſt the Rights of Biſhops, and the Liberties of Churches. But it would take up too much time to ſhew the groſs falſity of theſe Monuments, that are now rejected by a common Conſent, and even by thoſe Authors, that are moſt favourable to the Court of *Rome*, who are obliged to abandon the Patronage of theſe Epiſtles, though they have done a great deal of Service in eſtabliſhing the greatneſs of the Court of *Rome*, and ruining the ancient Diſcipline of the Church, eſpecially in relation to Eccleſiaſtical Deciſions, and Rights of Biſhops.

An Abridgment of the Doctrin, Diſcipline, *and* Morality *of the Three Firſt* Ages *of the* Church.

An Abridgment of Doctrine, &c.

After having given a Summary of what is Contained in the Works of the Eccleſiaſtical Authors for the Three firſt Ages of the Church, I ſuppoſe it would not be amiſs, to preſent the Reader with an Abridgment alſo of the Theology of the Primative Chriſtians. This Deſign, beſides the relation it had to the Work it ſelf, ſeem'd in my Opinion to be the principal Fruit and Advantage that could be gathered from it. For the ultimate Scope and End, which a Man ought to propoſe to himſelf in reading the Eccleſiaſtical Authors, and their Hiſtory, is not to gratifie a vain fooliſh Curioſity, but to learn Religion thereby. We muſt not ſtudy theſe Matters, only to make a Pompous Oſtentation of our Knowledge, but to come better Chriſtians, to become more certain of the Doctrin of the Church, more reſpectful to its Diſcipline, and better inſtructed in its Holy Morality. For all Theology reduces it ſelf to theſe Three Points,

Doctrin,

Doctrin, Discipline and Morality. Doctrin concerns the Articles of Faith that our Religion teaches us; Discipline concerns the Government of the Church; and Morality teaches us, what things we are to do, and what we are to forbear. Hereticks overthrow the Doctrin of the Church by their Errours. Schismaticks destroy its Discipline by violating the Orders and Rules of the Church: And lastly, The vitious Christian discards and lays aside the Laws of its Morality, by living after an irregular manner. For the better avoiding these Rocks and Precipices, it is exceeding requisite for all Christians, to draw out of the Tradition of the ancient Church, that is to say, out of the Books of the Primitive Fathers, who are the unquestionable Witnesses of the Opinion of the Church in their own times; to draw, I say, from thence the Doctrin which they are obliged to believe, to examine the Ecclesiastical Discipline, which they are to revere and obey, and lastly from thence to learn the most Holy Rules of the Christian Morality.

Of False Decretals, &c.

An Abridgment of the Doctrin.

An Abridgment of Doctrin.

THE Doctrin of the Church was always the same, and will be ever so till the end of the World: For 'tis utterly impossible that the true Church should cease to be, or that the true Church should not teach the Doctrin of Jesus Christ, because whether she should teach a Doctrin different from that of Jesus Christ, or whether she should not teach the Doctrin of our Blessed Saviour, in both these Cases she would cease to be the true Church. Jesus Christ, as S. *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, and all the rest of the Ancients have observed, taught his Apostles all the Truths of Faith. The Apostles published them throughout all the Earth, and opened them to all the Churches in the World, whose Doctrin is found to be conformable each to other in Articles of Faith. This Doctrin was always preserved in the Church, which is the Pillar and Foundation of Truth. 'Tis indeed very true, that they did not always make use of the same terms, and that before the Birth of Heresies, they did not observe that precaution in speaking of Mysteries, which they did afterwards, when they were attack'd by the Hereticks: But still the Foundation of Doctrin was always the same as to the principal Articles of our Faith. We must likewise acknowledge, that there were some Errours very frequent in the First Ages of the Church, that have been rejected since, but then they don't concern the principal Articles of our Faith; and besides were never looked upon to be the received Doctrin of the Church, but only the most common Opinions. These previous Observations, will be confirmed by an Abridgment of the Doctrin of the Church, as it is delivered by the Authors of the Three first Centuries; which we are going to represent in as few words as possiby we can.

They taught, That the Grounds and Principles of Faith, were the Holy Scriptures, and Tradition; that we ought to believe Mysteries, though we were not able to comprehend them; they spoke of the Nature of God and of his Attributes after a most excellent manner; they believed him to be Invisible, Eternal, Incorruptible, *&c.* they have frequently discoursed of his Providence, his Power, his Bounty, his Mercy, and his Goodness; they wrote very sharply against the false Divinities of the Pagans, and the Errours of Hereticks, who imagined that there cou'd be above one Sovereign and Independent being; they proved that God Created all Things, and even Matter it self, which was not Eternal; they acknowledged the Trinity of the Three Persons in one only God, the Divinity and Eternity of the Word, and of the Holy Ghost; they maintain'd that the Word was from all Eternity in God, as a Person distinct from the Father; that the Father created the World by him, and that he governs it, and that it was the Person of the *Word* that appear'd to the ancient Patriarchs under different Figures, and who was at last Incarnate; that Jesus Christ was the Word made Man, God and Man all together, composed of two intire and different Natures; that he had a Soul and Body like unto ours; that he took this Body in the Womb of the Virgin *Mary*; that his Flesh was real and true; that he suffered and was really Dead; that he made himself Man, to save the World that was lost by the Sin of the first Man; that he came to discover the Truth to them, to shew them an Example; and that he redeemed them by his Death; that he descended into Hell, and afterwards rose again from the Dead; that he will come at the Day of Judgment to judge all Men; that he will Condemn the Wicked to everlasting Punishments, and reward the Good with Eternal Happiness, after he has raised up both the one and the other. All the Fathers, of whom we have spoken, make Profession of this Faith, and assure us, That this is the Doctrin, which all the Churches in the World have received from the Apostles, and that it was necessary to believe it in order to become a Christian. They sometime make use of some Expressions concerning the Person of the Word, that seem to derogate from his Divinity; as for instance, when they say, that the Word was not begotten, till the Beginning of the World; that he is visible, and that the Father is invisible; that he is one Portion of the Substance of the Father, and that the Father is all Substance. But these ways of Speaking, have a very good Meaning in these Authors, as we have often observed. For when they say, That the Word was begotten at the Beginning of the World, and that he was not the Son before, they don't mean that the Word began only to exist then, since they acknowledge he existed before, and was in God from all Eternity: But they take the Word *Generation* in another Sense than we do, giving this Name to a certain Prolation, or Emission of the Word, which they imagine was done, when God resolved to create the World; and 'tis in this sense they say, that the Word who was from all Eternity in God, was generated or begotten at that time, and that he had

An Abridgment of Doctrin.

had not always the Quality of the Son. We have likewise explained in what sense they say, that the Word is visible, and the Father invisible; and we have made it evidently appear, that they did not believe, that the Word was therefore of a different Nature from the Father but only that they attributed Visibility to the Son, as they ascribed Almightiness to the Father: Saying, That it is through the Son, that God makes every External Being, and consequently that by him he renders himself visible to Mankind. This Manner of Speaking is so little contrary to the Divinity of the Word, that it is to be found in *Athanasius*, and in the other Fathers that lived after the *Nicene* Council. In short, when they say that the Son was a Portion of the Substance of the Father, we are so far from being able to conclude that they were of *Arius*'s Opinion, that on the contrary, it follows from thence, that they believed the Son was not created of Nothing, as *Arius* afterwards taught, but that he was Consubstantial to the Father; that is to say, of the same Substance as the *Nicene* Council has determined. But wherefore do they say, that the Son is only something derived from the Substance of the Father? Is it because they believed he was inferiour to the Father? Not at all, but it was because they conceived, that the Father, as having all the Divinity in him, communicated it to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost. 'Tis upon this account that they usually ascribe to the Person of the Father all the Attributes of the Godhead, as we may see in the Creed, where after it is said, *I believe in God*, they add, *Almighty, Creator of Heaven and Earth*, &c. and yet we must not therefore say, that these Attributes don't agree to the Son and the Holy Ghost, but only that they are attributed to the Father; because he is the Fountain and Original of the Divinity, and because the Son and Holy Ghost receive it from him. I pass over in Silence some feeble Objections, that are only founded upon the ambiguity of the words *Nature and Creation*, that have not been as yet determined to a certain sense, as also the Signification of the word *Hypostasis* has been a long time undetermined. Thus when the Son is called another Substance than the Father, (though that is but very seldom) yet we are not to conclude from thence, that the Person who speaks after this manner, does not believe him to be truly God, because the Words of Nature and Substance were not at that time determined to the sense, they received afterwards, and because they may be taken for a Person subsisting. This is so true, that *Gregory Nazianzen*, and some others that lived in a time, when these Expressions were determined, forbore not to say sometimes that the Father was the first Substance or Nature, and the Son the Second; And thus it is ordinary for those, that acknowledged the Divinity of the Word, to say, That God made or created him, though they believe that he was not created of Nothing, but Begotten of the Divine Substance.

As to the Incarnation, the Fathers of the Three first Centuries have said nothing that in the least seems to favour the Errours of the *Paulianists*, the *Apollinarists*, the *Nestorians*, or the *Eutychians*; and they always distinguished Two Natures in Jesus Christ, and admitted the Proprieties of these Natures without Confusion, and being changed one into the other, yet re-united at the same time in the same Person. God and Man both together. They likewise plainly say, That Jesus Christ was Born of a Virgin by the Operation of the Holy Ghost, without Concupiscence and without Sin. And though they frequently tell us, That the benefit of the Incarnation is the Instruction, and the Example which Jesus Christ has given us; yet they acknowledge besides that, that he has truly Redeemed us by his Death; and that he has satisfied God for us. They believed, that we could not be Saved without believing in him; and for that Reason they imagined, that he descended into Hell, as well as the Apostles after him, to Preach the Gospel there to the *Jews* and *Gentiles*, who had known the true God, and had lived virtuously. They were of Opinion, That the Day of Judgment was at hand; That the Souls of Men until that Day, were neither perfectly Happy nor Miserable, though they underwent some Punishment before-hand, or were at rest, according to the proportion of the Good or Evil they had done in their Bodies. They almost universally believed with *Papias*, that Jesus Christ was to Reign a Thousand Years upon Earth, but they never asserted that Opinion as a Matter of Faith. They were sufficiently divided about the Nature of the Soul; some of them supposed it to be Corporeal, others declared, That they believed it to have been Spiritual; but however the better part of them agreed that it was Immortal, that the Just would be rewarded with Everlasting Happiness, and the Wicked everlastingly Punished. They never disquieted themselves in examining wherein the Beatitude consisted, but they were perswaded, That the Wicked should be punished with Fire, and that not Metaphorical, but Real. They advanced Man's Free-Will very highly, and maintained that he might carry himself either to Good or Evil; and yet they acknowledged, That since the Transgression of the First Man, we were naturally inclined to Evil, and that we stood in need of the Assistance and Grace of God to determine us to what was Good. They did not Philosophize too far about the Nature, and several Species of Angels; but only satisfied themselves, that there were good Angels, and likewise bad ones called *Dæmons*. They were of Opinion, that both the one and the other were Corporeal, and imagined that the bad Angels were lost for their love of Women, and they positively asserted, that the good Ones took care of things below. All of them were sensible of the Wounds and Punishment of *Adam*'s Sin, but they dont seem to agree, that Infants were born subject to Sin, and worthy of Damnation. Nevertheless, this appears to be the common Opinion; as is evident from S. *Cyprian*, who says, "That it was requisite to Baptize Infants before "the Eighth day, for fear lest if they died without Baptism, this delay should prove the occasion "of their Destruction. They often spoke of the Necessity and wonderful Effects of Baptism, and said that the Holy Ghost descended by the Imposition of the Hands of the Bishop. They maintained, That the Church had Power to reconcile those that repented of their Sins; and did not doubt but that the Eucharist was the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, and accordingly called it by that

Name.

Name. They extolled Virginity without condemning Marriage; they honoured the Saints and Martyrs as the Servants of God; they ſpoke of the Virgin *Mary* with a great deal of reſpect, and yet with no leſs diſcretion and adviſedneſs. S. *Clement* affirms, That ſhe continued a Virgin after her Delivery; but *Origen*, *Tertullian*, and ſome others, were of the contrary Opinion. We find nothing in the Three firſt Ages of the Church, either for or againſt the Aſſumption; there is a Paſſage in S. *Irenæus*, that is not favourable to the immaculate Conception. They believed that the Holy Scriptures were written by the Inſpiration of the Holy Ghoſt, that they contain all the principal Articles of our Faith; that though they are obſcure in ſome places, yet they are clear enough in many others, and that even their Obſcurity has its Uſe; and that all Chriſtians might read them, provided they made good uſe of them: That it is neceſſary to believe what the Scripture, Tradition, and the Church teach us, without endeavouring to ſearch too deep into the Myſteries of our Religion, and diſputing about them. They acknowledged no other Books of the Old Teſtament to be Canonical, but thoſe that were received into the Canon of the *Jews*, though now and then they cited ſome other Books as very good and uſeful. In the New Teſtament they received as Canonical the Four Evangeliſts, the Fourteen Epiſtles of S. *Paul*, (though ſome of them queſtioned that to the *Hebrews*, and many Perſons attributed it to another, and not to S. *Paul*) the Firſt Epiſtles of S. *John*, and of S. *Peter*. The Epiſtles of S. *James* and S. *Jude*. The Second of S. *Peter*, the Second and Third of S. *John* were received by ſome, and rejected by others, as well as the *Apocalypſe*. They ſometimes cited the Apocryphal Books, but never reckoned them among the Canonical Scriptures. An Abridgment of Doctrin.

Thus I have given you a ſhort Summary of part of the Opinions of the Fathers in the Three Firſt Ages of the Church. The moſt part of the Proofs, which I have here laid down, are to be found in the Abridgment of thoſe Authors, that I have made in this Volume; and I don't in the leaſt queſtion, but that thoſe Perſons, who will carefully read over the ſame Authors, will be ſenſible, that I have impoſed nothing upon them, and that their Doctrin is what I have now repreſented it.

An Abridgment of the Diſcipline.

WE cannot ſay of the Diſcipline of the Church, what we have affirmed concerning its Doctrin *viz.* That it is the ſame in all Times, and all Places; becauſe it is an undeniable Truth, that it has been different in many Churches, and has been from time to time ſubject to change. We ought not however to conclude from this Principle, that it is unneceſſary to ſtudy the Primitive Diſcipline, or that we are obliged only to learn that of the Time and Church where we live; for beſides, that thoſe Perſons who are ignorant of the Diſcipline of the Primitive Church, cannot pretend to underſtand the Books of the Ancients, this ancient Diſcipline is the Foundation of ours: And tho' the Exterior part has been changed, yet the Spirit of the Church is always the ſame. It is not therefore an unprofitable Labour as ſome have vainly imagined, to buſie ones ſelf in examining the Diſcipline of the Ancient Church; on the contrary, it is a Study extremely uſeful and neceſſary for a Divine. An Abridgment of Diſcipline.

It muſt be acknowledged that the Diſcipline that was obſerved in the Infancy of the Church, however Holy it was in its Simplicity, yet was not arrived to its Perfection; for the Apoſtles altogether applying themſelves to what was neceſſary at the beginning, were content to Preach the Doctrin and Morality of our Bleſſed Saviour, without giving themſelves the trouble to regulate what related to the Ceremonies or Diſcipline of the Church. Nevertheleſs we are not to imagine, that they intirely neglected it, and S. *John*, who lived longer than the reſt of the Apoſtles, ſeems to have applied himſelf more particularly to it. But the Succeſſors of the Apoſtles, by little and little, regulated the Ceremonies, that ought to be obſerved, as well in the Adminiſtration of the Sacraments, as in the Aſſemblies of Chriſtians, and made particular Orders about the Government of Churches, the Form of Eccleſiaſtical Judicatures, and many other Points of Diſcipline.

Theſe Ceremonies were exceedingly augmented in the Fourth Century, when the Church began to enjoy the Benefits of Peace and Tranquility, and publickly Celebrated the Divine Service in the time of the Emperor *Conſtantine*. Then it was that the Biſhops met together with Liberty, being ſupported by the Authority of Princes; and made abundance of Rules concerning the Government of the Church, the Rights of the Biſhops of the greater Sees, the Forms of Judicature, and infinite Numbers of other Matters.

We have here obliged our ſelves to ſpeak only of the Diſcipline, that was obſerved in the Three firſt Ages of the Church: Then it was plain and ſimple, and had ſcarce any other Splendor to recommend it, but what the Holineſs of the Manners and Lives of the Chriſtians gave to it. They Aſſembled every *Sunday* in particular, in certain Places appointed and ſet apart for Publick Devotion, where they continued a long time in Prayer, which they pronounced with a low Voice, without Singing it aloud, as afterwards they did. The Biſhop, or in his Abſence, the Miniſter, preſided in that Congregation, where they read the Holy Scriptures, and oftentimes the Biſhop preached the Word of God. The Feſtivals of our Bleſſed Saviour's Nativity, of *Eaſter* and *Whitſunday* were Celebrated even in thoſe Days with great Solemnity. It was not their Cuſtom on *Sundays*, as likewiſe from *Eaſter* to *Whitſunday*, to pray Kneeling, and when they offered up their Prayers, they always turned to the Eaſt. The places where they met were plain and without Ornament, and it ſeems probable, that in thoſe times the uſe of Images, of Croſſes and Incenſe was not common. They did not give

An Abridgment of *Diſcipline.*

the Name of *Temple* to their Houſes of Publick Prayer, nor that of *Altar* to the Table upon which they celebrated the Euchariſt; they had often their Feaſts of Charity and Benevolence, which they called *Agapæ*, where all Comers were kindly entertained.

They pray'd for the Dead, and made Oblations for them, and celebrated the Sacrifice of the Maſs in Commemoration of them; the Chriſtians gave one another a Kiſs of Peace; they called one another by the Name of Brethren, and continually made the Sign of the Croſs. They pray'd to Saints and Martyrs, and ſolemnized the day of their Death with Joy, and were perſuaded that they interceded with God in behalf of the Living. They Baptized with ſome Ceremonies, thoſe that were well inſtructed in their Religion, and who had given ſatisfactory Signs of their ſincere Converſion; they generally dipt them thrice in the Water, invoking the Name of the Holy Trinity, and they never adminiſtred this Sacrament ſolemnly, but at the Feaſts of *Eaſter* and *Pentecoſt*. In *Africk* towards the Third Age of the Church, they made uſe of Holy Water in Baptizing their *Neophytes*. They anointed them with Oil after Baptiſm, and imagined that this Ceremony convey'd ſome Internal Benefit to them, and likewiſe in ſome Churches they gave them Milk and Hony to taſte. They impoſed Hands upon them, that the plenitude of the Holy Ghoſt might deſcend on them, and they conſidered this Impoſition of Hands, which was generally reſerved for the Biſhop, as a diſtinct Sacrament from Baptiſm.

Baptiſm was never reiterated among them, but by Hereticks in ſome particular Churches, and if after it any Chriſtians fell into Sin, of which they were convinced, or made a Confeſſion to the Prieſt, they were enjoyn'd a ſevere Penance; that is to ſay, they were thrown out of the Communion of the Church, forbidden the Aſſemblies of the Faithful, and obliged to Faſt, to Humble and Mortifie themſelves Publickly at the Church-Porch. In ſome Churches, and particularly in thoſe of *Africk* and *Rome*, there was a time, when they never admitted to Peace thoſe that fell into Idolatry, or thoſe that had committed Murder and Adultery. They afterwards conſented to ſome relaxation for Murderers and Adulterers, and afterwards for Idolaters themſelves, whom they reconciled to the Church, either at the point of Death, or after a long and ſevere Penance. 'Tis true, indeed, they did not uſe the ſame Severity in all Churches, and in ſome they admitted Offenders to a Reconciliation after a ſhort Penance, and they likewiſe abated ſomewhat of the Rigor of it at the recommendation of the Martyrs. As for the Clergy, thoſe of them that fell into any notorious Sin, were not only deprived for ever from the Miniſtry, but alſo obliged to undergo Publick Penance, at leaſt in ſome Churches. They that had once undergone this Scandal in the Face of the Congregation were never admitted into the Clergy. They impoſed this courſe of Repentance never but once, and whoever fell into his vitious Tranſgreſſions the ſecond Time, could never be reconciled to the Church, and was to expect his Pardon from God alone. The Sentence of Excommunication was pronounced againſt Hereticks, the Diſturbers of Diſcipline, and thoſe Chriſtians that perſiſted in a profligate irregular Life. He that was Excommunicated by a Biſhop, could be no where received into Communion. The Matter of the Euchariſt was ordinary Bread, and Wine ming'led with Water; the Faithful made this Offering, and the Prieſt or the Biſhop that preſided in the Aſſembly, ſaid Prayers and Thankſgivings over the Bread and over the Chalice, and after theſe Prayers were ended, all the Congregation anſwered *Amen*. They divided the Conſecrated Bread into ſeveral pieces, and the Deacons diſtributed them to the Standers by, and gave them alſo the Conſecrated Wine. In ſome Churches this Diſtribution was reſerved for the Prieſts, and in others every Man approached near the Table, and took his Portion of the Euchariſt himſelf. All the Chriſtians took it with wonderful reſpect, proteſting they received the Body and Blood of Jeſus Chriſt: They received the Species of Bread in their Hands, and likewiſe the Euchariſt was given to Infants under the Species of Wine. They generally received it in the Morning before they had eaten, but this Cuſtom was not intirely Eſtabliſhed as a Law, and ſometimes they received it in the midſt of a repaſt. This Celebration of the Euchariſt was frequently called a Sacrifice; the Prieſt recited ſeveral Prayers both before and after Conſecration; and S. *Cyprian* obſerves, that he ſaid, *Lift up your hearts to God*: And the People anſwered, *We have lifted them up to the Lord*. The manner of celebrating this Sacrament was Simple and without abundance of Ceremonies, as we have already obſerved in another place. They received the Euchariſt often, and generally whenever they met together in the Aſſemblies of the Faithful: But they believed that they were obliged to live Piouſly, and according to the Holy Rules of the Goſpel, that they might partake of this Celeſtial Food worthily, and after a manner that might be beneficial to them. There is no mention made, in the Three firſt Ages of the Church, of Anointing the Sick, which S. *James* ſpeaks of; perhaps becauſe it was ſeldom uſed in that time. Marriage was celebrated in preſence of the Prieſts, and was confirmed by ſome Oblation. Second Marriages were reputed Scandalous; nay, they were condemned by ſome Perſons. In ſome Churches they allowed the Husband to ſend home his Wife and Marry another, in caſe of Adultery only: But this was no general Cuſtom among them. They took great Care in the Choice of their Miniſters to elect ſuch Perſons, whoſe Life and Converſation were unblameable. After the Death of thoſe who had been ordained by the Apoſtles, the People Elected. Though the Names of Biſhops and Presbyters were frequently confounded; yet the Biſhops were above the Presbyters. The Biſhops were generally Ordained by their Brethren, who impoſed their Hands upon them, and the Prieſts by the Impoſition of their Biſhop and the Clergy. The Biſhop was mightily reſpected and conſidered by them: Nothing of conſiderable moment in the Church could be done without him, even Baptiſm it ſelf was reſerved for him, but then he treated his Presbyters as Brethren, and did nothing without their Advice. There were Deacons in the

Times

Times of the Apostles, to whom belonged the Administration of Sacred Things at the beginning of the Church, and to whom in some places it was allowed to lay Hands upon Penitents in case of Necessity. The Deaconnesses also are very Ancient. As for the Sub-Deacons, and other inferiour Orders, they were afterwards instituted; yet they were in use in S. *Cyprian*'s time. An Abridgment of *Discipline.*

All the Bishops were persuaded, that they received their Office immediately from Jesus Christ, and that Providence had assigned to each of them a Portion of the Flock of the Heavenly Pastor to Govern, in such a manner however, as that in an exigence or time of Necessity, they were to relieve the wants of all Churches. They lived in great Union together, and preserved a mutual Correspondence by Letters, which they sent one to another. The Bishops of great Cities had their Prerogatives in Ordinations, and in Councils; and as in Civil Affairs Men generally had recourse to the Civil Metropolis, so likewise in Ecclesiastical Matters, they consulted with the Bishop of the Metropolitan City. The Churches of the Three Principal Cities of the World were looked upon as Chief, and their Bishops attributed great Prerogatives to themselves. *The Church of* Rome *founded by S.* Peter *and S.* Paul, *was consider'd as first, and its Bishop, as first among all the Bishops of the World; yet they did not believe him to be Infallible; and though they frequently consulted him, and his Advice was of great Consequence, yet they did not receive it blind-fold and implicitely, every Bishop imagining himself to have a Right to Judge in Ecclesiastical Matters.* They had a Prodigious respect for the Decisions of Councils; and the Opinion of the Universal Church, that is to say, of all the Churches in the World, passed for an Infallible Rule of Faith. They esteemed those Persons, that were separated from the visible Society of the Church, to be Schismaticks, for whom no Salvation was to be had. The Clergy were not distinguished from others by any peculiar Habits, but by the Sanctity of their Life and Manners, they were removed from all kind of Avarice, and carefully avoided every thing that seem'd to carry the appearance of scandalous, filthy Lucre. They administred the Sacrament *gratis*, and believed it to be an abominable Crime to give or receive any thing for a Spiritual Blessing. Tithes were not then appropriated to them, but the People maintained them voluntarily at their own Expence. The Goods of the Church were in common between the Priests and Bishop, who had the Administration of them; the Offerings were reserved for the Poor; the Pastors never abandoned the Flock that was committed to their Care, but with infinite regret, and only in case of Necessity, and carefully acquitted themselves in all the Functions of the Ministry. The Clergy were prohibited to meddle with any Civil and Secular Affairs. They were ordained against their Will, and did not remove from one Church to another, out of a Principle of Interest or Ambition. They were extremely Chast and Regular. It was lawful for Priests to keep the Wives they married before they were Ordained, but Marriage was never permitted after Ordination; but both the one and the other was allowed to Deacons. Monks were not as yet instituted; but there were abundance of Persons of both Sexes among the Christians, that lived in a state of Celibacy, and chearfully submitted to the austerities of an Ascetick Life. There were likewise some Women in the Third Age of the Church, that solemnly obliged themselves to keep their Virginity all their Life-time. All Christians forbore to eat of any Meat that was Strangled, or Blood, or things offered to Idols, which were called *Idolothyta*. They fasted with great rigor before *Easter*, some a longer, and others a shorter space, according to the different Customs of Churches: Besides this, they ordinarily fasted every *Wednesday* and *Friday*, till Three a Clock in the Afternoon only, and many of them spent these Days in Prayers, which they called their Stations. They likewise fasted and mortified themselves in Times of Publick Calamities, and when they were in the rank of Penitents. They were of Opinion, That it was unlawful to fast on *Sundays*, and from *Easter* to *Whitsontide*. They buried the Bodies of the Deceased in the Earth, and did not approve of the Custom of those that burnt them.

These are the Principal Points of the Discipline of the Ancient Church, which I have collected with all the brevity and exactness that was possible. But no body ought to conclude from what has been said here, that all these things were practised in all Churches, and in all Times of the Three first Centuries. Some began to be used but in the Third Age, and others were only observed in some particular Churches. After all, it must be confessed, That the Discipline of the Church has been so extremely different, and so often altered, that it is almost impossible to say any thing positively concerning it.

An Abridgment of the Morality.

THE Morality of the Gospel has been as immutable as its Doctrin, but it has moreover this Advantage, that though there have been abundance of lewd, wicked Christians in the World, who lived in a manner contrary to the Rules of the Evangelick Morality; yet there were never any Persons to be found in all Antiquity, so rash as to overthrow the Rules of this Morality, and to establish Maxims opposite to it; for, there was scarce ever any dispute in the Church, or any different Sentiments about the Questions of Morality. They followed the Precepts of the Gospel according to the Letter, and exhorted all the Faithful to imitate the Life of Jesus Christ, as a Model of what they were to observe. I should never have done, if I should endeavour to heap together all the Principles or Heads of Morality, that are to be found in the Authors of the Three first Ages: It is sufficient to say, that they not only carried the Professors of Christianity to observe the Precepts of the Decalogue and the Natural Law, but that they likewise recommended to them, the embracing the Perfection of the Christian Mo- An Abridgment of *Morality.*

An Abridgment of *Morality.*

Morality. They maintained, that the moſt agreeable Sacrifice that could be offered to God, was to give him a contrite Heart; that it was neceſſary to love him above all things, in order to be juſt; that thoſe that were influenced only by a Principle of ſervile fear, were not really upright; that we ought to die, and ſuffer all Puniſhments imaginable, rather than be guilty of any thing, that might give the World occaſion to believe, that we have renounced or deſpiſed the Doctrin of Jeſus Chriſt; that we ought to love our Neighbour as our ſelf, and aſſiſt and help him; to wiſh ill to no body, to render Good for Evil, and Pray for thoſe that Perſecute us. They exhorted the Faithful to give large Alms, to viſit the Poor, to comfort the Sick, and thoſe that were Impriſoned upon the account of Religion. They recommended it to the Conſideration of thoſe Chriſtians that were Rich and Powerful, to employ the Superfluities of their Fortune in theſe indiſpenſable Duties, and to uſe the World without being Wedded to it; They taught them, that they were obliged not only to avoid Criminal Pleaſures, ſuch as Debauchery, and thoſe that were dangerous, ſuch as the publick Shows and Comedies, but alſo all unprofitable Pleaſures, that had no other end but the meer entertainment of the Senſes; that they ought to content themſelves with what was neceſſary, without a ſollicitous purſuit and ſearch after thoſe Things that ſerved only for Pleaſure or Luxury: That Chriſtian Women ought to be extremely Modeſt in their Garb and Dreſs. They commanded all Perſons of whatſoever Condition, to be Obedient to all Emperors, Magiſtrates and Secular Powers. They exhorted Wives to love their Husbands, Husbands to cheriſh their Wives, Children to obey their Fathers and Mothers, and Parents to have a Care of their Children, and reprehend them without Bitterneſs; they admoniſhed the Faithful to be ſubmiſſive to their Paſtors, and the Paſtors to have a great deal of Charity and Zeal for their Flock.

In a word, They preſcribed all the Rules and Holy Maxims of the Goſpel to the Obſervation of Chriſtians, and exhorted them to lead a Life conformable to them. But what is moſt to be admired, this excellent Syſtem of Morality was not only to be found in the Writings of the Firſt Chriſtians; but it appeared and glittered in their Lives and Actions. *We ſay not great things*, ſays one of theſe Ancients, *but we live them.* Non eloquimur magna, ſed vivimus.

The End of the Firſt Volume.

A CHRO-

A

Chronological Table

OF THE

AUTHORS

OF THE

OLD TESTAMENT.

With the Names of the Authors, their Country, and Imployments, Time of their Birth, Time when they Flourished, and Time of their Death.

MOSES, of the Tribe of *Levi*, Chief of the People of *Israel*, born in *Ægypt* in the 2433d, year of the World, 1571 Years before Jesus Christ; he brought the *Israelites* out of the *Ægyptian* Bondage in the Year 2513, and led them in the Wilderness for forty years.

He died in the Year 2553. 1451 Years before the Birth of Jesus Christ.

JOSHUA, Son of *Nun*, *Moses*'s Successor, born in the Year 2460, he succeeded *Moses* in the Year 2552; and governed the People till the Year 2570, died in the Year 2570, Aged 110 years.

JOB, descended from *Esau*, believed to be as old, or older than *Moses*.

SAMUEL, Prophet and last Judge of the People of *Israel*, born in the Year 2849. he began to govern the People in the Year 2888. and ruled them 21 years, died in the Year 2947.

The AUTHORS of the Books of *Judges* and *Ruth*, who lived before the Captivity.

DAVID, Son of *Jesse*, of the Tribe of *Judah*, King of *Israel*, born in the Year 2919, he reigned forty years, *i. e.* 7 years in *Hebron*, and 33 in *Jerusalem*; died in the year 2990, and 1014 years before Jesus Christ.

GAD and NATHAN, Prophets, Prophesied under *David* and *Solomon*, from the Year 2980. till the Year 3020 *circiter*.

SOLOMON, Son of *David*, King of *Israel*, reigned from the Year 2990, till the Year 3030, died in the Year 3030.

AHIJAH and IDDO, Prophets, under *Solomon* and *Jeroboam*.

HOSEA, Son of *Beeri*, Prophesied under *Uzziah*, *Jotham*, &c. from the Year 3194, till towards the End of the next Age.

JOEL, Prophet; some say, soon after *Hosea*'s death; others, not till after the Captivity.

ISAIAH, Son of *Amos*, of the Blood-Royal, began to Prophesie in the 25th Year of *Uzziah*, in the Year 3219, and continued for an Age.

AMOS, Herdsman of *Tekoah* near *Bethlehem*, began to Prophesie in the 24th Year of *Uzziah*; *i. e.* about the 3218th Year of the World, and continued 25 or 26 years.

OBADIAH, Prophet, Time when he lived, and Prophesied very uncertain.

JONAH, Son of *Amittai* of the Tribe of *Zebulun* Prophesied from the end of the 31st Century of the World, to the end of the 32d.

MICAH, Of the Tribe of *Judah*, began to Prophesie in the Year 3257. under *Jotham*, and continued under *Ahaz* and *Hezekiah*, for about fifty years.

HABBAKKUK, Prophet, sometime in *Manasseh*'s Reign, but uncertain.

NAHUM, Prophet, Time uncertain.

JEREMIAH, born near *Jerusalem*, of the Family of the Priests began to Prophesie in the Year 3375, and continued 45 years.

BARUCH, Scholar and *Amanuenſes* to *Jeremiah*, Propheſied in *Jeremiah*'s time, or rather after his death.

DANIEL, Of the Blood-Royal, Propheſied during the Captivity, from the Year 606, before Jeſus Chriſt, *i. e.* the Year 3398. of the World, for almoſt 70 Years.

EZEKIEL, Son of *Buzi* the Prieſt, began to Propheſie in the Year 3408, the fifth of the Captivity, and continued under *Jeconiah* 22 Years.

HAGGAI and *ZECHARIAH*, Son of *Berachiah* the Son of *Iddo*, Propheſied after the People returned; and began in the Year 3485. 519 Years before the Birth of Jeſus Chriſt.

MALACHI, Prophet, after the two former.

TOBIT, wrote after the Ten Tribes were carried away by *Shalmaneʒar*, in the Year 3283, 721 Years before Jeſus Chriſt.

The Author of the Book of *JUDITH* uncertain. Time uncertain.

EZRA, returned from *Babylon* to *Jeruſalem* in the Year 3537.

NEHEMIAH, the Author of the Book of *Chronicles*, returned in the Year 3550. Lived in *Ezra*'s time

The LXX Interpreters, under *Ptolomy Philadelphus*, about the Year 3727.

JESUS, Son of *Sirach*, under *Ptolomy Euergetes*, in the Year 3759.

The uncertain Author of the firſt Book of *MACCABEES*.

JASON, Abridger of the Second.

PHILO JUDÆUS, A Platonick Philoſopher, under the Emperors *Tiberius*, and *Caius Caligula*.

JOSEPHUS, of the Prieſtly Family, deſcended from the *Haſmonæans*, born the Year 37. after Jeſus Chriſt, under *Veſpaſian*, *Titus* and *Domitian*; died in the Year 93, after Jeſus Chriſt.

JUSTUS, of *Tiberias*, at the ſame time.

A CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE of the Authors of the *NEW TESTAMENT*.

With the Names of the Authors, *their* Country, *and* Employments, *Time of their* Birth, *Time when they* Flouriſhed, *and time of their* Deaths.

ST. *MATTHEW*, Publican, converted by Jeſus Chriſt, and made an Apoſtle, wrote his Goſpel about the 39th year of the common Account.

St. *MARK*, Diſciple of St. *Peter*, wrote about the Year 43, or perhaps ſeveral years after.

St. *LUKE*, Phyſician of *Antioch*, wrote his Goſpel about the Year 56. of Jeſus Chriſt. The *Acts* were written afterwards, towards the Year 58.

St. *JOHN*, Son of *Zebedee*, Apoſtle of Jeſus Chriſt, and the beloved Diſciple, wrote his Goſpel about 100 years after the Birth of Jeſus Chriſt.

The *Revelation* in the Year 95.

The time of his Epiſtles uncertain. Died in the Year 101. after the Birth of Jeſus Chriſt, in the 68th year after his Death.

SAUL or *PAUL*, of the Tribe of *Benjamin*, of the City of *Tarſus*, converted in the Year 34.

Wrote his two Epiſtles to the *Theſſalonians* in the Year 52.

In the Year 56, to the *Galatians* and *Corinthians*.

In the Year 57, to the *Romans*.

In the Year 62, to the *Epheſians*, *Philippians*, the *Coloſſians*, the *Hebrews*, and *Philemon*.

In the Year 63, the firſt Epiſtle to *Timothy*, and that to *Titus*.

In the Year 64, the Second to *Timothy*. Suffered Martyrdom in *Nero*'s Perſecution, in the Year 64.

St. *JAMES*, Kinſman of our Lord, made Biſhop of *Jeruſalem* after the Death of Jeſus Chriſt.

Time when he wrote his Epiſtle uncertain. Died in the Year 63.

St. *PETER*, Son of *Jona*, Chief of the Apoſtles, wrote his firſt Epiſtle in all probability, about the Year 43 or 44. and the Second a little before his Death. Suffered in the Year 64. in *Nero*'s Perſecution.

St. *JUDE*, Son of *Alpheus*, called alſo *Thaddeus* or *Lebbæus*, wrote after St. *Peter*'s Death.

A CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF THE Eccleſiaſtical Authors That are Mentioned in this Volume.

With the Names of the Authors, their Country, and Employments, Time of their Birth, Time when they Flouriſhed, and Time of their Deaths.

HERMAS, a Greek Author; the ſame Perſon probably that St. *Paul* ſalutes in his Epiſtle to the *Romans*; which was written in the Year 57. *Neronis* 4to.

St. CLEMENT, Biſhop of *Rome*, by birth a *Greek*, contemporary with the Apoſtles, he governed that Church from the Year 93, to the Year 101, under the Emperors *Domitian*, *Nerva*, *Trajan*; died in the Year 101. the third Year of *Trajan*.

DENYS, believed to have been originally of *Thrace*, Judge of the *Areopagus* at *Athens*, and afterwards Biſhop of that Church, converted by St. *Paul* in the Year 52. conſtituted Biſhop of that Church towards the Year 60; he governed it till the Year 95, under the Emperor *Nero*, *Veſpaſian*, and *Domitian*; died in the Year 95. in *Domitian*'s Perſecution.

St. IGNATIUS, called *Theophorus*, of *Aſia*, Biſhop of *Antioch*. Some ſay he was about ſeven years old when *Jeſus Chriſt* preached: Some ſay he was not born till after *Jeſus Chriſt*'s Death. He ſucceeded *Evodius* in the See of *Antioch* in the Year 70 of *Jeſus Chriſt*, and govern'd that Church forty years under *Veſpaſian* and his Succeſſors, till *Trajan*'s time, under whom he ſuffered Martyrdom; died in the tenth Year of *Trajan*, in the Year 107.

St. POLYCARP, of *Aſia*, Biſhop of *Smyrna*, born about the Year 70, Conſecrated to the Service of God in the Year 81. Conſecrated about the Year 98. He govern'd the Chutch of *Smyrna* till the Year 167, from the time of *Nerva* to *Commodus*; ſuffered Martyrdom in the Year 167.

PAPIAS, of *Aſia*, Biſhop of *Hierapolis*, Diſciple of St. *John* the Evangeliſt; he flouriſhed under the Emperors *Trajan* and *Hadrian*. The year of his Death is not known.

QUADRATUS, of *Aſia*, Diſciple of the Apoſtles, flouriſhed under *Hadrian*, to whom he preſented an Apology for the Chriſtians about the Year 120.

ARISTIDES, a Philoſopher of *Athens*, preſented an Apology to the ſame Emperor about the ſame time.

AGRIPPA, a Greek Author, flouriſhed at the ſame time.

HEGESIPPUS, of *Palæſtine*, born ſoon after the Apoſtles deaths, about the beginning of the Second Century, flouriſhed under the *Antonines*, and wrote his Hiſtory under Pope *Eleutherius*; he died under the Emperor *Commodus*, about the Year 180.

St. JUSTIN, a Philoſopher born at *Sichem*, a City in *Palæſtine*, a Greek by Birth and Religion; flouriſhed under *Antoninus Pius*. to whom he preſented an Apology about the Year 150. died in the Year 166.

MELITO, of *Aſia*, Biſhop of *Sardis*, flouriſhed under *M. Aurelius* the Philoſopher to whom he preſented an Apology for the Chriſtians in the Year 182. died about the Year 185.

TATIAN, an *Aſſyrian*, flouriſhed under *M. Aurelius*, and *Commodus*.

ATHENAGORAS, an *Athenian* Philoſopher, flouriſhed at the ſame time, and preſented an Apology to *M. Aurelius*.

HERMIAS, a Greek Author. Time when he lived uncertain.

THEOPHILUS, a Greek Author, Bishop of *Antioch*. Consecrated Bishop of *Antioch* in the Year 170. governed that Church till the Year 181 or 182, under *M. Aurelius*, and the first years of *Commodus*. Died in the Year 182.

APOLLINARIS, a Greek, Bishop of *Hierapolis*, a City in *Phrygia*, flourished under the Emperor *M. Aurelius*; died about the beginning of *Commodus*'s Reign, in the Year 182 or 183.

DIONYSIUS, Bishop of *Corinth*, flourished under the Emperors *M. Aurelius* and *Commodus*. Died in the latter End of *Commodus*'s, or the beginning of *Severus*'s Reign.

PINYTUS, a Bishop in *Crete*.
PHILIP, a Bishop in the same Island.
MODESTUS, a Greek.
MUSANUS, a Greek.
BARDESANES, a *Syrian* of *Edessa*.

These five flourished under the Emperors *M. Aurelius Antonius* the Philosopher, and *Commodus*.

St. *IRENÆUS*, a Greek, went into *Gaul*, was ordained Priest, and afterwards Bishop of *Lyons*, born about the year 140. Disciple of S. *Polycarp* and *Papias*, Consecrated in the Year 178. in the 17th year of the Reign of *M. Aurelius*, under whom, and his Successors, *Pertinax* and *Severus*, he flourished in the time of *Eleutherius* and *Victor*, Bishops of *Rome*. Suffered Martyrdom in the Year 202 or 203.

VICTOR, Bishop of *Rome*, Consecrated Bishop of that Church in the Year 191, died in the year 201.

POLYCRATES, of *Asia*, Bishop of *Ephesus*, lived at the same time.

THEOPHILUS, of *Palæstine*, Bishop of *Cæsarea*, and

BACHILLUS, Bishop of *Corinth*, lived at the same time.

The two *APOLLONII*, one a Greek, the other a Roman Senator, flourished under *Commodus*.

Two *ANONYMOUS* Greek Authors, who wrote against the Heresies of *Montanus* and *Artemo*, at the same time.

HERACLITUS,
MAXIMUS,
APPION,
CANDIDUS,
SEXTUS,
ARABIANUS,
JUDAS, and several others, whose Country is not known, flourished under *Commodus*, *Pertinax*, and *Severus*.

SERAPION, Bishop of *Antioch*, chosen in the Year 191, governed that Church under the Emperors *Commodus*, *Pertinax*, *Severus*, and *Caracalla*. Died in the year 213. about the end of the first year of *Caracalla*.

RHODON, of *Asia*, studied at *Rome*, under the Emperors *Commodus* and *Severus*.

PANTÆNUS, a Stoick Philosopher, born in *Sicily*, Catechist of *Alexandria*, President of the *Alexandrian* School towards the beginning of *Commodus*'s Reign, about the Year 184. He went then into the *Indies* to preach the Gospel, and upon his return resumed his Employment under the Emperors *Severus* and *Caracalla*. Died about the year 212. under the Emperor *Caracalla*.

St. *CLEMENT*, believed to have been of *Athens*, Presbyter and Catechist of *Alexandria*, flourished under the Emperors *Severus*, *Caracalla*, and *Heliogabalus*, from the year 196. to the year 220. Died in the year 220.

MILTIADES, a Greek, flourished under *Commodus* and *Severus*.

TERTULLIAN, originally of *Africa*, a *Carthaginian*, Presbyter of that Church, a Latin Writer, flourished under the Emperors *Severus* and *Caracalla*, from the year 194. till towards the year 216. He turned *Montanist* in the year 207. Died about the year 220.

CAIUS, Presbyter of *Rome*, flourished under *Severus* and *Caracalla*, under the Popes *Victor* and *Zephyrinus*, from the year 196. to the year 201.

HYPPOLITUS, Bishop of *Ostia* in *Italy*, or rather of a City in *Arabia*; suffered Martyrdom in the Year 230.

GEMINIANUS,
or
GEMINUS, under the same Emperor.

ALEXANDER, Bishop in *Cappadocia*, afterwards of *Jerusalem*, taken in as Coadjutor to *Narcissus*, Bishop of *Jerusalem*, in the beginning of *Caracalla*'s Reign, about the Year 213. Died in the Year 250.

JULIUS AFRICANUS, of *Palæstine*, flourished under the Emperor *Heliogabalus* and *Alexander Severus*, from the Year 218. till about the Year 230.

MINUTIUS FELIX, a Lawyer of *Rome*, flourished towards the beginning of the third Century.

AMMONIUS, a Philosopher of *Alexandria*, flourished under the Emperor *Severus*.

ORIGEN, an *Alexandrian*, Catechist of that School, afterwards Presbyter, born about the Year 185, settled Catechist about the Year 203, and flourished till the Year 252. Died in the Year 252.

BERYLLUS, Bishop of *Bostra* in *Arabia*. Converted by *Origen*, under the Emperor *Gordian* in in the Year 238.

St. *CYPRIAN*, an *African*, Bishop of *Carthage*, Converted by *Cæcilius* in the Year 246. govern'd the Church of *Carthage* from the Year 248. to the Year 258. under the Emperors *Philip*, *Decius*, *Gallus*, *Volusian* and *Valerian*. Suffered Martyrdom in the Year 258.

PONTIUS, of *Africa*, Disciple of St. *Cyprian*, under *Volusian*.

CORNELIUS, Bishop of *Rome*, Consecrated in the Year 251.

NOVATIAN, a Roman, flourished under the Emperor *Philip*; created Anti-Pope in 251. and wrote in 253.

St. *MARTIALIS*, a Greek, came to *Tholouse* in the Year 250.

SIXTUS,

A TABLE of Books belonging to the *Old Teſtament*.

SIXTUS, Biſhop of *Rome*, choſen Biſhop in the Year 254.

GREGORY THAUMATURGUS, born at *Neocæſarea*, a City in *Pontus*, of a Noble Family; afterwards Biſhop of that City. Born about the Year 215. Converted by *Origen*, whoſe Diſciple he was. Choſen Biſhop in the Year 240. flouriſhed under the Emperors *Gordian*, *Philip*, *Gallus*, *Voluſian*, *Decius*, *Valerian* and *Gallienus*, for 25 years. Died in the year 265.

DIONYSIUS, Diſciple of *Origen*, Catechiſt, and Biſhop of *Alexandria*, choſen Biſhop in the year 247. flouriſhed under the ſame Emperors for ſeventeen years.

THEOGNOSTUS, of *Alexandria*. Time uncertain.

ATHENOGENES. Time uncertain.

DIONYSIUS, Biſhop of *Rome*, govern'd that Church from the year 258. to the year 270.

MALCHION, Presbyter of *Antioch*, diſputed againſt *Paulus Samoſatenus* in the year 270.

ARCHELAUS, a *Syrian*, Biſhop of *Meſopotamia*, flouriſhed under the Emperor *Probus* towards the year 280.

ANATOLIUS, of *Alexandria*, Biſhop of *Laodicea* in *Syria*, under the ſame Emperor, and his Succeſſor *Carus*.

VICTORINUS, Biſhop of *Paſſaw*, at the ſame time.

PIERIUS, Presbyter, and Catechiſt of *Alexandria*, under *Carus* and *Diocleſian*, about the year 285.

METHODIUS, Biſhop of *Lycia*, afterwards of *Tyre* in *Paleſtine*, under the ſame Emperors; ſuffered Martyrdom in 302 or 303.

PAMPHILUS, Presbyter of *Cæſarea* in *Paleſtine*, ſuffered Martyrdom under *Maximinus*.

LUCIAN, Presbyter of *Antioch*, died under the ſame Emperor.

PHILEAS, of *Thmuis*, a City of *Ægypt*, died, under the ſame Emperor.

ZENO, Biſhop of *Verona*, died in *Julian* the Apoſtate's time.

ARNOBIUS, an *African*, Profeſſor of Rhetorick at *Sicca*, a City in *Numidia*, flouriſh'd under *Diocleſian* towards the end of the third, and beginning of the fourth Centuries.

L. CÆCILIUS FIRMIANUS, ſirnamed *LACTANTIUS*, according to ſome, an *Italian*, to others, an *African*, ſtudied in *Africa*, afterwards went to *Nicomedia*, where he taught Rhetorick, and at laſt Tutor to *Criſpus*. He wrote in Latin; flouriſhed under *Diocleſian* and *Conſtantine*, from the year 302, till towards the year 330.

COMMODIANUS, a Latin Author, probably an *Italian*, in the time of Pope *Sylveſter*.

JULIUS FIRMICUS MATERNUS, a Latin Author, Biſhop of *Milain*, according to *Baronius*, under *Conſtantius* and *Conſtantine*, Sons of *Conſtantine* the Great. He wrote about 340 or 350.

A TABLE of *BOOKS* that belong to the *Old Teſtament*, Canonical, Apocryphal, and Loſt.

Canonical Books unanimouſly received by Jews and Chriſtians.

THE five Books of *Moſes*.
The Book of *Joſhua*.
The Book of *Judges*.
The Book of *Samuel*, *i.e.* the firſt and ſecond Books of *Kings*.
Iſaiah.
Jeremiah.
Ezechiel.
The Twelve minor Prophets.
The Book of *Job*.
The 150 *Pſalms*.
The *Proverbs*, *Eccleſiaſtes*, *Canticles* } of *Solomon*.
Daniel.
The *Chronicles*.
Ezra divided by us into Two Books.

Thoſe Books thus divided are 22.

Books owned by ſome Jews as Canonical and rejected by others.

Eſther.
Ruth.
Baruch.

Books rejected by Jews, and moſt Primitive of the Chriſtians, as Apocryphal, and afterwards received by the Church.

Tobit.
Judith.
Wiſdom.
Eccleſiaſticus.
The two Books of *Maccabees*.
The Hiſtory of *Suſanna*.
Bel and the *Dragon*.

Books cited in the Old Teſtament, which are loſt.

The Book of the Covenant, *Exod.* 24. [This does not ſeem

A TABLE of Books belonging to the *Old Teſtament*.

ſeem to be a Book by it ſelf, but only thoſe Laws which are ſet down in the 10, 21, 22, and 23d Chapters forgoing: for the People promiſed in the ſame Verſe, That *all which the Lord hath ſaid, they would do, and be obedient.* (Exod. 24. 7.) which words refer to the Laws ſet down above, that God delivered to *Moſes* upon the Mount.]

The Book of *the Wars of the Lord*, Numb. 21. 14.
The Book of *Jaſher*, Joſ. 10.13. 2. Sam.1. 18.
The Books of *Nathan, Gad, Shemaiah, Iddo, Ahijah, Jehu*, Chron.
The Book of *Samuel*, 1 Chron.29.29. [This alſo ſeems to be no other than the Books of *Samuel* in the Old Teſtament; in which, as every one knows, there is a very particular Account of *David*'s Life, from his Unction by *Samuel*, till his Death.]
The Sayings of *Hozai*, [or as our Tranſlation renders it, *of the Seers.*] 2 Chron. 33. 19.
The Diſcourſes of *Uzziah*, 2 Chron. 26. 22. [This is obſcurely expreſſed: He means the Life of *Uzziah*, written by the Prophet *Iſaiah.*]
Three thouſand Proverbs of *Solomon*, 1 Kings 4. 32.
A thouſand and five Songs. *Ibid.*
Several other Diſcourſes of his. *Ibid.*
The Deſcriptions of *Jeremiah*, Matth.2. 17. [What our Author means here, I cannot tell. The Evangeliſt quotes the Prophet *Jeremiah*, (31. 15.) and the ſence of the words of the Prophet, agrees with that of thoſe in the Evangeliſt, exactly.]
The Memoirs of *Hyrcanus*,
The Books of *Jaſon*.

Apocryphal Books, not dangerous.

The Prayer of King *Maneſſes*.
The Third and Fourth Book of *Eſdras*.
The Third and Fourth Books of the *Maccabees*.
The Genealogy of *Job*, and a Diſcourſe of his Wife.
The 151ſt *Pſalm*.

Other Apocryphal Books of the ſame Nature, which are loſt.

The Book of *Enoch*.
The Book of the Aſſumption of *Moſes*.

Books forged by Jews and Hereticks, Fabulous and Erroneous, which are loſt.

The Generations of the Creation of *Adam*.
The Revelation of *Adam*.
A Book of Magick by *Cham*.
The Aſſumption of *Abraham*.
The Book of the Twelve Patriarchs.
A Book of *Jannes* and *Jambres*.
A Book written by King *Og*.
Jacob's Ladder.
The Genealogy of the Sons and Daughters of *Adam*.
With ſeveral others.

Greek Tranſlations.

An old Verſion of the Bible, or of ſome part of it.
The Tranſlation of the LXX Interpreters.
Aquila's Verſion.
Theodotion's Verſion.
Symmachus's Verſion.
A Fifth and Sixth Verſion.
A Seventh upon the Pſalms.

Authors whoſe Books have a Relation to the Hiſtory of the Old Teſtament.

Genuine.

Philo.
Joſephus.
Juſtus.

Forged or Doubtful.

Ariſteas.
Ariſtobulus.
Joſeph Bengorion.
Pſeudo-Beroſus.
Manetho.
Metaſthenes.
Pſeudo-Dorotheus.
Zoroaſter.
Sanchoniathon.
Philo Byblius.
The Teſtament of the Twelve *Patriarchs.*

A TABLE of *BOOKS* that belong to the *New Teſtament.*

Books owned as Canonical, at all times, and by all CHRISTIANS.

THE Four Goſpels.
Thirteen Epiſtles of St. *Paul.*
The firſt Epiſtle of St. *Peter.*
The firſt Epiſtle of St. *John.*
[The *Acts of the Apoſtles*; This by a Miſtake is omitted in *du Pin.*]

Books doubted of at firſt by ſeveral, but ſoon received as Canonical by the Catholick Church.

The Epiſtle to the *Hebrews.*
The Epiſtle of St. *James.*
The Second Epiſtle of St. *Peter.*
The Second and Third Epiſtle of St. *John.*
The Epiſtle of St. *Jude*, ſomething later.
The *Revelation*, which was not univerſally received of a long time.

Apocryphal Books, not full of Errors.

The Letter of *J. C.* to *Agbarus.*
The Letters of the *V. M.*
The Goſpel according to the *Ægyptians.*
The Goſpel according to the *Hebrews.*
The *Proto-Evangelium* of St. *James.*
The Goſpel of *Nicodemus.*
The Ancient Acts of *Paul* and *Thecla.*
The Epiſtle to the *Laodiceans.*
The Letters of St. *Paul* to *Seneca.*
The Epiſtle of St. *Barnabas.*
The Liturgies { Of St. *Peter.* / Of St. *Mark.* / Of St. *James.* / Of St. *Mathew.*
The Canons and Conſtitutions of the Apoſtles.
The Book of *Prochorus.*
The Book of *Abdias.*
The Ancient Acts of the Paſſion of St. *Andrew.*

Erroneous Books forged by Hereticks.

The Goſpels. { Of St. *Thomas.* / Of St. *Matthias.* / Of St. *Bartholomew.* / Of the Twelve. / Of *Philip.* / Of *Judas.* / Of *Thaddæus.* / Of *Barnabas.*
A Book of the Childhood of *Jeſus Chriſt.*
A Book of the Genealogy of *Mary.*
The Acts { Of St. *Peter.* / Of St. *Paul.* / Of St. *Andrew.* / Of the Apoſtles. / Of St. *John.* / Of St. *Philip.* / Of St. *Thomas.*
The Doctrine and Sermons of St. *Peter.*
The *Clementines.*
The Memoirs of the Apoſtles.
The Travels of the Apoſtles,
A Book of the Prieſthood of *Jeſus Chriſt.*
The Life of the Virgin *Mary.*
Queſtions of the Virgin *Mary.*
Revelations. { Of St. *Peter.* / Of St. *Paul.* / Of St. *Thomas.* / Of St. *Stephen.*

Other Suppoſititious Books, favourable to Religion.

A Letter of *Agbarus* to *Jeſus Chriſt.*
Letters of *Lentulus* and *Pilate* concerning *Jeſus Chriſt.*
The *Sybilline* Oracles.
The Books of *Hermes Triſmegiſtus.*
The Books of *Hyſtaſpes.*
Seneca's Letters to St. *Paul*
A Paſſage of *Joſephus* concerning *Jeſus Chriſt*; which we cannot tell whether it be Suppoſititious or no.

A TABLE

Of all the

Eccleſiaſtical Writers.

Mentioned in this Volume.

Names of Authors.	*Genuine Books ſtill extant.*	*Books Loſt.*	*Suppoſititious Books.*
HERMAS.	A Diſcourſe entituled, *Paſtor* divided into Three Books.		
St. *CLEMENT.*	Two Epiſtles to the *Corinthians.*		The Conferences of St. *Peter* and *Appion.* Recognitions. Apoſtolical Conſtitutions. *Clementines*
DENYS the *Areopagite.*			Books of the Celeſtial and Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchy. A Diſcourſe of the Names of God. A Diſcourſe of Myſtical Theology. Ten Letters.
St. *IGNATIUS.*	Epiſtles to the *Smyrnæans.* To St. *Polycarp.* To the *Epheſians.* To the *Magneſians.* To the *Philadelphians.* To the *Trallians.* To the *Romans.* According to *Voſſius*'s and *Uſher*'s Editions.		Five ſpurious *Greek* Letters. To *Maria Caſſobilita.* To the *Tarſians.* To the *Antiochians.* To *Hero* the Deacon. To the *Philippians.* Three in *Latin*, one to the *V. M.* the other two to St. *John.*
St *POLYCARP.*	Epiſtle to the *Philippians.*	Some Letters to the Neighbouring Churches.	A Letter to St. *Denys* the *Areopagite* A Diſcourſe of the Union of St. *John.* [Dr. *Cave* produces a Quotation out of *Helloixius*'s Life of St. *Polycarp*, which ſays, This Book was *concerning* St. *John*'s *Death.* They both mean the ſame *Book*, becauſe they ſay from *Halloixius*, that it is extant in the Library of the Abby of *Fleury.* I believe it is falſe Printed in Mr. *Du Pin.*

A Table of all the Eccleſiaſtical Writers, &c.

Names of Authors.	*Genuine Books, ſtill Extant.*	*Books loſt.*	*Suppoſititious Books.*
PAPIAS.		Five Books entituled *Explications of the Diſcourſes of our Saviour.*	
QUADRATUS. *ARISTIDES.*		Two Apologies for the Chriſtians.	
AGRIPPA. *HEGESIPPUS.*		A Diſcourſe againſt *Baſilides.* An Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, divided into five Books.	
JUSTIN Martyr.	Two Apologies, The Second Part of the Book of the Monarchy of God. A Conference with *Trypho*, the *Jew.* Two Orations againſt the *Gentiles*, doubtful. A Letter to *Diognetus*, doubtful. [Theſe are owned by Doctor *Cave.*]	A Diſcourſe againſt Hereſies, particularly againſt *Marcion.* Two Books againſt the *Gentiles*, one called *The Pſalmiſt.* A Book of Collections concerning the Soul. [Beſides theſe, Dr. *Cave* mentions, An Expoſition of the *Revelations.* A Commentary upon *Hexameron.* Letters, *περὶ τῆ πάντων.* A Diſcourſe upon the Reſurrection.	Letters to *Zena* and *Serenus.* [Owned by Dr. *Cave* as *Genuine.* A Confutation of ſome *Ariſtotelian* Opinions. [Owned likewiſe by him.] Queſtions and Anſwers to the Queſtions of the Orthodox. An Expoſition of the Faith concerning the Trinity.
MELITO.		Two Books of *Eſther.* One of the Lives of the Prophets. One of the Church. Of the Lord's Day. Of the Nature of Man. Of the Creation. Of the Obedience of our Senſes to the Faith. Of the Soul, the Body, and the Spirit. Of the Truth. Of Baptiſm. Of the Generation of *J. C.* Of Prophecy. Of Hoſpitality. A Book entituled, *The Key.* Of the Devil. Of the Revelations. Of God Incarnate. Collections out of the Scripture. An Apology for the Chriſtian Religion.	
TATIAN.	A Diſcourſe againſt the Gentiles.	A Goſpel compoſed out of the four. A Diſcourſe of Evangelical Perfection.	
ATHENAGORAS.	Apology for the Chriſtians. A Diſcourſe of the Reſurrection.		A Romance *of True and Perfect Love*, in *French*, ſaid to have been Tranſlated out of *Greek.*

Names of Authors.	*Genuine Books ſtill Extant.*	*Books Loſt.*	*Suppoſititious Books.*

[*Huetius* in his Diſcourſe of the Original of Romances, thinks that this Book might poſſibly have been compoſed by *Philander*, who impoſed upon *M. Fumée*, as if it had been really written by *Athenagoras*. This Dr. *Cave* ſays is very improbable: But if we conſider how extremely particular this Author is in his Deſcription of thoſe Buildings he mentions, how very improbable it is that *Athenagoras* ſhould have brought in his *Melangenia*, deſcribing *Jupiter Hammon*'s Temple more like an Architect than an Hiſtorian, we can hardly conceive it to have been written by a *Greek*. Beſides, the Architecture it ſelf is ſo very exact according to the Rules of the Five Orders, the Four Ancienteſt whereof were introduced firſt by the *Greeks*; that it is not likely that one of that Nation, who knew very well that *Jupiter Hammon*'s Temple was never raiſed by Men that were acquainted with their Models of Building, would ever have deſcribed it as Built after ſuch a manner, if he had thought fit to have deſcribed it at all. So that though we cannot certainly tell whether *Philander*, (who wrote Commentaries upon *Vitruvius*) was the Author of this Romance, or no; yet theſe Reaſons ſeem to make it more than probable, that it was not written by *Athenagoras*, eſpecially ſince a *Greek* Copy was never yet produc'd, and that none of the Ancients ever quoted it, either as his, or as belonging to any Body elſe. And I do not doubt, but Dr. *Cave* would have been of the ſame Opinion, if he had read the Book over himſelf.

HERMIAS.	A Diſcourſe to ſhew the Ridiculouſneſs of the Opinions of the Pagan Philoſophers.		
THEOPHILUS.	Three Books to *Autolycus*,	A Diſcourſe againſt *Marcion*. A Diſcourſe againſt the Hereſie of *Hermogenes*: And ſome other little things.	

[Since the firſt Edition of Mr. *du Pin*'s *Bibliotheque* was publiſhed. Mr. *Dodwell* ſet out the Chronological Fragments of Biſhop *Pearſon*, with Additions of his own to the late Biſhop of *Cheſter*'s Diſcourſes concerning the Succeſſion of the firſt Biſhops of *Rome*. In his Additions to the ſecond Chapter of Biſhop *Pearſon*'s firſt Diſcourſe, he brings ſome Arguments to prove that this *Theophilus* the Author of theſe Diſcourſes to *Autolycus*, was not that Biſhop of *Antioch* that was the 6th from St. *Peter*, as it has hitherto univerſally been believed. *Theophilus* ſpeaks of the Perſecution, as of a Calamity the Chriſtians then groaned under, in two or three places, towards the end of the third Book: Καθ' ἡμέραν and ἕως τῆς νῦν: *daily*, and *until now*. He ſays alſo, that it chiefly lay upon thoſe that *haſtned after Virtue, and endeavour'd to live a Holy Life*, Σπεύδοντας ἐπὶ ἀρετὴν καὶ ἀσκῆσαι βίον ὅσιον. Theſe Mr. *Dodwell* affirms to have been Proſelytes and Catechumens who endeavoured to live up to the Rules of their new Religion, and uſed great Philoſophical ſtrictneſſes of Life, as *Origen* and his Diſciples did, which is properly meant by the word ἀσκῆσις. The Perſecution of *Severus* was raiſed particularly againſt New Converts, and thoſe that endeavoured to inſtruct the Catechumens in the Chriſtian Faith: for which reaſon, *Origen* was ſo ſeverely enquir'd after; from hence it will neceſſarily follow, That *Theophilus*, who mentions the Perſecution as a thing that had been of ſome Continuance, which did not begin till the Year CCIII. could not be that Biſhop of *Antioch* that ſucceeded *Maximinus*, and preceded *Heros*.]

APOLLINARIUS.		An Apology to the Emperor for the Chriſtians. A Treatiſe againſt the *Gentiles*, divided into five Books. Two Books againſt the *Jews*. Diſcourſes againſt the *Montaniſts*.	
DIONYSIUS, Biſhop of *Corinth*.		Epiſtles to the *Lacedemonians*. the *Athenians*. the *Nicomedians*. the Church of *Gortyna*. the *Amaſtrians*. the *Gnoſſians*. *Soter*, and to *Chryſtophora*.	

PINYTUS.

A Table of all the Eccleſiaſtical Writers, &c.

Names of Authors.	Gennine Books ſtill Extant.	Books loſt.	Suppoſititious Books.
PINYTUS.		Letter to *Dionyſius*, Biſhop of *Corinth*.	
PHILIP and MODESTUS.		Diſcourſes againſt *Marcion*.	
MUSANUS.		Diſcourſe againſt *Encratitæ*.	
BARDESANES.		Diſcourſe againſt *Marcion*. Of Fate.	
St. IRENEUS.	Five Books againſt Hereſies, extant only in *Latin*. A Letter to *Victor* in *Euſebius*.	Letters to *Blaſtus*. to *Florinus*. A Diſcourſe of Knowledge. A Diſcourſe againſt *Marcion*. Several Diſcourſes of various Subjects.	
VICTOR, POLYCRATES, THEOPHILUS, BACHYLLUS.		Letters and Diſcourſes concerning the Celebration of *Eaſter*.	
HERACLITUS.		Commentaries upon St. *Paul*.	
MAXIMUS.		A Diſcourſe concerning the Original of Evil.	
APPION, CANDIDUS.		Commentaries upon the *Hexameron*.	
SEXTUS.		A Diſcourſe of the Reſurrection.	
JUDAS.		A Diſcourſe upon *Daniel's* Weeks.	
ARABIANUS.		Works unknown.	
SERAPION.		Letters againſt the *Montaniſts*. to *Domninus*. Other Letters. A Diſcourſe concerning the Goſpel, falſly attributed to St. *Peter*.	
RHODON.		A Diſcourſe againſt *Marcion*. A Diſcourſe upon the *Hexameron*.	
PANTÆNUS.		Commentaries upon the Bible.	
St. CLEMENT of *Alexandria*.	Exhortation to the *Gentiles*. *Pædagogus*, in three Books. *Stromata*, in eight Books. A Diſcourſe concerning *What rich man can be ſaved*. [Dr. *Cave* mentions a Hymn in Praiſe of our Saviour.	Eight Books of Inſtitutions, A little Book of *Eaſter*. A Diſcourſe of Faſting. A Diſcourſe of Slander. An Exhortation to Patience. [And ſeveral other Diſcourſes.]	
MILTIADES.		A Diſcourſe againſt the *Montaniſts*. Againſt the *Gentiles* and *Jews*. An Apology for the Chriſtian Religion.	

A Table of all the Eccleſiaſtical Writers, &c.

Names of Authors.	*Genuine Books, ſtill Extant.*	*Books loſt.*	*Suppoſititious Books.*
APOLLONIUS, a *Greek.*		A Diſcourſe againſt the *Montaniſts.*	
APOLLONIUS, a *Roman.*		An Apology for the Chriſtian Religion.	
ANONYMOUS Authors.		Diſcourſes againſt the Hereſies of *Montanus* and *Artemo.*	
TERTULLIAN.	Of Penance. Of Baptiſm. Of Prayer. An Apology for the Chriſtian Religion. Of Patience. Exhortation to Martyrdom. A Diſcourſe to *Scapula.* Two Books to the *Gentiles.* Of Publick Shews. Of Idolatry. Of the Dreſſes of Women. Of Womens Habits. Of the Teſtimony of the Soul, Five Books againſt *Marcion.* Of Preſcriptions. Of the Fleſh of Jeſus Chriſt. Of the Soul. Of a Soldier's Crown. A Book entituled, *Scorpiacum.* [Againſt the *Gnoſticks.* Againſt the *Jews.* Againſt *Praxeas.* Againſt *Hermogenes.* Againſt the *Valentinians.* Of the Philoſophical Cloak. To his Wife two Books. Of Chaſtity. Of Faſting. Of ſingle Marriages. An Exhortation to Chaſtity. Of Flight in Perſecution. Of Veiling of Virgins.	A Diſcourſe againſt *Apollonius.* Of *Aaron*'s Robes. Of Circumciſion. Of clean and unclean Beaſts. Of Paradiſe. Of Fate. Of the Hope of the Righteous. Againſt *Apelles.* Of Baptiſm. Of Publick Shews, } in Gr. Of veiling of Virgins. } [The Diſcourſe *de Coronâ Militis* was tranſlated likewiſe by himſelf into *Greek.*	A Catalogue of Hereſies at the end of his Preſcriptions. A Letter of Jewiſh Meats. Of the Trinity. Several Poems.
CAIUS.		A Diſcourſe againſt *Proclus* the *Montaniſt.* Another entituled, *The little Labyrinth.* Of the Nature of the Univerſe	
HIPPOLITUS.	A Paſchal Cycle.	Commentaries upon the Pſalms Of the Witch of *Endor.* Commentaries upon St. *John*'s Goſpel, and the *Apocalypſe.* Of Spiritual Gifts. Apoſtolical Tradition. Chronicles; or Chronological Accounts of Time. Againſt the *Greeks*, and *Plato*, concerning the Univerſe. Exhortation to *Severina.* A Demonſtration of the Time of *Eaſter*, as it is in the Table. Odes upon all the Scriptures.	Of the End of the World, and Anti-Chriſt. A Demonſtration againſt the *Jews.* A Diſcourſe of *Suſanna.* [Not diſowned by Dr. *Cave.*] Collections againſt *Bero* and *Helico*, amongſt the *excerpta* of *Anaſtaſius.* Homilies of the Trinity and the Incarnation.

Of

A Table of all the Eccleſiaſtical Writers. &c.

Names of Authors.	*Genuine Books, ſtill Extant.*	*Books Loſt.*	*Suppoſititious Books.*
		Of God, and the Reſurrection of the Dead. Of Good, and whence cometh Evil.	A ſhort Account of the Lives of the XII Apoſtles. [Aſcribed by ſome to *Hypolitus*, Jun. who lived about the year DCCCCXXXIII.
		Againſt Hereſies. Againſt the *Marcionites*. Several other Tracts.	
GEMINIANUS.		Works unknown.	
ALEXANDER.		Epiſtles to the *Antenoitæ*. To the *Antiochians*. To *Origen* To *Demetrius*, and others	
JULIUS AFRICANUS.	Letter to *Origen*, concerning the Hiſtory of *Suſanna*.	A Chronicon. Letter to *Ariſtides* of the Genealogy of *J. C.* a great part whereof is quoted by *Euſebius*.	
MINUTIUS FELIX	*Octavius*; a Dialogue againſt the *Gentiles*.		
AMMONIUS.	Evangelical Harmony.	Several Treatiſes.	Of Fate; loſt.
ORIGEN.	*See the Catalogue of his Comments upon the SS. in his Life.*		
	Againſt *Celſus* in Eight Books. Of Martyrdom. Of the Hiſtory of *Suſanna*, in a Letter to *Africanus*. His Principles in *Latin*. Of Prayer.	His Principles in Four Books. Of the Reſurrection. *Stromata* in Ten Books. Conference with *Beryllus* Biſhop of *Boſtra* Dialogues concerning the Reſurrection. Explication of the *Hebrew* Names of the Old Teſtament.	Againſt *Marcus*; Dialogue. Two Commentaries upon *Job*. Commentaries upon St. *Mark*. Several Homilies. The Lamentations of *Origen*.
BERYLLUS.		Conference, Letters, and other ſmall things.	
St. CYPRIAN,	LXXXIII. Letters. Of the Vanity of Idols. Teſtimonies againſt the *Jews*, to *Quirinus* in three Books. Of the Diſcipline and Habits of Virgins. Of the *Lapſi*. Of the Unity of the Church. Of Prayer. An Exhortation to Martyrdom. Of Mortality. To *Demetrianus*.		Againſt publick ſhews Of Chaſtity. Homily againſt *Novatian*. Homily againſt Gameſters. Of the Celibacy of the Clergy. Of the XII Abuſes of the Age. A Panegyrick upon Martyrdom.

Of

A Table of all the Eccleſiaſtical Writers, &c.

Names of Authors.	Genuine Books ſtill Extant.	Books Loſt.	Suppoſititious Books.
	Of Works of Mercy and Alms-Deeds. Of Patience. Of Envy. [*Trithemius* tells us that St. *Cyprian* alſo enlarged *Seneca*'s and *Tyro*'s Characters, by adding of numbers of Technical words that belong'd to the Chriſtian Religion; they are all Printed by *Gruter*, and are commonly bound up with his Body of Inſcriptions.]		Of double Martyrdom A diſcourſe of the Cardinal Virtues, by *Arnaldus Bonævallis.* *Ruffinus*'s Explication of the Creed. Of the Baptiſm of Hereticks Of Mount *Sion*, and Mount *Sinai.* The Supper. Of the Revelation of S. *John Baptiſt*'s Head *Celſus*'s Preface. Two Books to Martyrs S. *Cyprian*'s Confeſſion. A Kalendar for *Eaſter.* The Secrets of St. *Cyprian.*
PONTIUS.	St. *Cyprian*'s Life.		
CORNELIUS.	Two Letters amongſt St. *Cyprian*'s, and a Fragment of another in *Euſebius.*		
NOVATIAN.	A Letter in St. *Cyprian*'s Works. Of the Trinity Of Jewiſh Meats.	Of the Paſſover. Of the Sabbath. Of Circumciſion. Of the High Prieſt. Of Prayer. Of Reſolution. Concerning *Attalus.*	
St. *MARTIALIS.* *SIXTUS.*			Two Letters. The Sentences of *Sixtus* the *Pythagorean.*
GREGORY Thaumaturgus.	A Speech to *Origen.* A Profeſſion of Faith in *Gregory Nyſſen.* A Canonical Epiſtle. A Paraphraſe upon *Eccleſiaſtes.*		An Expoſition of Faith, publiſhed by *Turrian.* A Treatiſe of the Soul. Sermons.
DIONYSIUS of Alexandria.	Beſides Fragments produced by *Euſebius*, we have a Letter to *Baſilides.*	Two Letters to the *Roman* Confeſſors. to *Stephen.* to *Sixtus.* to *Philemon.* to *Dionyſius.* to *Hierax.* to the Church of *Antioch* againſt *Paulus Samoſatenus.* Paſchal Letters. Diſcourſes of Martyrdom. Of the Promiſes of God. Againſt the *Sabellians.* Of the Trinity to *Dionyſius.* An Apology and Refutation of his former Opinions. Of Nature, and Temptations. Several other Letters mentioned by *Euſebius.*	A Diſcourſe againſt *Origen*, quoted by *Anaſtaſius* of *Nice.*

THEOG

A Table of all the Eccleſiaſtical Writers, &c.

Names of Authors.	*Genuine Books ſtill Extant.*	*Books Loſt.*	*Suppoſititious Books.*
THEOGNOSTUS.		Inſtitutions.	
ATHENOGENES.		A Hymn.	
DIONYSIUS, Biſhop of *Rome.*		A Letter againſt the *Sabellians.*	
MALCHION.			A Conference againſt *Paulus Samoſatenus.*
ANATOLIUS.	A Diſcourſe concerning *Eaſter* in *Latin.*		
VICTORINUS.	A Diſcourſe upon the *Revelations.* [This is thought to be Spurious by moſt Men, or at leaſt extreamly interpolated.]	A Book againſt all Hereſies. Commentaries upon *Geneſis, Exodus, Leviticus, Iſaiah, Ezekiel, Eccleſiaſtes,* and the *Canticles,* [*Habakkuk*, St. *Matthew*, and the *Revelations.* Dr. *Cave* has publiſhed the beginning of a Diſcourſe of this *Victorinus, Of the Fabrick of the World,* which he thinks may be a Fragment of this Father's Commentaries upon *Geneſis* or the *Apocalypſe.*]	
PIERIUS.		Homily upon *Hoſea.* Twelve other Books.	
METHODIUS.	The Banquet of the Virgins, and ſeveral Fragments.	Of the Reſurrection. Of the Witch of *Endor.* Of Free-Will. Commentaries upon *Geneſis Canticles,* and ſeveral other Books.	A Homily upon the Preſenting of *J. C.* in the Temple. Another Sermon upon *Palm-Sunday.* A *Latin* Profeſſion of Faith upon the Trinity.
PAMPHILUS.		Letters.	
LUCIAN.		A new Edition of the Verſion of the Bible. Small Tracts, and ſome Letters.	
ZENO *Veronenſis.*			Homilies.
ARNOBIUS.	Seven Books againſt the *Gentiles.*	Poems upon his Voyage.	
LACTANTIUS.	Inſtitutions in ſeven Books. An Abridgment of the firſt Three Books. Of the Workmanſhip of God Of the Anger of God. Of Perſecution, or the Deaths of the Perſecutors.	To *Aſclepiades.* Eight Books of Letters.	
COMMODIANUS.	Inſtructions to the *Gentiles.*		
JULIUS FIRMICUS, MATERNUS.	Of the Error of Prophane Religions.		

A Table of all the Eccleſiaſtical Writers. &c.

Names of Authors.	*Genuine Books ſtill Extant.*	*Books Loſt.*	*Suppoſititious Books.*
COUNCILS of the three firſt Centuries.	A Letter from the Council of *Antioch* concerning *Paulus Samoſatenus*. *Euſeb. Lib. VII. Chap.* 30.	Synodical Letters in P. *Victor*'s time concerning the Celebration of *Eaſter*.	A Letter and a Profeſſion of Faith of the Council of *Antioch*, ſet down by *Turrian*.
		A Decree of a Council held under *Agrippinus*, concerning the Baptiſm of Hereticks.	Decretals of the Ancient Popes before *Siricius*.
		A Decree of another under *Dionyſius* Biſhop of *Rome*.	
		A Decree of another held at *Antioch* in P. *Stephen*'s time.	
		A Decree of ſome Councils held in *Aſia* concerning *Noëtus*.	

A TABLE of all the *Writings* of *Eccleſiaſtical Authors*, according to the Order of their Arguments, that are mentioned in this Volume.

Apologies for the Chriſtian Religion, and Diſcourſes againſt Gentiliſm.

Juſtin's two Apologies.
——two Orations againſt the *Gentiles*.
Tatian's Book againſt the *Gentiles*.
Athenagoras's Apology.
Hermias of the Ridiculouſneſs of the Heathen Philoſophers.
Theophilus the *Antiochian*'s Three Books to *Autolycus*.
Clemens Alexandrinus's Exhortation to the *Gentiles*.
——Eight Books of *Stromata*.
Tertullian's Apologetick.
——to *Scapula*.
——to the *Gentiles*.
——of the Teſtimony of the Soul.
Minutius Felix's *Octavius*.
Origen's Eight Books againſt *Celſus*.
St. *Cyprian* of the Vanity of Idols.
——to *Demetrianus*.
Arnobius's Seven Books againſt the *Gentiles*.
Lactantius's Inſtitutions.
——of the Deaths of the Perſecutors.
J. Firmicus Maternus of the Errors of Prophane Religions

Books againſt the Jews.

St. *Juſtin*'s Dialogue with *Tryph.*
Tertullian's Books againſt the *Jews*.
St. *Cyprian*'s firſt Book of Teſtimonies to *Quirinus*.

Books againſt Hereticks.

St. *Irenæus*'s five Books againſt Hereſies.
Tertullian's Preſcriptions.
—— Five Books againſt *Marcion*.
——*Scorpiacum* againſt the *Gnoſticks*.
——againſt *Praxeas*, *Hermogenes*, and the *Valentinians*.

Diſcourſes upon particular Articles of Religion.

St. *Juſtin* of the Kingdom of God.
Novatian of the Trinity.
Athenagoras of the Reſurrection.
Tertullian of the Reſurrection.
——of the Body of Chriſt.
——of the Soul.
Clemens Alexandrinus's *Stromata*,
Origen's Principles.
Gregory Thaumaturgus's Profeſſion of Faith.
Lactantius of the Workmanſhip of God.
——of the Anger of God.
A Letter of the Council of *Antioch* againſt *Paulus Samoſatenus*.

Diſcourſes

A TABLE of all the Writings of the Eccleſiaſtical Authors, &c.

Diſcourſes of the Diſcipline of the Church.

S. *Clement*'s Epiſtle to the *Corinthians.*
S. *Ignatius*'s Epiſtles.
S. *Irenæus*'s Letter to P. *Victor.*
Tertullian of Penance.
——— of Baptiſm.
——— of Prayer.
——— two Books to his Wife.
——— of Chaſtity.
——— of Faſting.
——— of ſingle Marriages.
——— exhortation to Chaſtity.
——— of the Veiling of Virgins,
The laſt Five written when he was a Heretick againſt the Diſcipline of the Church.
Hippolitus's Paſchal Cycle.
S. *Cyprian*'s Letters.
——— of the *Lapſi.*
——— of the Unity of the Church.
——— of Prayer.
Anonymus of the Baptiſm of Hereticks, Printed with S. *Cyprian.*
Novatian of Jewiſh Meats.
Gregory Thaumaturgus's Canonical Epiſtle,
Dionyſius Alexandrinus's Letter to *Baſilides.*
Anatolius of *Eaſter.*
Methodius Banquet of Virgins.

Books of Morality.

Hermas's Paſtor.
S. *Clement*'s Epiſtle to the *Corinthians.*
S. *Polycarp*'s Letter to the *Philippians.*
S. *Juſtin*'s Epiſtle to *Diognetus.*
S. *Clement*'s *Pædagogus* in Three Books.
——— his Seventh Book of *Stromata.*
——— of what Rich Man can be ſaved.
Tertullian and S. *Cyprian* of Patience.
Their Exhortations to Martyrdom.
Tertullian of publick Shews.
——— of Idolatry
——— of Womens Dreſſes and Habits.
——— of the Veiling of Virgins.
——— of the Philoſophick Cloak.
——— of Flight in Perſecution.
——— two Books to his Wife.
S. *Cyprian* of the Diſcipline and Habits of Virgins.
——— three Books of Teſtimonies to *Quirinus.*
——— of Mercy and Alms-Deeds.
——— of Zeal and Envy.
Origen of Martyrdom.
Methodius's Banquet of Virgins.
Commodianus's Inſtructions.

Commentaries upon the Bible.

Origen's Commentaries and Homilies.
Gregory Thaumaturgus's Paraphraſe upon *Eccleſiaſtes.*
Victorinus upon the *Revelations.*
Ammonius's Harmony.
Africanus and *Origen*'s Letter, concerning the Hiſtory of *Suſanna.*
Africanus's Letters concerning the Genealogy of *Jeſus Chriſt.*

AN ALPHABETICAL TABLE OF *AUTHORS NAMES* mentioned in this Volume.

A.

Page.

Abdias 16
Agbarus 1
Agrippa 48
Alexander 90
Ambroſe 116
Ammonius 95
Amos Pr. 5
Anonymi 61
Anatolius 155
S. Andrew 16
Apollinarius 57
Apollonii 66
Appion 61
Apoſtles 4, 8, 13, 14
Arabianus 61
Archelaus 155
Ariſtides 48
Ariſteas Pr. 41.
Ariſtobulus P. 41
Arnobius 163
Athenagoras 56
Athenogenes 154

B.

Bachyllus 61
Bardeſanes 58
Barnabas 6
Baruch Pr. 5
Beroſus Pr. 42.
Beryllus 116

C.

Caius 86
Candidus 61
Chronicles Pr. 3
S. Clemens Rom. 27
S. Clemens Alex. 62
Commodianus 169
Councils of the three firſt Centuries 171
Cornelius 144
S. Cyprian 117

D.

Daniel Pr. 5
David. Pr. 4
Decretals of Popes 173
S. Denys Areop. 31
S. Denys of Cor. 57
S. Denys of Alex. 149
S. Denys of Rome 154

E.

Ester Pr. 3
Ezekiel Pr. 5
Ezra Pr. 3

G.

GAD Pr. 2
Geminianus 90
Gregory Thaumat. 147

H.

Habakkuk Pr. 6
Haggai Pr. 6
Hegeſippus 48
Heraclitus 61
Hermas 26
Hermias 56
Hippolytus 87
Hoſea Pr. 5
Hyſtaſpes 17

J.

James Pr. 45
S. John Pr. 44
Jeremiah Pr. 4
JESUS CHRIST 1
Jeſus Son of Sirach Pr. 4
S. Ignatius 35
Job Pr. 3
Joel Pr. 5
Jonah ibid.
Joſephus Pr. 41
Joſeph Bengorion Pr. 41
Joſhuah Pr. 2
S. Irenæus 58
Iſaiah Pr. 4
Judas 61
S. Jude Pr. 45
Judith Pr. 3
Judges Pr. 2
Julius Africanus 91
S. Juſtin 50
Juſtice of Tiberius, Pr. 41
Lactantius 165
Lentulus 17
S. Linus 16
S. Luke Pr. 43
Lucian 161

M.

Maccabees Pr. 6
Malachi Pr. 6
Malchion 154
Manetho Pr. 42
S. Mark Pr. 43
The Virg. Mary 2
S. Martialis 146
J. Maternus Fer. 170
S. Matthew Pr. 43
Maximus 61
Melito 55
Mercurius Triſmeg. 17
Methodius 156
Micah Pr. 5
Miltiades 66
Minutius Felix 92
Moſes Pr. 1
Modeſtus 58
Muſanus 58

N.

Nahum Pr. 6
Nathan Pr. 2
Nehemiah Pr. 3
Novatian 145

O.

Obadiah Pr. 5
Origen 96

P.

Pantænus 61
Pamphilus 161
Papias 46
S. Paul Pr. 44
Phileas 162
Philippus 58
Philo Pr. 41
Pierius 156
Pilat 17
Pinytus 58
S. Peter Pr. 45
S. Polycarp 44
Policrates 61
Pontius 144
Procherus 16

Q.

Quadratus 48

R.

Rhodon 61
Ruth Pr. 2

S.

Samuel Pr. 2
Seneca 17
Serapion 61
Sextus 61
Sibyls 17
Sixtus or Xyſtus 147
Solomon Pr. 4

T.

Tatian 55
Tertullian 69
Theophilus of Ant. 56
Theophilus of Cæſ. 61
Theognoſtus 153
Tryphon 116
Tobit Pr. 3

V.

Victor 61
Victorinus 155

Z.

Zechariah Pr. 6
Zeno Veronenſis 162
Zephaniah Pr. 6
Zoroaſter Pr. 41

A General Index of the Principal Matters.

Pr. *Stands for* Preface. P. *for* Preliminary Diſſertations. *The ſmall* Italick Letters *for* Notes.

A.

Abdias, Lives of the Apoſtles falſly attributed to him. 16

Abſolution, not too ſpeedy, 122. refus'd to be given anciently for ſeveral Crimes, and afterwards granted, *ibid.* 123.

Acts of the Revelation of the Apoſtles, ſpurious and forged, 5.

Acts of the Paſſion of St. *Andrew* forged by Hereticks, 16. Others, quoted by Catholicks, alſo doubtful, *ibid.*

Actors, Condemned by the Church, 133.

Agbarus, K. of *Edeſſa*, 1. His Letter to *J. C.* ſpurious, *ibid.* Proofs of its Forgery, *ibid.* 2. Hiſtory of his Converſion fabulous, 2. His receiving *J. C's* Picture not probable, *ibid.*

Agrippa, Sirnamed *Caſtor*, 48. wrote a Book to confute the Errors of *Baſilides*, *ibid.*

Alcinous, the Philoſopher convicted of ſeveral Abſurdities concerning the Reſurrection, 87.

Alexander, Biſhop in *Cappadocia*, Coadjutor of *Narciſſus*, Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, 90. His Letters, *ibid.* His Martyrdom, *ibid.*

Allegories, uſed by the Primitive Chriſtians, 7.

Ambroſe, *Origen's* Scholar, 116. Anathematized the Errors of *Valentinus* when he turned Catholick, *ibid.* Ordained Deacon, *ibid.*

Ammonius, his Profeſſion and Life, 95. His Religion, *ibid.* Harmony of the Four Goſpels written by him, and not by *Tatian*, *ibid.*

Amos, Time when he Lived and Prophefied, P. 5.

Anatolius, Birth and Qualities, 155. He wrote of *Eaſter*, and Ten Books of Arithmetick, *ibid.*

Andrew, ſee *Acts*.

Angels, Corporeal, according to the generality of the Ancients, 55. *Origen's* particular Opinions concerning them, 110. They take care of Things here below, 66. They ought to be Honour'd, *ibid.*

Anonymous Authors againſt the Hereſies of *Montanus* and *Artemo*. 83.

Apocryphal Books, why ſo called, p. 27. *b.*

Apollinarius of *Hierapolis*, 57. Catalogue of his Writings, of which only the Titles remain, *ibid.* His Style and Genius, *ibid.* Fragments falſly attributed to him, 64.

Apollonii, Two different Authors of that Name, and their Writings, 66.

Appion, His Commentary upon the *Hexameron*, 61.

Aquila, Tranſlation of the Bible, and his Verſion, P. 38.

Arabianus, an old Author, 73.

Archelaus, an Author.

Ariſtides, Athenian Philoſopher, 48. His Apology for the Chriſtians to the Emperor *Adrian*, *ib.*

Ariſteas and *Ariſtobulus*, P. 36.

Arnaldus Bonevallis, 143.

Arnobius, his Profeſſion and Religion, 163. yet a Catechumen, he wrote Seven Books againſt the Pagan Religion, *ibid.* Abridgment of them, 164. Cenſure upon them, *ibid.* Their Editions, *ibid.*

Athenagoras, a Philoſopher, lived in M. *Antonin's* Time, 56. Preſents an Apology to the Emperor in behalf of the Chriſtians, *ibid.* Abridgment of his Apology, *ibid.* This Author unknown to *Euſebius*, *ibid.* Editions of his Books. *ibid.*

Anethogenes, Martyr, Author of a Hymn, 134.

Aurelius and *Celerinus*, of St. *Cyprian's* Clergy, 124.

Authors, little known by the Ancients, *Pr.* A Catalogue of thoſe that have written about Eccleſiaſtical *Authors*, *ibid.* What Hereticks that have written upon them, *ibid.* Characters by which the Time and Order of their Works may be known, *ibid.* Of the *Authors* of the Bible, and and what may be gueſſed about them, P. 1, *&c.*

B.

Bachyllus of *Corinth* wrote a Letter concerning *Eaſter*, 61.

Baptiſm, its Neceſſity and Efficacy, 80. Infants Baptized as ſoon as they were Born, 128. Queſtions concerning it, 80. Ceremonies of it, 95.

Baptiſm of Hereticks: S. *Cyprian's* and *Stephen's* Opinions concerning it, 118. *f. g.* Hiſtory of their Differences upon that Queſtion, *ibid.* Councils held about it, *ibid.* Different Cuſtoms in ſeveral Churches, *ibid. h. i. k. l.* decided in a Council held at *Arles*, 118.

Bardeſanes, a Syrian: His Country; his Profeſſion; at firſt a Chriſtian; afterwards went over to the *Valentinians*, 58. His Errors, *ibid.* A Man of quick Parts and Learning, *ibid.*

Barnabas, an Apoſtle; Reaſon of his Name; his Profeſſion and Imployment, 6. His Letter, *ibid.* Not Canonical, *ibid.* To whom directed, 7. When and how often Printed, *ibid.*

Baruch and his Prophecy, P. 5. *ll.* His Book by whom received as Canonical, P. 28. Rejected by St. *Jerome*, *ibid.*

Baſilides, Heretick; his Errors, 48. 130.

Bel; its Hiſtory, P. 5. *nn.*

Beroſus, a Suppoſititious Author, P. 42.

Beryllus, Biſhop of *Boſtra* in *Arabia*, his Errors and Converſion, 116.

Bible, Canonical Books, P. 1. *&c.* Books loſt and Apocryphal, P. 28, *&c.* Hiſtory of its Books, P. 35, *&c. Greek* Verſions, *ibid. &c.* In what Language and Characters the Books of the *Bible* were written, *ibid.* 38.

Bibliotheca of Eccleſiaſtical Authors; Why this Book ſo called, *Pr.* Its Deſign in general, *Pr.* How purſu'd, *Pr.* Why written in *French*, *Pr.*

Biſhops eſtabliſhed by the Apoſtles, and afterwards

The INDEX.

wards chosen by the Church, 28. Distinction of *Bishops* and *Presbyters*, 42. Duty of *Bishops*, 43. they ought to govern the Flock of J. C. from whom they received their Office, 123. They have a Power to judge in matters of Faith and Discipline, 123. Can do nothing without their Clergy, 122.

Blessedness, The Ancients believed not perfect till after the Resurrection, 54. *t. Origen*'s particular Opinions concerning it, 110.

Books; ways to find out when they are spurious, *Pr.* How many sorts, *Pr.*

C.

Caius, Presbyter of the Church of *Rome*, 86. Fragments of his Book against *Proclus*, *ibid.* Other Books of his, 87. His Errors, *ibid.*

Calumnies against the Christians refuted, 56.

Canons of the Apostles. Different Opinions concerning them, 13. Not drawn up by the Apostles, *ibid.* By whom attributed to them, *ibid.* Ancient, 14. Nine other *Canons* falsly attributed to the Apostles, 16.

Canon of the SS. Of the Old Testament, made by whom, P. 26, 27. *&c.* What Books it takes in, P. 27. *&c.* What are Apocryphal, P. 29, 30. Of the N. T. P. 49. Why the *Canonical* Books are so called, P. 26. *a.*

Canticles, P. 4.

Celerinus, v. *Aurelius.*

Celibacy of the Clergy, 183.

Ceremonies of the Church, 82.

Cerinthus; His Error concerning the Blessedness of the Righteous, 86.

Charity; Necessity of Alms-deeds, and vain Excuses to avoid it, 154.

Christians; Their Manners, 61, 53. Their Assemblies, and upon what Occasions, 75. Called each other Brethren, and why, *ibid.* How they prayed in the Primitive Church, 202.

Chronicles, when written, and by whom, P. 3.

Church; Abridgment or the Doctrine, Discipline and Morality of the Three First Ages of the *Church*, 178, 183. out of it no Salvation, 142. Unity of the *Church*, 137. Those that enter in ought to be Holy, 153.

Clergy,; Their Lives and Manners, 183. Exempt from Guardianship by Will, 133.

S. *Clemens Romanus*, Disciple and Coadjutor of the Apostles, 27. *a.* When ordained Bishop of *Rome*, *ibid. b.* His First *Epistle to the* Corinthians, sent when, and by whom, *ibid.* 28. *c.* Its Antiquity and Authority, and the Esteem paid to it by the Ancients, *ibid.* An Abridgment of it, *ibid.* In whose name written, *ibid.* Its Style, *ibid.* Second Letter doubtful, *ibid. e.* Argument, of the Fragment that remains, *ibid.* Other Books attributed to him, *ibid. Recognitiones Clementines*, and *Constitutions*, falsly attributed to him, *ibid.* 29. Judgment, in general upon all these Books, 30.

S. *Clemens Alexandrinus*; his Name, Country, and Profession, 62. *a. b. c.* Catalogue of his Books, *ibid.* Abridgment of his Books, 62, 63. Of the *Exhortation to the Gentiles*, ibid. Of the *Pædagogus.* ibid. Of the Second and Third Book of the *Pædagogus*, ibid. Of the *Stromata*, 63, 65. His Learning, *ib.* Of his *Institutions*, ib. Of the Book, entituled, *What Rich Man can be saved?* ib. What Judgment ought to be made of him, *ibid. i.* Editions of his Works. *ib.*

Cloak. Habit of a Philosopher, 72. *aa.*

Coadjutor; Example of a Bishop taken in as a *Coadjutor* in the Primitive Church, 90.

Commodianus wrote a Book called *Institutions*, 169. Abridgment of it, *ibid.* His Style, *ib.* Censure upon it, *ibid.* His Learning, *ibid.*

Constitutions, See S. *Clemens Romanus.*

Cornelius, P. His Election and Ordination, 162. His Letters, *ibid. a.* His Martyrdom, *ibid.* Letter to *Lupinicus* forged, *ibid.*

Covenant, A Book of the O. T. so called, lost, P. 29.

Councils; Their Original, 171, 172. Of the three first Ages of the Church, *ib.* Called by the Apostles, 173. In the Primitive Church, *ib.* At *Antioch* against *Paulus Samosatenus*, *ibid.*

Confession of Sins used in the Primitive Church, 112.

Creed, Apostles, when composed, 9. Whether made by themselves, doubtful, 10. Reasons, 11. Several compared in a Table, 12.

Cross; not worshipped anciently, 202.

S. *Cyprian*; Country, 117. *a. b.* Conversion, *ib. c.* Ordination, *ib.* Life and Actions, 117, 118. Differences with *Novatian*, 117, Difference with P. *Stephen* about Rebaptizing of Hereticks, 118. Censure upon that matter, 118, 119. His Martyrdom, 119. Chronological Order of his Letters, and their Abridgment, 119. — An Abridgment of his other Writings, 135, — 140. Books falsly attributed to him, 141, 142. Censure upon his Style, 156. His Learning, *ibid.* Editions of his Books, 143.

D.

Daniel, Life, Profession, Writings, P. 5. *mm. nn.*

Deacons, and *Deaconesses*, 182.

Death; Christians Opinions concerning it, 139. Prayers for the Dead, 181.

Decretals; Falshood of those anciently so called 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 199.

Demetrius, Bishop of *Alexandria*, *Origen*'s Enemy, 98. Excommunicates him, *ibid.*

Demons Corporeal; lost themselves by the Love of Women, 56.

Denys, or *Dionysius* of *Alexandria*, called the Great, 149, *Origen*'s Scholar, *ib.* When chosen Bishop of *Alexandria*, *ib.* His Quality, *ib.* Catalogue of his Works, and Abridgment, 150, 151, 152. Persecutions he suffered, 152. Defends the Faith against *Paulus Samosatenus*, *Nepos*, and *Sabellius*, 170, 171. His Opinion of Baptizing Hereticks, and the difference between *Stephen* and S. *Cyprian*, 150. Of *Easter*, 151, 172. Of *Lent*. 153. His Death and Style, *ib.* Catalogue of his Works, 150 — 152.

Dionysius of *Corinth*; Time when he flourished, and his Qualities, 57. His Letters and what they contain, *ib.* 16. Says that *Dionysius* the Areopagite was the first Bishop of *Athens*, 58. Not known whether Martyr or Confessor, *ib.*

Dionysius Bishop of *Rome*; His Writings, 158,

Dionysius the Areopagite; Country, 31, *a.* Bishop of *Athens*, *ib. c.* Not the St. *Denys* of *France*, *ibid. e.* Books attributed to him Forged, 32, 33, 34, Catalogue of them and their Editions, 34, 35.

Doctrine and *Discipline* of the Church, 178, 138.

E.

Easter; the Day when it was to be kept disputed, 59. History of that Question, *ib.* Anciently the People tarried in the Church till Midnight on *Easter-Eve*, 156. Of its Celebration, 181.

Eccleſiaſtes, P. 4.
Edeſſa; where ſituated? 1. *a.*
Enoch; His Book accounted Apocryphal. Quoted by S. *Jude*, P. 31.
Envy Condemned, 140.
Eſther; Author unknown, P. 3. *f. t.* When that Hiſtory happened, P. 20. 21.
Euchariſt; The Body of *J.C.* 60, 134, 135. How to be received, and how anciently Adminiſtred, 181. Ceremonies uſed at that time, *ibid.* Cuſtom of mixing Water with the Wine, 134, 135. Of uſing Water alone without Wine in the Morning, *ibid.* Obſcurely explained by the Ancients, becauſe of the Gentiles, 112. Neceſſary Diſpoſitions of Mind to receive it, *ibid.*
Eunuch; Not lawful to make our ſelves ſo, 97.
Excommunication impoſed by one Biſhop, not to be removed by another, 98.
Exhortation to follow *Jeſus Chriſt*, 62.
Ezekiel; Life and Writings, P. 5.
Ezrah; Author of the Books under that Name, P. 3. *m.*

F.

Faſting; When truly performed, 112. Before *Eaſter*, on *Fridays* and *Wedneſdays*. 112, 204. Exceſſively us'd by the *Montaniſts*, 82.
Fathers; ſometimes miſtaken in Critical Matters, 21.
Fear of God; 62, 63. When ſervile uſeful, but not ſufficient for Juſtification, 64.
Feaſts of *Eaſter* and *Pentecoſt*, 112.
Feliciſſimus, 118.
Fuardentius a Franciſcan, 61. Cenſure upon his Notes, *ibid.*
Flight in Perſecution, 121. Condemned by *Tertullian*, 82.

G.

Geminianus, or *Geminus*, 90.
Genealogy of *Jeſus Chriſt*, 92.
George of *Amiens* Capuchin, publiſhed a trifling Edition of *Tertullian*, 86.
God; His Exiſtence naturally known, 74, 76. His Attributes, *ibid.* Providence, 73. Worſhip, *ibid.*
Goſpel; Etymology and Signification of the Word, P. 43. *a. b.* Of the four Canonical Goſpels, *ibid.* Their Order, *ibid.* Some forged, and why? 3. One according to the Egyptians, *ibid.* According to the Hebrews, *ibid.* Believed by ſome to be the Original of St. *Matthew*, *ibid.* Proofs to the contrary, *ibid.* The *Proto-Evangelium* of St. *James*, *ibid.* The *Goſpel* of *Nicodemus*, *ibid.* Others forged by Hereticks, 4. The Hebrew Original of St. *Matthew*, 3.
Grace of Jeſus Chriſt, 64.
Gregory Thaumaturgus; Name, Birth, and Education, 147. *Origen*'s Scholar, *ibid.* Afterwards made Biſhop of *Neocæſarea*, *ibid.* His Books, *ibid.* His Canonical Epiſtle, *ibid.* Suppoſititious Books attributed to him, 148.

H.

Habakkuk, P. 6.
Haggai; Time when he propheſied, P. 6. *tt.*
Hebrew Character before and after the Captivity, P. 35. *b. c.* Language when diſus'd by the Jews, *ibid. a.* Syriack called Hebrew, *ibid. f. g.* Points when invented, *ibid. h.*
Hegeſippus, when he lived, 48. *a.* His Converſion, *ibid. b.* Life, 48, 49. Writings and Fragments, *ibid.* He mentioned the firſt Heretick that ever was in the Church, *ibid.* Hiſtory of the Jews falſly attributed to *Hegeſippus*, *ibid.* His Genius, *ibid.*
Heraclitus, Author, 61.
Hereſies. Their uſe, 77. Owe their Original to Philoſophy, *ibid.* An infallible Rule to confute them, 68, 77. Their Novelty, 77.
Hereticks. Their Genius, 68.
Herma. His true Name, 26. *b.* Who he was, *ibid.* The judgment the Ancients paſſed upon his Book, and how it ought to be eſteemed, 27.
Hermias, 56.
Hermogenes Heretick, 78.
Hexapla, and *Tetrapla* of *Origen* how ordered, P. 38. 78, 97.
Hippolytus. Where Biſhop, *a.* His Martyrdom, *ibid. b.* Books, 88. Others attributed to him, *ibid.* and 89. *e. f. g. h.* His Paſchal Cycle, 89, *i.* Fragments of his Works, 90.
Hiſtaſpes. An unknown Author, 22. Books attributed to him Suppoſititious, 23.
Hoſeah. His Prophecy, P. 5. *oo.*

I.

Saint *James*. His Writings, P. 45. *r.* 49.
James the Brother of *John* converted his Accuſer, 65.
Idols. Puniſhments inflicted by the Church upon thoſe that Sacrificed, 121, 122.
Idolatry confuted.
Jeſus Chriſt proved *Meſſiah*, 76. 135. Truly God-Man and really Incarnate, 43. Some of his Words not in the four Goſpels, 41. Miracles unqueſtionable, 48. Of *David*'s Family, 49. His deſcent into Hell, 68. Believed by St. *Ireneus* to have lived 50 Years, *ibid.* *Origen*'s Opinion concerning him, 107, 108. Letter written by him to *Agbarus* forged, 1.
Jeremiah. Life and Writings, P. 4. The Fifty Second Chapter not written by him, *ibid.*
St. *Ignatius* called *Theophorus*, and why? 35. *a.* Whoſe Succeſſor, and how long Biſhop? *ibid.* His Martyrdom, *ibid.* Teſtimonies of the Ancients concerning his Letters, *ib.* 36. Catalogue of Editions, 36, 37. *e. f.* Judgments and Opinions concerning them, 37, 38. Which ought to be rejected. *ibid.* Which interpolated, 38. Seven Genuine by *Voſſius* and *Uſher*'s Editions, *ib.* Their Antiquity aſſerted, 39, to 42. Objections anſwered, *ibid.* The Order in which they were written, 42, 43. An Abridgment of them, 43.
Impoſition of Hands, 121.
Incarnation. Doctrine of the Ancients about it, 180.
Indulgences, 121, 181.
Job, a real Hiſtory, P. 3. *x. y. z.* Author of the Book, P. 3. *u.* Genealogy, P. 4. *y. z.*
Joel. His Prophecy, P. 5. *pp.*
St. *John*. His Beginning, P. 44. Thrown into boiling Oyl, then Baniſhed into *Patmos*, where he is ſaid to have written the *Revelation*, *ibid.* Wrote his Goſpel at *Epheſus*. *ibid.* and three Letters, *ib.* Hiſtory of a young Man converted by him, 65.
Jonah, P. 5. *ſſ.*
Joſephus. His Works, P. 41. Cenſure upon his Style, *ibid.* Upon the Paſſage in him concerning Jeſus Chriſt, 25.
Joſeph Bengorion. A Suppoſititious Author. Life, Style, and Works, P. 41.

Joſhua, P. 2. *k.*

S. Irenæus. Life, Time when, by whom Taught, 58. *a.b.c.d.* When went into *France*, *ib.* By whom ordained Biſhop of *Lyons*, 59. *g.* When ſent to *Rome*, *ib. h.* His Book againſt Hereſies, when Compoſed. Why, and in what Language. 59. *i. k. l m.* Catalogue of his other Books, 67. Letters to *Victor*, *ibid*, Martyrdom, *ib.* Fragments and Abridgment of his Works, 59, 60. Particular Opinions, *ibid.* Style, Learning and Genius, *ibid* 61. Editions of his Books, *ib.*

Iſaiah. His Writings, P. 4. *hh. ii. kk.*

Judas Author, wrote upon *Daniels* Weeks, 61. Saint *Jude* his Epiſtle, P. 45.

Judges. Book ſo called, P. 2. *l.*

Judgment to come, 180. Eccleſiaſtical ones ought to be determined in their own Province, 143.

Judith. Her Hiſtory, when, by whom Written, P. 3. *r.* Anciently rejected as Apocryphal, P. 29. Said by St. *Jerome* to have been received by the Council of *Nice*, *ib.* Reaſons to the contrary, *ib* Received by the Latin Church, by the Councils of *Carthage* and *Trent*, *ib.*

Julius Africanus. Country and Employment, 91. *a.b.* His Chronicon, *e.f.* Other Books, *ib.* His Opinion to reconcile the Genealogy's of *J. C.* and of the Hiſtory of *Suſanna*, *ib.* 92. Not the Author of the *Ceſti*, 92. *g.*

Julius Firmicus Maternus, wrote a Book of the Errors of prophane Religions, 170. Who he was, and when he Lived, *ib. a. b.* Several Editions of this Book, 171. Abridgment of it, *ib.*

St. *Juſtin.* Country and Profeſſion, 50. *a.b.* Apologies when Writt n and to whom, 51. Death, 50, 51. *g. h. i. k. l.* Dialogue with *Tryphon*, 51. Other Works, *ib.* 55. Suppoſititious, 55. Cenſure upon his Genius and Style, *ib.* Particular Opinions and Errors, *ib. r. ſ. t. u. x. y. z. aa. bb. cc.* Editions of his Books, 55. *bb.* Deſign of a new Edition, 55, 56.

Juſtus of *Tiberias* wrote a Hiſtory of the Jews, P. 41.

K.

Kings. Who wrote the Book ſo called, P. 2. Two firſt Books called the Books of *Samuel*, *ib.*

L.

Labyrinth. Book ſo called, by whom written, 87.

La Cerda Jeſuit, Commented on *Tertullian*, 85.

Lactantius. Life and Employments, 165. His Book of the Workmanſhip of God, *ib.* Seven of Inſtitutions, *ib. Firſt*, of Falſe Religion, *ib. Second* of the Original of Error, *&c.* 166. His other Books, 167. Poems falſly attributed to him, *ibid.* His Eloquence, 168. Editions of his Works, 169.

Laodiceans. Epiſtle to them forged, and why? 5.

Lentulus. Letter to the Senate, 23.

Leonidas Father of *Origen*; Martyr, 96.

Linus not the Author of the Acts of the Martyrdom of St. *Peter* and St. *Paul*, 16.

Liturgies. Their Original, 8. One falſly attributed to S. *James*, 8. Proofs of its being ſpurious, 9. Why different in different places, 8. Several falſly attributed to the Apoſtles and others, 8.

Lucian. Martyr, 61.

Lucius P. His Election and Martyrdom, 118.

Saint *Luke.* Of what Profeſſion and Country, P. 43. *i.* Not *J. C's*, but S. *Paul's* Diſciple, *ib. k.* Wrote his Goſpel when he journey'd with St. *Paul*, P. 44. Upon what occaſion it was Written, P. 43, 44.

Luxury Condemned, 136.

M.

Maccabees, P. 29. *zz. aaa.* Whether Canonical, P. 6. Of the 3d and 4th Books, P. 31.

Malachi, P. 6. *yy.* The laſt Prophet, *ib.*

Malchion's Diſpute with *Samoſatenus*, 154.

Manaſſes Prayer, P. 31.

Manners of the Chriſtians, 51, 57.

Marcianus, Biſhop of *Arles*, joyned with the *Novatians*, and Excommunicated, 129, 130.

Marcion. Errors and Sect, 58, 61.

St. *Mark* the Evangeliſt not mentioned in the Acts, and St. *Paul's* Epiſtles, P. 43. He wrote his Goſpel at *Rome* in Greek, not in Latin, *ib. h.*

Marriages. (Second) diſapproved, 63, 182.

St. *Martialis*, When went into *France*, 145. Letters and Life ſpurious, *ib.* Reaſons, *ib.*

Martialis and *Baſilides*, Biſhops in *Spain*, turned out for Idolatry, 130.

Martyrs. Reſpect due to them, 45. They give Indulgences, 121, 122.

Maſſe. Ancient way of Celebrating, 8. *a.*

Matthew. His Goſpel in Hebrew, P. 43. *c. d.* and not in Greek, *ib.*

Matthias. Life ſpurious, 17.

Maximus. Author of a Diſcourſe of Matter, 61

Meats ſtrangled, and offered to Idols unlawful for Chriſtians to Eat, 164, 204.

Melito, Biſhop of *Sardis.* Writings, 55.

Mercurius Triſmegiſtus. Ancient and famous Author, 22, 23, *n. o.* Books falſly attributed to him, 23. *p.*

Methodius. Where Biſhop, 156. *a.* Writings, *ib.* Abridgment of the *Banquet of Virgins*, 157, 158. Sermons, 160. Style, *ib.*

Micah. Country. Time of Prophecy, P. 5.

Millenaries. Opinion, 54, 60. 86, Rejected by *Caius*, 110. By St. *Cyprian*, 142. By *Origen*, 86.

Miltiades. Works, 66.

Minutius Felix. Profeſſion and Time when he Lived, 92. *a.b.* Abridgment of his Dialogue, 92, 93, 94. Cenſure, 95. Editions, 95. Book of *Fate* ſaid to be his, *ib.*

Modeſtus, 58.

Moſes. Author of the Pentateuch, P. 1. Reaſons, *ib. &c.* 6, 7, 8, 9. Anſwer to Objections, P. 10, 18. His Aſſumption, P. 31.

Montaniſts. Sect and Opinions, 66.

Morality of Primitive Chriſtians, 183.

Muſanus, Writings, 58.

N.

Nahum. Prophet, P. 6.

Nepos. Heretick, 170.

Nicholas. One of the 7 Deacons. His Action, 78. Author of the Sect of Nicolaitans, *ib.*

Novatus. Novatian, 163. Manners, *ib.* Error and Schiſm, *ib.* Genius, *ib.* Letters, *ib.* Writings, *ib.* Condemnation, *ib. Dionyſius's* Letter to him, 169.

Numidicus Confeſſor. His Martyrdom, 124.

O.

Obadiah, Time of his Prophecy uncertain, P. 5. *rr.* Who he was, *ib.*

Ordination. By Dioceſan, 182.

Origen. Country, Name, Life, 96. *a. b. c.* Education, Maſters, Zeal for Martyrdom, *ibid.* After his Father's Death taught Humanity and Grammar, 96, 97. Made Catechiſt of the School of *Alexandria*, 97. Profeſſor of Divinity there, *ibid.* Diſciples, *ib.* Action blamed, *ib.* Voyage to *Rome*, *ib. f.*

Hexapla and *Tetrapla*, *ib.* P. 38. Taught the *SS.* in *Paleſtine*, *ib.* Ordained and quarrelled with the Biſhop of *Alexandria*, 98. Diſputed with *Beryllus* and others, 99. Commentaries upon the Bible, 98, 100. His Glorious Confeſſion, 99. *n.* Death, *ib.* *o. p.* Diviſion of his Works, 100, *&c.* Catalogues of *Euſebius* and St. *Hierome* loſt, 100. Catalogue of his Books upon the *SS.* 100, *&c.* Other Books, *ib.* 101. Spurious, 106. Abridgment of his Opinions, 107,—112. Cenſures of the Ancients upon his Opinions of the Trinity, 108. Of the Incarnation, *ib.* 109. Of Angels, 109. He thought them Corporeal, *ib.* Of the Soul, 110. Of Free-will, *ibid.* Wherein it lies, and its extent, *ib.* His Opinion of the Stars, of the Reſurrection of Good and Bad, of Judgment, *ib.* 111. Points of Diſcipline taken out of his Books, 112. Points of Morality, *ib.* Books of *SS.* own'd and rejected by him, *ibid.* 113. Genius and Character, 113. Prayer, 114. Abridged, *ib.* 115.

P.

Pamelius; Commentator upon *Tertullian* and St. *Cyprian*, 85. Cenſure upon it, *ib.*

Pamphilus, 161.

Pantænus; Life, Profeſſion, Opinions, Writings, 61. preached the Goſpel to the Indians, 62.

Papias Biſhop of *Hierapolis*; Diſciple of S. *John*, 46. *b.* Books and Fragments, 47. Of indifferent Parts, *ib.* Author of the Notion of the *Millenium*, *ib.*

Paradiſe allegorized by *Origen*, 111.

Patience; Exhortation to it, 82.

St. *Paul*; Converſion, P. 44. Changed his Name from *Saul*, *ib.* Beheaded by *Nero*, *ib.* *Epiſtles*, P. 45. Wrote, 14. *ib.* Time and Place of them, P. 44, 45. to the *Romans*, P. 44. The *Galatians*, 45. to the *Hebrews*, *ib.* To the *Laodiceans* ſpurious, 5. *a. b.* But two to the *Corinthians*, *ib.* To *Seneca*, ſpurious, 24.

Paulus Samoſatenus, Error and Condemnation, 152, 172, 173.

Penance; What, and how many degrees, 149. Before and after Baptiſm, 181. Publick, *ib.* Of Idolaters, *ib.* Abſolution when, *ib.* Once only after Baptiſm, 112.

Pentateuch; Author, P. 1, 6, 7, 8. Argument, P. 1, 2.

Perſecution againſt Chriſtians, 74.

St. *Peter*; Epiſtles, P. 45. *f.* His ſecond Epiſtle, *ib.* Suffered at *Rome*, with St. *Paul*, P. 47. *o.*

Phileas Biſhop, 162.

Philip of *Gortyna*, 58. Wrote againſt *Marcion*, *ibid.*

Philo; His Book, P. 41.

Philo Biblyus, P. 42. *c.*

Pilate; Teſtimony of our Saviour, and Letter to *Tiberius*, 23.

Pierius; Life, Profeſſions, Quality, Writings, 156. Cenſure upon his Writings and Style, *ibid.*

Pinytus Biſhop of *Gnoſſus*, wrote to *Dionyſius* Biſhop of *Corinth*, 58.

Polycarp; St. *John*'s Diſciple, and Biſhop of *Smyrna*, 44. *a. b.* Looked upon as Metropolitan of the Churches of *Aſia*, *ib. c.* Came to *Rome*, when, *ib. d.* Confers with P. *Anicetus* about the Celebration of *Eaſter*, *ib.* His Horror of Hereticks, 45. Martyrdom, *ib.* Letter to *Philippians*, *ib.* Its Subject, *ib.* Editions, 46. Spurious Books, *ib.* Epiſtle of St. *Ignatius* to him, 43.

Polycrates Biſhop of *Epheſus* diſputes with *Victor*, 61. Letter, *ib.* Spurious Books, *ib.*

Pontius. St. *Cyprian*'s Deacon wrote his Life, 144.

Praxeas, Heretick, 78.

Prayer. Uſe and Conditions, 114. Four ſorts, 115. *Lord's Prayer* explain'd, *ib.* What Diſpoſition of Mind required, 114. How he ought to pray, *ib.* Common places of Prayer, *ib.* 115. Time when, 138.

Prayer for the Dead, 181.

Prieſts, 121.

Privatus of *Lambeſa*. Heretick, 123.

Prochorus one of the 7 Deacons, 16. Life of St. *John* falſly attributed to him, *ib.*

Proclus or *Proculus*, a Montaniſt, 86.

Prophets. Their Books, P. 4. Ought not to ſpeak with Extaſie, or Fury, 66. *a.* Prophecies cited in the N. T. difficult to find in the Old, 32, 33.

Pſalms. Written by whom? P. 4. *aa. bb. cc.*

Q.

Quadratus. Apologiſt for Chriſtianity, 48. Who he was, *ib. a.* Fragment of his Apology, *ib.* 51. Not Biſhop of *Athens*, *ib.* Was a Prophet, *ib. b.*

R.

Raillery. Sometimes allowable, 79.

Religion. Proofs, 19. Exhortation to embrace it, 76. To be taken up voluntarily, *ib.*

Reſurrection, 79.

Revelations. Opinions of the *Ancients* concerning them, P. 50. Others forged by Hereticks, 5.

Rhenanus. Wrote excellently upon *Tertullian*, 85.

Rhodon, 61.

Rigaltius. Cenſure upon his Comments, 85.

Ruth. Author of her Hiſtory, and the time when it happened, P. 2. Why that Book is joyn'd with *Judges*, *ib.*

S.

Sabellius. Hereſie condemned, 152.

School of *Alexandria*, 62, 97.

Scripture, Rule of Faith, 64, 179. Number of Books, P. 27, 28. How many Claſſes the Books divided into. *ib.* Which Genuine, which Apocryphal, P. 27, 28. Which loſt, P. 30. Thoſe not Canonical, P. *ib.* Why? *ib.* Books out of the Canon of the O. T. 31. Quotations from the Prophets in St. *Matthew*, not to be found, P. 32, 33. Of the Canon of the N. T. P. 49, 50.

Seneca. Letters to St. *Paul*, 24. Spurious, *ib.* Arguments of it, *ib.*

Septuagint. Tranſlation of the O. T. P. 35, 56. Whether there be an older Verſion, *ib.* What Books were Tranſlated by them, *ib.*

Serapion. Author: His Book, 61.

Serapion, A Sick Man, received the Euchariſt when he was a Dying, 150.

Sextus. Author, 61.

Shews. (publick) unworthy of Chriſtians, 82.

Sibylls. Reaſon of the Name, 17. *a. b.* Numbers and Names, 18. *c.* Their Books preſerv'd in the Capitol by the Romans, 18. What became of them, *ib.* Thoſe now remaining Spurious, 19. *i. k. l.* Ancient and quoted by the Fathers, 20. When forged *ibid.*

Sichem. Where ſituated, 50. *a.*

Sign of the Croſs uſed by the Primitive Chriſtians, 82.

Simeon Son of *Cleophas*, 49.

F. *Simon* follows *Hobbs*, *Peretius*, and *Spinoza*, in his Notions of the *Pentateuch*, P. 7. *a.* His Chimerical Syſtem, *ib.* His Notion of publick Scribes groundleſs, P. 13. *&c.* His Principles grounded on weak Conjectures, *ib.* Proves none of his Aſſertions, *ib.* Miſunderſtands *Joſephus*, *ib.* 14. Quotes *Euſebius* to no purpoſe, P. 14. Miſquotes *Theodoret*, *ib.* 15. Alledges Authors which do him no Service, 15. His falſe Reaſonings, *ib.* *&c.* Wreſts a Rule in Criticiſm, P. 18. Applies it wrong *ib.*

Simony condemned, 112.

Sins confeſſed to Prieſts in *Origen*'s Time, 112. how they ought to be reproved, *ib.* Diſtinction, *ib.* Remedies, *ib.* againſt the Holy Ghoſt, how not to be forgiven, 154.

Sixtus: Sentences of *Sixtus* the *Pathygorean* attributed to the Pope, 147.

Solomon; His Books, P. 4.

Soul; *Irenæus*'s Opinion concerning it, 6c. Opinions of the Ancients concerning the Souls of the Wicked, 54 *x. y.* *Tatian*'s Opinion, 55. *Tertullian*'s Opinions of the Soul, 79. *Origen*'s 110.

Stars: *Origen* thought they had Life, 110.

Stephen Biſhop of *Rome*; His Election, 118. Diſpute with S. *Cyprian*, *ib.* Cenſure upon it, *ib.* Martyrdom, 132.

Stichometria of *Nicephorus*, 39, 45.

Stromata; Meaning of the Word, 77.

Supremacy of S. *Peter*, and the Church of *Rome*, 137, 182. *Peter*, *James* and *John* never diſputed it, 65.

Symbol; Etymology of the Word, 10, 11. *d, e.*

Symmachus, P. 38.

T.

Tatian; Country, Profeſſion, 55. *a.* Hereſie, *ib. b. c.* Writings, 55, 56. Abridgment, *ib.* Goſpel ſaid to be made by him, *ib.* a Book of his confuted by *Clemens Alexandrinus*, ibid.

Temple, God dwelleth not in material ones, 93.

Tertullian; Country, Life, 96. *a. b. c. d. e.* If married, when, *ib. h. i.* If Prieſt, of what Church, 70. *k. l.* His Fall, *ib. n.* What Motives, *ib. o.* Orthodox Books: Of Penance, 70. Of Baptiſm, 71. of Prayer, *ib.* Apologetick, *ib.* of Patience and Exhortation to Martyrdom, *ib.* of publick Shews and Idolatry, *ib.* of the Teſtimony of the Soul, *ib.* Chronological Order of his Books, 72. *y. z. aa. bb. cc, dd.* Spurious ones, 73. *ff. gg. hh.* Abridgment, 74. ----83. Genius and Character, 83. *kk. ll.* Editions, 85. Model of a New one, 86.

Thebutis, firſt Heretick, 49.

Theodotion, P. 38.

Theodotus; Heretick, 68. another a Goldſmith, a Heretick, *ib.*

Theognoſtus; His Writings, 153.

Theophilus Biſhop of *Antioch*, 56. Not he to whom S. *Luke* wrote, *ib.* What ſtill extant of his, 57. Abridgment of his Book, *ib.* He firſt uſed the Word *Trinity*, 56. Editions, 57.

Theophilus of *Cæſarea*, 61,

Thomas Apoſtle not called *Judas*, 2. *c.*

Tiberius; Story of his deſire to Deify J. Chriſt uncertain, 22.

Tobit; Hiſtory of him, P. 3. *q.* His Book rejected, P. 29.

Tradition; Its Authority, 77, 82,

Trinity; Opinions of the Ancients, 53. *r.* 64, 145. of *Origen*, 108.

Tryphon, *Origen*'s Scholar, 116,

V.

Valentinians; Their Dotages, 58.

Victor; Difference with the *Aſiaticks*, 61. Books written by him, *ib.*

Victorinus Biſhop of *Paſſaw*, not *Poictiers*, 155. Writings, 156. Genius, *ib.*

Virgin Mary; Letters falſly attributed to her, 2.

Virgins too familiar with Deacons, 133.

Virgins who vow'd to preſerve their Virginity, 134. Their Habits and Dreſſes, 136.

Virginity commended thô not enjoyned, *ib.*

Univerſe; Book of its Nature, 87.

Unction of the Sick unuſual in the Primitive Ages, 182.

Voſſius; His opinion of the Sibylline Books, 21. His Edition of Saint *Ignatius*, 37.

W.

War; Book of the Wars of the Lord, P. 30.

Wiſdom; Book ſo called, P. 4. Not *Solomons*, P. ib. *ee.*

Word; See Trinity.

Z.

Zechariah; Prophet, P. 6. Not he whom *Euſebius* ſpeaks of; or he that was killed between the Temple and the Altar, *ib.*

Zeno Veronenſis, 162. Sermons, *ib.*

Zephaniah; Time of his Prophecy, p. 6.

Zoroaſter; Spurious, p. 42.

FINIS.

A

NEW HISTORY

OF

Eccleſiaſtical Writers.

Vol. SECOND.

A NEW

HISTORY

OF

Eccleſiaſtical Writers:

Containing an ACCOUNT

Of the LIVES and WRITINGS of the

PRIMITIVE FATHERS;

A

Judicious Abridgment

AND

Catalogue of their *WORKS*;

Their Various Editions, and Cenſures Determining the GENUINE and SPURIOUS.

Together with A

Judgment upon their *Style* and *Doctrine.*

ALSO,

A Compendious Hiſtory of the COUNCILS;

With Neceſſary TABLES to the whole.

Written in *FRENCH*

By *Lewis Ellies du PIN*, Doctor of the *SORBON.*

VOLUME the SECOND,

Containing the AUTHORS *that Flouriſhed in the FOURTH AGE of the CHURCH.*

LONDON,

Printed by *J. Heptinſtall*, for Abel Swalle and Tim. Childe, at the *Unicorn* at the Weſt End of St. *Paul's* Church-yard, MDCXCVII.

THE CONTENTS OF THE SECOND VOLUME.

Of the LIVES *and* WRITINGS *of the* Authors *that Flouriſhed in the* Fourth Century, *viz.*

Euſebius *of* Cæſarea.
Conſtantine *the firſt Chriſtian Emperor.*
Juvencus.
Rheticius.
Euſtathius *Biſhop of* Antioch.
Peter *of* Alexandria.
St. Athanaſius.
Jacobus Niſibenus.
Marcellus *of* Ancyra.
Hoſius.
Aſterius.
Theodorus.
Tryphillius.
Heliodorus.
Donatus, *and* Vitellius, *and* Macrobius, *his Diſciples.*
St. Anthony.
St. Pachomius.
Oreſieſis.
Theodorus *Diſciple of St.* Pachomius.
The Macarii.
Serapion *Biſhop of* Thmuis.
Euſebius Emiſenus.
Baſil *of* Ancyra.
Liberius.
St. Hilary.
Lucifer.
Victorinus *of* Africa.
St. Pacianus.
Gregory *of* Bœtica.
Phæbadius.
Optatus.
Acacius *of* Cæſarea.
Photinus.
Aëtius *and* Eunomius.
George *of* Laodicea.
The Apollinarii.
Titus *Biſhop of* Boſtra.
Didymus *of* Alexandria.
Peter *of* Alexandria.
Lucius.
Aquilius Severus.
Euzoïus.
St. Cyril *of* Jeruſalem.
St. Ephrem Syrus, *Deacon of* Edeſſa.
Damaſus *Biſhop of* Rome.
St. Baſil *the Great.*
St. Gregory Nazianzen.
St. Gregory Nyſſen.
St. Cæſarius.
St. Amphilochius.
Maximus.
Euſebius Vercellenſis.
Meletius.
Diodorus *Biſhop of* Tarſus.
Hilary *the Deacon.*
Priſcillian; Matronianus, Tiberianus, *and* Dictinius *his Diſciples.*
Ithacius, *or* Idacius.
Fauſtinus.
Philaſtrius.
Timothy *of* Alexandria.
Nectarius.
Gelaſius *of* Cæſarea.
Siricius.
Sabinus.
Ambroſe *of* Alexandria.
Theotimus.
Evagrius *of* Antioch.
St. Ambroſe *Biſhop of* Milan.
St. Epiphanius.
Philo-Carpathius.
Q. Julius Hilarion.

OF

OF THE

COUNCILS

Held in the

FOURTH CENTURY.

79 Councils

OF the ſuppoſititious Council of Sinueſſa.
Of the Council of Cirtha.
Of the Council of Alexandria *under* Peter, *Biſhop of that Church.*
Of the Council of Eliberis *or* Elvira.
Of the pretended Council of Carthage.
Of the Council of Rome.
Of the Council of Arles.
Of the Councils of Ancyra *and* Neocæſarea.
Of the firſt Council of Alexandria *againſt* Arius.
Of the pretended Council of Bithynia *for* Arius.
Of the ſecond Council of Alexandria *againſt* Arius, *held in the Preſence of* Hoſius.
Of the Council of Nice.
Of the pretended Council of Antioch *againſt* Euſtathius.
Of the Synod of Cæſarea.
Of the pretended Council of Tyre *againſt St.* Athanaſius.
Of the Synods of Jeruſalem.
Of the Council of Conſtantinople *againſt* Marcellus *of* Ancyra.
Of the Council of Conſtantinople *againſt* Paul *Biſhop of that City.*
Of the Council of Alexandria *for St.* Athanaſius.
Of the Council of Rome *under Pope* Julius *for* Athanaſius.
Of Councils held at Antioch.
Of the Council of Milan.
Of the ſuppoſititious Council of Cologne *againſt* Euphratas.
Of the Council of Sardica.
Of the firſt Council of Sirmium.
Of the ſecond Council of Sirmium.
Of the Council of Arles.
Of the Council of Milan.
Of the Council of Beziers.
Of the third Council of Sirmium.
Of the Council of Antioch.
Of the Council of Ancyra.
Of the fourth Council of Sirminm.
Of the fifth Council of Sirmium.
Of the Synod of Ariminum.
Of the Council of Seleucia.
Of the Council of Conſtantinople.
Of the Synod of Melitine.
Of the Synod of Antioch.
Of the Synod of Alexandria.
Of the Council of Paris.
Of the Council of Italy.
Of the Council of the Egyptian *Biſhops held at* Antioch.
Of the Council of Antioch *under* Meletius.
Of the Council of Lampſacus.
Of the Council of Singedunum *compos'd of* Arian *Biſhops.*
Of the Synods held by the Semi-Arians.
Of the Synod of Tyana.
Of the Council of Gangra.
Of the Council of Laodicea.
Of the Council of Rome *under* Damaſus.
Of the Council of Rome *under* Urſicinus.
Of the Council of Valence.
Of the Council of Antioch *for reſtoring Peace in that Church.*
Of the Councils of Conſtantinople.
Of the ſecond Council of Conſtantinople.
Of the third Council of Conſtantinople.
Of the Council of Aquileia.
Of the Council of Saragoſſa.
Of the Council of Sida *in* Pamphylia.
Of the Council of Bourdeaux.
Of the Council of Capua.
Of the Councils of Rome *and* Milan *againſt* Jovinian.
Of the Councils of the Novatians *held at* Sangarus.
Of the firſt Council of Carthage.
Of the ſecond Council of Carthage.
Of the Councils of Cabarſuſſa *and* Bagais.
Of the Council of Hippo.
Of the Council of Carthage *in the Year* 394.
Of the Council of Carthage *in the Year* 397.
Of the Council of Carthage *in the Year* 398, *called the* IV.
Of the Council of Carthage *in the Year* 399.
Of the Council of Carthage *in the Year* 401, *commonly called the* V.
Of the Council of Conſtantinople, *in the Year* 394.
Of the Council of Alexandria *in the Year* 399.
Of the Council of Cyprus *at the ſame time.*
Of the Council of Turin.
Of the Council of Toledo.
An Abridgment of the Doctrine of the Church in the fourth Century.
An Abridgment of the Diſcipline of the Church in the fourth Century.

A N

AN ALPHABETICAL TABLE OF THE *Names of the* Authors *mentioned in this Volume.*

A.

ACACIUS of *Cæsarea.* *Page* 79
AETIUS. 98
ALEXANDER. 27
St. AMBROSE. 198
AMBROSE of *Alexandria.* ibid.
St. AMPHILOCHIUS. 184
St. ANTHONY. 53
The APOLLINARII. 100
AQUILIUS SEVERUS. 106
ASTERIUS. 52
St. ATHANASIUS. 28

B.

BASIL of *Ancyra.* 59
St. BASIL. 122

C.

St. CÆSARIUS. 184
CONSTANTINE. 11
St. CYRIL of *Jeruſalem.* 107

D.

DAMASUS. 120
DICTINIUS. 190
DIDYMUS. 103
DIODORUS. 188
DONATUS. 53

E.

St. EPIPHANIUS. 234
St. EPHREM. 115
EVAGRIUS of *Antioch.* 198
EUNOMIUS. 98
EUSEBIUS of *Cæſarea.* 1
EUSEBIUS of *Edeſſa.* 59
EUSEBIUS VERCELLENSIS. 186
EUSTATHIUS of *Antioch.* 21
EUZOIUS. 106

F.

FAUSTINUS. 192

G.

GELASIUS of *Cæſarea.* 196
GEORGE of *Laodicea.* 100
GREGORY of *Bætica.* 85
St. GREGORY NAZIANZEN. 159
St. GREGORY NYSSEN. 176

H.

HELIODORUS. 53
St. HILARY. 64
HILARY *the Deacon.* 189
Q. JULIUS HILARION. 240
HOSIUS. 50

I.

JACOBUS NISIBENUS. 49
ITHACIUS. 192
JULIUS. 51
JUVENCUS. 20

L.

LIBERIUS. 60
LUCIFER. 79
LUCIUS. 106

M.

The MACARII. 55
MACROBIUS. 53
MARCELLUS of *Ancyra.* 50
MATRONIANUS. 199
MAXIMUS. 186
MELETIUS. 187

N.

NECTARIUS. 195

O.

St. OPTATUS. 87
ORESIESIS. 55

P.

St. PACIANUS. 81
St. PACHOMIUS. 54
PHÆBADIUS. 85
PHILASTRIUS. 192
PHILO CARPATHIUS. 240
PHOTINUS. 98
PETER of *Alexandria*, I. 25
PETER of *Alexandria*, II. 105
PRISCILLIAN. 190

R.

RHETICIUS. 21

S.

SABINUS. 198
SERAPION. 58
SIRICIUS. 196

T.

THEODORUS of *Perinthus.* 52
THEODORUS, Diſciple of St. *Pachomius.* 55
THEOTIMUS. 198
TIBERIANUS. 190
TIMOTHY of *Alexandria.* 195
TITUS of *Boſtra.* 102
TRYPHILIUS. 52

V.

VICTORINUS. 80
VITELLIUS. 53

AN

AN Alphabetical TABLE OF THE COUNCILS.

A.

Councils of Alexandria, *Pag.* 242. 250. 255. 265. 285.
Councils of Ancyra, 248. 263.
—— *Of* Antioch, 254. 256. 258. 263. 265, 266. *ibid.* 271, 272.
—— *Of* Aquileia, 273.
—— *Of the Semi*-Arians, 267.
—— *Of* Ariminum, 263.
—— *Of* Arles, 247. 262.

B.

Councils of Bagais, 277.
—— *Of* Beziers, 263.
—— *Of* Bithynia, 250.
—— *Of* Bourdeaux, 275.

C.

Councils of Cabarſuſſa, 277.
—— *Of* Capua, 275.
—— *Of* Carthage, 245. 275, 276, 277. 280. 283.
—— *Of* Cæſarea, 254.
—— *Of* Cirtha, 241.
—— *Of* Cologne, 258.
—— *Of* Conſtantinople, 255. 265. 271. 285.
—— *Of* Cyprus, 285.

E.

Council of Elvira, 242.

G.

Council of Gangra, 267.

H.

Council of Hippo, 277.

I.

Councils of Jeruſalem, 255.
—— *Of* Italy, 266.

L.

Councils of Lampſacus, 266.
—— *Of* Laodicea, 268.

M.

Councils of Melitine, 265.
—— *Of* Milan, 258. 262. 275.

N.

Councils of Neocæſarea, 248.
—— *Of* Nice, 250.

P.

Council of Paris, 266.

R.

Council of Rome, 246. 255. 270. *ibid.* 275.

S.

Councils of Sangarus, 275.
—— *Of* Saragoſſa, 274.
—— *Of* Sardica, 259.
—— *Of* Seleucia, 264.
—— *Of* Sida,
—— *Of* Singedunum, 267.
—— *Of* Sinueſſa, 241.
—— *Of* Sirmium, 261, 262, 263. *ibid.*

T.

Council of Toledo, 285.
—— *Of* Turin, 285.
—— *Of* Tyana, 267.
—— *Of* Tyre, 254.

V.

Council of Valence, 270.

BIBLIO-

BIBLIOTHECA PATRUM:
OR, A
NEW HISTORY
OF
Eccleſiaſtical Writers.

TOME II.

CONTAINING

An Account of the LIVES and WRITINGS of the *Primitive FATHERS*, that Flouriſhed in the *Fourth Century* of *Chriſtianity*, with *Cenſures* upon all their *BOOKS*, determining which are *Genuine*, and which *Spurious*.

EUSEBIUS *of* Cæſarea.

Euſebius of *Cæſarea.*

EUSEBIUS Surnam'd *Pamphilus* (*a*), was Born in *Palæſtine* (*b*), towards the latter end of the Reign of *Galienus* (*c*). He was ordain'd Prieſt by *Agapius* Biſhop of *Cæſarea* in *Palæſtine*, and ſettled a Famous School in that City. When the Perſecution of *Diocleſian* aroſe, he exhorted the Chriſtians of *Cæſarea* to Suffer with Courage for the Faith of Jeſus Chriſt, and more particularly aſſiſted his dear Friend *Pamphilus*, who ſuffer'd Martyrdom after two Years Impriſonment. Some have accus'd him of offering Incenſe to Idols during this Perſecution, to releaſe himſelf out of Priſon (*d*); but this Accuſation is groundleſs, and 'tis much more probable, that he con-

(a) *Surnam'd* Pamphilus.] From the Name of the Martyr *Pamphilus* his Friend, and not of his Brother, as *Nicephorus* believ'd; for in the 7th Book of his Hiſtory, he ſays, That he was firſt acquainted with him when he was a Prieſt.

(b) *Palæſtine.*] All the Ancients call him *Euſebius* of *Palæſtine*. In the Firſt Book of the Life of *Conſtantine*, he teſtifies, that he had his Education in *Palæſtine*, and in the Second Book of the ſame Work, after he has repeated a Law of *Conſtantine* directed to thoſe of *Palæſtine*, he adds, *This was the firſt Letter which* Conſtantine *addreſs'd unto us.* 'Tis not known who were his Kindred. Some have thought that he was the Kinſman of *Euſebius* of *Nicomedia*, becauſe in a Letter of *Arius* to this Biſhop, *Euſebius* of *Cæſarea* is call'd his Brother. Neither is it known who were his Maſters. In the Seventh Book of his Hiſtory, he ſays, That he heard *Dorotheus*, a Prieſt of *Antioch*, expound the Scriptures; from whence *Trithemius*, and ſome others, have concluded that he was his Scholar. *Acacius* Succeſſor to *Euſebius* wrote his Life, but 'tis loſt.

(c) *Towards the latter End of the Reign of* Galienus.] There is ſome Proof of this *Epocha*: For in his Hiſtory Book III Ch. 28. he ſays, That *Denys* of *Alexandria*, who died the 17th Year of the Reign of *Galienus*, liv'd in his time: And in the Fifth Book he ſays, That *Paulus Samoſatenus* reviv'd the Error of *Artemon* in his time; and in his Seventh Book, where he gives an Account of what was done under *Galienus*, he ſays, *After we have related the Tranſactions of former times, we come now to thoſe things which happened in our own time.*

(d) *Some have accus'd him of Offering Incenſe to Idols during this Perſecution*, &c.] This he was charged with by *Potamon* a Confeſſor and Biſhop of *Egypt*, at the Synod of *Tyre*; for if we give Credit to St. *Epiphanius*, in Hereſie 68, this Biſhop perceiving *Euſebius* of *Cæſarea* there preſent, cry'd out, O Euſebius, *How come you to ſit as Judge upon the innocent* Athanaſius? *Who can endure it? Tell me, I pray you, were not we in Priſon together in the time of Perſecution? I loſt an Eye there, for maintaining the Truth, but you have loſt no Part of your Body, you have ſuffered nothing: How then did you get out of Priſon?* Epiphanius adds, That *Euſebius* hearing this, roſe up and diſſolv'd the Aſſembly, ſaying, *Seeing you charge me with things of this Nature, in a place where you are Strangers, it muſt be true which your Accuſers ſay; for if you exerciſe ſuch Tyranny here, much more will you do it in your own Country.* This is confirm'd by the Biſhops of the Council of *Alexandria*, who ſay in their Letter, *That* Euſebius *of* Cæſarea *was accus'd by the Confeſſors of Sacrificing to Idols.* In the mean time, this Charge of *Potamon* is groundleſs: For although it were true, that *Euſebius* was caſt into Priſon for the Faith of Chriſt, it does not follow that he muſt have Sacrific'd to Idols to obtain his liberty, becauſe he loſt no Part of his Body, ſince he might have been delivered from that Perſecution for many other Reaſons, without loſing any of his Members: and it was a raſh Cenſure of his Neighbour in *Potamon*, to accuſe, as he does, a Biſhop of ſo heinous a Crime, upon ſo weak a Conjecture as this: But the Good-man had more Zeal than Prudence.

 tinued

Euſebius of Cæſarea.

tinued alway ſtedfaſt in the Faith of Jeſus Chriſt (e). Immediately after this Perſecution was ended, *Euſebius* was choſen Biſhop of *Cæſarea* in the room of *Agapius (f)*, in the Year 313, or 314, from the Birth of Chriſt: And from that time he was much engag'd in the Controverſie of *Arius*, a Presbyter of *Alexandria*, whom he, (as well as ſome other Biſhops of *Palæſtine*) at firſt protected, thinking that he was unjuſtly perſecuted by *Alexander* of *Alexandria*, his Biſhop. He did not only write to this Biſhop in favour of *Arius*; but finding he could not prevail to reſtore him, he permitted him and his Followers to keep their Places, and to hold the ordinary Aſſemblies of the Faithful in their Churches, upon condition that they ſhould ſubmit to their Biſhop, and earneſtly deſire to be re-united to his Communion.

It appears by a Letter of *Euſebius* to *Alexander*, which is produced in the Second Council of *Nice*, that he did verily think that *Arius*, and thoſe of his Party, acknowledg'd the Eternity of the *Word*, and that he believ'd the contrary Doctrine was falſly charg'd upon them, which may in ſome meaſure excuſe his Proceedings in this Affair: For as ſoon as *Arius* did clearly diſcover his impious Sentiments in the Council of *Nice*; *Euſebius*, with all the other Biſhops, condemn'd them, and propos'd a very Orthodox Confeſſion of Faith. But becauſe it ſeem'd not to renounce the Hereſie of *Arius* formally enough, therefore the Fathers of the Council added to it the word *Conſubſtantial*, together with Anathematiſms againſt the Errors of *Arius*. This new term *Conſubſtantial*, gave ſome trouble to *Euſebius*, and he refus'd at firſt to aſſent to it; but being afterwards fully ſatisfy'd of its true meaning, he made no ſcruple of Subſcribing to it, and of Signing the Confeſſion of Faith made by the Council of *Nice*, which he was never known afterwards openly to violate, though he always maintain'd an intimate Correſpondence with the Biſhops of *Arius*'s Party. He was preſent with them at the Council of *Antioch*, held in the Year 330, wherein they unjuſtly depos'd *Euſtathius*, then Biſhop of *Antioch*. But if he was to be blam'd for conſenting to that unjuſt Deprivation of a Biſhop who was his Enemy; yet it muſt be acknowledg'd that he deſerves great Commendation for refuſing to Succeed him in his See; For being Elected both by the Biſhops and the People, in order to his Ordination to the Biſhoprick of *Antioch*, after the Depoſing of *Euſtathius*, he did abſolutely refuſe it; and when the Biſhops wrote about it to the Emperour *Conſtantine*, that he would oblige *Euſebius* to agree to this Election, he wrote to him himſelf, humbly praying that he might have leave to refuſe this Biſhoprick; which at laſt the Emperour granted, and greatly commended his Moderation. Nevertheleſs *Euſebius* continued always to take part with *Euſebius* of *Nicomedia*, and aſſiſted at the Council of *Tyre*, held againſt St. *Athanaſius*, in the Year 335, and alſo at the Aſſembly of Biſhops, which was held at *Jeruſalem* at the time of the Dedication of the Church of that City: And, in fine, he was ſent in the Name of thoſe Biſhops to the Emperour *Conſtantine*, to juſtify what they had done againſt St. *Athanaſius*. Then it was that he ſpoke a Panegyrick in honour of the Emperour, at a time of publick Rejoicing for beginning the 30th. Year of his Reign, which was the laſt of his Life: And *Euſebius* himſelf did not long ſurvive this Emperour, whom he mightily lov'd and honour'd, for he alſo died about the Year 338.

He has written many very Learned Books. The Firſt were his Five Books of Apology for *Origen*, which he compos'd with the Holy Martyr *Pamphilus*, during the Perſecution of *Dioclefian*; and to which he only added a Sixth, after the Death of this Martyr. About the ſame time he wrote a Treatiſe againſt *Hierocles*, who had written two Books againſt the Chriſtian Religion. After he was choſen Biſhop of *Cæſarea*, he compos'd his Fifteen Books of *Evangelical Preparation*, and Twenty Books of *Evangelical Demonſtration* (g): After this he wrote a *Chronicle* from the Beginning of the World down to the 20th Year of *Conſtantine the Great*. After this *Chronicle* follow'd his *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory* (h), divided into Ten Books, which ſeems to have been finiſh'd ſome time after the Council of *Nice*, though it reaches no further than the 20th Year of *Conſtantine*. About the Year 332, he compos'd a Cycle for *Eaſter*, at the deſire of the Emperour, to whom he dedicated it, and caus'd ſome very fair Copies of the Holy Scriptures to be written out, as he himſelf tells us in the Fourth Book of the Life of *Conſtantine*, Chap. 34, and 35. St. *Jerom* and *Bede* make mention of this Paſchal Cycle of *Euſebius*, compos'd, as they ſay, in imitation of that of *Hippolitus*. His Books againſt *Marcellus* of *Ancyra* were written after the firſt Condemnation of that Heretick in the Council of *Conſtantinople*, held in the

(e) *'Tis much more probable that he continued always ſtedfaſt in the Faith of Jeſus Chriſt.*] Firſt, Becauſe we muſt always think well of our Neighbour, when it does not evidently appear that he has done ill. Secondly, Becauſe 'tis no ways probable, if he had committed ſuch a Crime when he was Prieſt, that he would have been afterwards choſen Biſhop of *Cæſarea*.

(f) *In the room of* Agapius.] *Baronius* and *Blondel* place *Agricolaus* between *Agapius* and *Euſebius*, whoſe Name is to be found among the Subſcriptions of the Council of *Ancyra*. But *Euſebius* in his Seventh Book reckoning up the Names of thoſe Biſhops who govern'd the Church while the Perſecution laſted, endeth his Catalogue of the Biſhops of *Cæſarea* with *Agapius*, of whom he ſays, that he took a great deal of pains for his Flock during that Perſecution: And *Euſebius* himſelf was ordained immediately after the Perſecution; for he aſſiſted in the quality of a Biſhop, at the Dedication of the Church of *Tyre*, which was done immediately after Peace was reſtor'd to the Church, before *Licinius* had taken Arms againſt *Conſtantine*, which happen'd in the Year 313. And therefore if there was one *Agricolaus* Biſhop of *Cæſarea*, he did not hold that See for any long time, for *Euſebius* was ordain'd to it in the Year 314.

(g) *After he was choſen Biſhop of* Cæſarea, *he compos'd his Fifteen Books of* Evangelical Preparation, *and Twenty Books of* Evangelical Demonſtration.] Theſe are cited in his *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory*, B. I. Ch. 2. *Blondel* believes the contrary, that the Hiſtory is cited in the Sixth Book of his *Evangelical Demonſtration*, Ch. 23. but he was deceived by the Tranſlation.

(h) *After this* Chronicle *followed his* Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory.] He ſaith expreſly in the beginning of his Hiſtory, that the *Chronicle* was written before it, in theſe Words, *Formerly I made an Abridgement of theſe things in my* Chronicle, *but now I will give a more ample Declaration of them here in this Work.*

Year

Year 335, or 336 (*i*). In ſhort, the Four Books of the Life of *Conſtantine*, were compos'd after the Death of that Emperor, to which he has added three Tracts, *viz.* The Harangue which he made at the Dedication of the Church of *Jeruſalem*, The Diſcourſe of *Conſtantine* to the Convention of the Saints, and a Panegyrick in Praiſe of this Emperor. *Euſebius of Cæſarea.*

Beſides theſe Works, whoſe Chronology is known, he hath alſo written, as St. *Jerom* teſtifies, Five Books of the Theophany, or the Incarnation, Ten Books of Commentaries upon *Iſaiah*, Thirty Books againſt *Porphyrie*, Ten whereof were loſt in St. *Jerom*'s time; and a Book of Topography, which is the ſame that St. *Jerom* tranſlated and entituled, a Book of the Country of the *Hebrews*, which was afterwards Publiſh'd in Greek by *Bonfrerius* in the Year 1631. There is mention made in this Book of two other Tracts of the ſame Nature, whereof one contains an Explication of the Names which the *Hebrews* give to other Nations, and the other was a Topographical Deſcription of the Holy Land and the Temple. St. *Jerom* alſo places in the Catalogue of *Euſebius*'s Works, Three Books of the Life of *Pamphilus*, ſome little Tracts upon the Martyrs (*k*), the Commentaries upon the 150 Pſalms, tranſlated afterwards by *Euſebius* of *Verceilles*, and the Rules for reconciling the Four Evangeliſts, together with a Letter to *Carpianus*. He mentions alſo, in an Epiſtle to *Pammachius*, *Euſebius*'s Commentary upon the Firſt Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*; and he teſtifieth in another place, that he caus'd to be Publiſh'd an Edition of the Verſion of the *Septuagint*, taken from the *Hexapla* of *Origen*. St. *Baſil* cites a Treatiſe of *Euſebius* concerning the Polygamy of the Patriarchs, of which *Euſebius* himſelf ſpeaks, *Book* I. *Chap.* 9. of the *Demonſtration*, and *Book* VII. *Ch.* 3. and 7. of the *Preparation*. In fine, *Theodoret* tells us, that *Euſebius* wrote Eclogues upon the whole Scriptures: But we muſt not forget the Letter which he wrote to the *Cæſareans* mentioned by *Theodoret* in his Hiſtory, nor thoſe Letters to *Alexander* and *Euobration* concerning *Arius*, which are cited in the Second Council of *Nice*, *Act.* 5. & 6. To theſe we may add, the Letter to the Empreſs *Conſtantia*, which is quoted by the Biſhops that condemn'd Images, whereof there is a Teſtimony related in the ſame Council, *Act.* 6. *Photius* mentions a Book of *Euſebius* entituled, *Apology and Refutation*, that is to ſay, An Apology for the Religion of Chriſt, and a Refutation of the Errors of the Gentiles, divided into two Books; and alſo of two other Books, which were, as he ſays, very little different from the two former. The Commentary upon the *Canticles*, publiſh'd by *Meurſius*, is falſly aſcribed to *Euſebius*, ſince in it are cited the Teſtimonies of Authors much later than *Euſebius*, ſuch as *Gregory Nyſſen*, *Philo Carpathius*, and many others. It is not certain, that *Euſebius* was the Author of that little Tract of *the Life of the Prophets*, publiſh'd in Greek before *Procopius*, by *Curterius*, from a Manuſcript of the Cardinal of *Rochefoucauld*, and printed at *Paris* in the Year 1580, though it appears to be ancient. To conclude, There are ſome Treatiſes or Diſcourſes publiſh'd by *Sirmondus*, which are believed to be a Tranſlation from the Greek of *Euſebius* of *Cæſarea*: But though theſe Treatiſes, which ſeem indeed to be tranſlated from the Greek, were compos'd by ſome ancient Author, and have ſomething of the Air and Genius of *Euſebius*'s Writings, neither do they contain any thing unworthy of him; yet there is no full aſſurance that they are his, becauſe they are not mention'd by any of the Ancients, and we cannot now judge with any certainty from a Verſion, of the Stile of *Euſebius*.

After we have given a Catalogue of all the Writings of *Euſebius*, whereof we have any Teſtimony, we muſt now Diſcourſe more largely of thoſe that are come to our Hands. His *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory* is the moſt conſiderable of all his Books, which is a Collection of all the Memorable Things which happen'd in the Church from the Birth of Jeſus Chriſt to his own time. He has exactly noted the Succeſſion of Biſhops to the Sees of all the Great Cities in the World; he has given an Account of Eccleſiaſtical Writers and their Books, together with the Hiſtory of Hereſies, and ſome Remarks concerning the *Jews*. He has deſcribed the Perſecutions of the Martyrs, the Controverſies and Diſputes touching Eccleſiaſtical Diſcipline; and, in a Word, all things which concern the Affairs of the Church. He Writes nothing of Hiſtory as from himſelf, but almoſt every where, in his Works, he cites the ancient Authors or their Monuments, from whence he had his Relations, and inſerts long Extracts taken out of them, as Men uſually do when they write Annals or Memoirs. This manner of writing Hiſtory, is leſs agreeable indeed, but much more profitable than any other, and gains Credit and Weight to that which is related: For when a Writer reports the Tranſactions of Ancient Times without citing the Authors from whence he had them, he cannot ſo eaſily gain Credit with his Readers, as when he cites his Vouchers, and produces their Teſtimonies for the Truth of what he ſays, ſince thoſe Relations muſt certainly be agreeable to Truth, which are founded on the Authority of unqueſtionable Witneſſes. But beſides this general Reaſon, there is alſo a particular one, why this way of writing Hiſtory, which is followed by *Euſebius*, is of wonderful Advantage unto us; which is this, That for the moſt part, thoſe Authors and their Works which were more ancient than *Euſebius*, have been loſt ſince his Death by the injury of time; and therefore we are mightily oblig'd to him who hath preſerved in his Hiſtory, not only the Memory of thoſe Authors, but ſome conſiderable Fragments of their Works. In ſhort, without the Hiſtory of *Euſebius*, we ſhould ſcarce have any Knowledge, not only of the Hiſtory of thoſe firſt Ages of the Church, but even of the Authors that wrote

(i) *His Books againſt* Marcellus *of* Ancyra *were written after the firſt Condemnation of that Heretick in the Council of* Conſtantinople *held in the Year* 335, *or* 336] They are Dedicated to *Flacillus* Biſhop of *Antioch*, who was not choſen Biſhop of that Church until the Year 335. Beſides, in the Firſt Book of *Eccleſiaſtical Theology*, Ch. 14. he ſays, *That* Marcellus *was condemned.*

(k) *Some little Tracts upon the Martyrs*] We have one Book of theſe Tracts concerning the Martyrs of *Paleſtine*, but it is probable that he wrote more. The Martyrology ſuppoſed to be tranſlated by St. *Jerom*, has been aſcribed to him, but that Work is none of his, neither is the Tranſlation St. *Jerom*'s.

Euſebius of Cæſarea.

at that time, and their Works, ſince no other Writer but he, has given an Account of thoſe things. For it is obſervable, that the Hiſtorians who followed after him, as *Socrates*, *Sozomen*, and *Theodoret*, begun their Hiſtory where he ended his, either becauſe they thought that he had Collected in his all that was Remarkable of thoſe firſt Ages, or becauſe they had no other way of coming to the Knowledge of them but by him. *Nicephorus Calliſtus*, who pretended to write a New Hiſtory in the Fourteenth Century, has mixt in it a great many fabulous and uncertain Tales, becauſe they were not taken out of *Euſebius*, nor confirm'd by the Authority of any Ancient Author. Nevertheleſs, it muſt be confeſs'd, That even the Hiſtory of *Euſebius* is not altogether ſo perfect as were to be wiſh'd, for it is not written ſmoothly, neither is it always exact (*l*). Our Author does often enlarge too much upon thoſe things that ought to be ſlightly paſs'd over; and on the contrary, ſometimes he expreſſes ſuch things very ſuccinctly, which deſerve a much larger Account. But notwithſtanding theſe Faults, it is a moſt Excellent Hiſtory, and highly to be priz'd.

There is at the End of the Eighth Book, a ſmall Tract of the Martyrs of *Palæſtine*, in which he deſcribes the Martyrdom of thoſe that ſuffered in this Province for the Faith of Jeſus Chriſt. Some have confounded this with the Eighth Book, but againſt Reaſon; for it is a diſtinct Tract, and, as it were, a Supplement to it.

Ruffinus is the firſt who Tranſlated this Hiſtory of *Euſebius*, but he, according to his uſual manner, took a great liberty in doing it. He has paſt over the whole Tenth Book, and has added to it two more which contain the following Hiſtory down to the Death of *Theodoſius*. His Tranſlation is clean, neat, and elegant enough, it gives the Sence and Thought of the Author in a very agreeable Stile, and ſometimes more faithfully than thoſe Interpreters who have Tranſlated him ſince. This Verſion has been the great Magazine to all the Latin Authors, who have drawn from thence whatever they either wrote or underſtood of the *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory* of the Firſt Ages.

Muſculus the Proteſtant, undertook a new Tranſlation of the Hiſtory of *Euſebius*, which he perform'd happily enough. He ties himſelf up very much to the Letter, and has Tranſlated the Text with much politeneſs and brevity: But he does not always underſtand his Author aright, and ſo he has committed many faults in his Verſion. The Tranſlation of *Chriſtophorſon* is more Elegant, and his Stile more *Ciceronian*, but it is too Copious for an Hiſtorian, whoſe Stile ſhould be conciſe and cloſe. He hath Corrected many Faults of *Muſculus*, and yet his own Verſion is not altogether free.

The Learned *Henricus Valeſius* having obſerv'd the Faults of all former Verſions, undertook to make a new one, more perfect. He publiſh'd it with the Greek Text, Reviſ'd by Four Manuſcripts, and added to it moſt learned Notes. His Verſion deſerves Univerſal Applauſe, and the ſingular eſteem of all Learned Men, for it has two qualities that rarely meet together, being both Elegant and Literal; And yet the Criticks have obſerv'd ſome Faults in it: But it is impoſſible to ſatisfie all Men, and very difficult to avoid all Miſtakes, in a Work of ſo great a length.

It was very fit that the Hiſtory of *Euſebius* ſhould be Tranſlated, that thoſe who neither underſtand Greek nor Latin might not be depriv'd of the Hiſtory of the Church in its Original Purity. The Preſident *Couſin* has done the Publick this Service, who has Tranſlated this Hiſtory into French, with as great Purity as Faithfulneſs, and has prefix'd to his Verſion a Preface wherein he briefly takes notice of the principal Errors of *Euſebius*, and paſſes a very ſound and ſolid Judgment upon his Hiſtory and his Perſon.

The Chronicle of *Euſebius*, or the Abridgement of the Univerſal Hiſtory of all Times and Places from the Beginning of the World down to his own time, was divided into Two Parts: The Firſt was entituled, *Canons of Univerſal Hiſtory*, or *Univerſal Chronography*; and the Second, *Chronical Canons*. In the firſt, he has collected the Origin and Hiſtory of all Nations ſeverally, the Succeſſion of all Kings and Princes of the World, of the High-Prieſts of the Jews, and the Biſhops of the Chief Churches from the Birth of Jeſus Chriſt. In the ſecond, he has enlarg'd and digeſted theſe Hiſtories according to the order of Time. St. *Jerom* has tranſlated both Parts (*m*): But there was nothing remaining of the Tranſlation of the Firſt, but ſome Extracts containing the Names of Kings, which are Printed with the Verſion of the Second Part. This Tranſlation of St. *Jerom*, which was thus Printed at *Baſle*, was

(*l*) *Neither is it always Exact.*] Many Faults are obſerved in it contrary to the Truth of Hiſtory, and contrary to Chronology. In his Firſt Book he ſaith, That the Taxing which *Joſephus* ſpeaks of in his Eighteenth Book of the Hiſtory of the *Jews*, is the ſame that St. *Luke* writes of. In the ſame Book, *Ch.* 9. he ſays, That *Lyſanias* Tetrarch of *Abylene* was Brother to *Philip*, and *Herod* the younger, which is not true. In *Ch.* 7. he ſays, That *Herod* Junior, was baniſhed to *Vienna*, contrary to the Teſtimony of *Joſephus*, who aſſures us, *Book* XVIII. *Ch.* 9. That he was ſent to *Lyons*. He thinks that Jeſus Chriſt ſpent Four Years in his preaching. He is miſtaken in the *Epocha* of the Voyage of St. *Paul* to *Jeruſalem*. In *Book* XI. *Ch.* 13. he diſtinguiſhes *Cephas* who was rebuked at *Antioch* by St. *Paul*, from the Apoſtle St. *Peter*, tho' he was certainly the ſame. I ſhall not now mention his other Faults, which he committed by taking things upon hear-ſay, nor the Apocryphal Books, which he cites very often. He miſtakes the Jews of *Alexandria*, mentioned by *Philo*, called *Therapeutæ*, for Chriſtians. *B.* II. *Ch* 10. he confounds *Novatus* and *Novatianus*. *B.* 6. *Ch* 45. he makes miſtakes in the years of the *Pontificates* of *Sixtus* and *Eutychianus*.

(*m*) *St. Jerom has tranſlated both Parts.*] St. *Jerom* in his *Commentary upon* Daniel, *Ch.* 9. ſaith, That there was found in the Verſion of the Chronicle of *Euſebius* an Explication of two Paſſages of Scripture, both which were in his Firſt Part: *Marcellinus* ſays alſo plainly, That St. *Jerom* tranſlated the Firſt Part. St. *Jerom* in the Preface to his Verſion ſays, That he tranſlated *Euſebius* word for word, from the time of *Abraham* to the taking of *Troy*; and that from the taking of *Troy* to the time of *Conſtantine*, he had added many things of his own Head, particularly about thoſe Matters that concern the *Roman* Hiſtory, which *Euſebius* had neglected; and that he was the Author of what follows after the time of *Conſtantine*, down to the Sixth Conſulſhip of *Valens*.

afterwards

afterwards Publish'd more exactly by *Arnaud de Pontac*, Bishop of *Bazas*, in the Year 1605. But none took care to Collect the Greek Fragments of the Original of *Eusebius*, before the famous *Joseph Scaliger*, who Publish'd them in the Year 1606, in a Book entituled, *The Treasure of Time*; wherein he gives a large Version of the First Part of the Chronicle than any other Edition, and renders the Version of the Second Part more Correct and Exact; to which he adds many very considerable Greek Fragments, taken out of some later Greek Authors.

Eusebius of *Cæsarea.*

This Book of *Eusebius* is a Work of Prodigious Study, and most Accomplish'd Learning: For he must have read an infinite number of Books and Ancient Monuments, to compose such an Universal History; and at the same time he must have a well-poiz'd Judgment, to collect so many Particulars, and relate every one of them in their proper time. This infinite Labour, is an evident Proof, that *Eusebius* was a Man of vast Reading and a Prodigious Memory: Nevertheless, it must be confess'd, that the Chronicle of *Africanus* was a great help to him, and that he took almost all his Chronicle from *Africanus's Chronicon*, which he had Copied. He corrected indeed some of the Faults which he found in him, but then he himself committed many more (*n*): And indeed it is next to impossible, to avoid all Errors in so long and knotty a Work as an Univerial Chronicle. These Faults are pardonable in a Book of this Nature, and do not hinder, but that it ought to be esteemed one of the most useful Books of all Antiquity.

The Four Books of the Life of *Constantine*, are, properly speaking, a Panegyrick; in which, he gives an Account as an Orator, rather than as an Historian; but only of the Life of this Emperor, but also of the Revolutions of the Empire, and the Affairs of the Church, in which *Constantine* had a hand, The Stile of this Work is more Sublime and Florid than that of the other Books of *Eusebius*, and yet it is not finer, nor more agreeable. He does nothing for the most part, but give slight hints of the Relations which he has given at large elsewhere, and deliver the Heads of them, leaving out the Circumstances and Particulars.

He has added at the End of those Four Books, *Constantine's* Oration to the Convention of the Saints, *i. e.* to the Christians, and a Harangue in praise of this Emperor, which he spoke before him at the Festival Solemnity of the 30th Year of his Reign. In this Piece he enlarges upon the Praises of God, the Wonders of his Providence, the Mystery of the Incarnation, the Benefits of Jesus Christ to Mankind, more than upon the Commendation of the Emperor, which he intermixes only now and then; for he praises him as a Christian Prince ought to be prais'd; that is to say, by publishing those Vertues which have a relation to Piety and Religion. This Discourse is the most Eloquent of all his Works, and is compos'd with much Art and Fineness.

The Fifteen Books of *Evangelical Preparation*, address'd to *Theodorus*, (who is believ'd to have been Bishop of *Laodicea*, and is mention'd in the 32d Chapter of the Seventh Book of his *Ecclesiastick History*) were written on purpose to dispose the Minds of Men to embrace the Christian Religion. In them *Eusebius* shows, that the Theology of the Pagans was ridiculous, and contrary to good Sence; and that the Christian Theology was Holy and Reasonable. The First Part of this Proposition, he proves in the First Six Books, and the Second Part in the other Nine. He begins with a General Description of the Doctrine of Christ, and to render it the more enticing, he give an account of the ineffable Blessings it has reveal'd to Mankind, and how it concludes to Piety, by teaching them to know and honour one God. After this, he alledges some Prejudices in favour of the Christian Religion, such as the Accomplishment of Prophecies, the Holiness of the Lives of Christians, and the wonderful facility, with all Persons, even those that were more dull and barbarous, found in comprehending the greatest and sublimest Truths. After he has thus dispos'd his Readers to be favourable to the Christian Religion, he destroys the Religions of all the Nations of the World, and lays open the Falshood of every one of them in particular, not only as to what concerns their History, but as to their pretended Mysteries and Prophane Morality. In the Fourth Book he confutes the strongest Argument of the Pagans, taken from the Predictions of their Oracles. He shows, that the Gods whom they worship'd were Evil Spirits, call'd *Dæmons*, as the Philosophers themselves have acknowledged. In the Sixth Book he opposes Destiny or Fatal Necessity, and proves there by many Reasons and Testimonies, that Man is entirely a free Agent.

In the following Nine Books, he shews that the Christians had reason to embrace the Theology of the Hebrews, because none but that affords solid Foundations for a Sincere Piety, together with Sound and true Doctrine. This he proves by a particular Induction of their Opinions, because there is no Theology but this which teaches the Immortality of the Soul, which commands Men to Adore one God only; which informs them, that he was the Creator of the World, which teaches them that the Word is the Son of God, and that the Holy Ghost is to be Worship'd with the same Worship that is due to the Father and the Son; There is no other Religion but this, which teaches Men, that they must not Adore the Angels as Gods, but honour them as the Ministers of God; which gives a rational Account of the Fall of some of the Angels, and instructs Man, that he is made after the Image of God: In a word, there is none but this whose Doctrine is agreeable to Right Reason. After this, he subjoins a long Fragment out of a Treatise of *Maximus*, which demonstrates that Matter is not Eternal.

In the Eighth Book he gives the History of the Version of the *Septuagint*, and to prove the Authority of the Holy Scriptures, he makes it appear by the Testimony of the Jews, that their Law is Mystical and very Significant, which he afterwards represents as worthy of all Esteem, by the holiness of

(n) *But then he himself committed many more Errors in Chronology.*] You may see them observed by *Scaliger* in the *Prolegomena* to his *Treasure of Time.*

their

Euſebius of Caſarea.

their Lives who have embrac'd it, by the Example of the *Eſſenes*, whoſe manner of Life he deſcribes, and by the Wiſdom of *Philo*.

In the Ninth Book, he relates the Teſtimonies of the Pagans, who have ſpoken in favour of the Jewiſh Religion; and of thoſe who allow the Truth of *Moſes*'s Hiſtory. In the 10th. he ſhows, that *Plato* and the Pagan Philoſophers have taken the greateſt part of what they have written, from the Books of *Moſes*. In the 11th. Book he demonſtrates particularly, that the Doctrine of *Plato* is agreeable to that of *Moſes*, and compares many of the Opinions of that Philoſopher with thoſe of the Jews. He carries on that Compariſon in the 12th. and 13th. Books. But in the mean time, he demonſtrates, that this Philoſopher had his Errors, and that no Book but the Scriptures is wholly free. In the 14th. and 15th. Books, he relates the Opinions of the Philoſophers, he ſhows their Contradictions, and oftentimes confutes one of them by another: From all which he concludes, that the Chriſtians had reaſon to forſake the Religion of the Pagans, and embrace that of the Jews.

After he has thus prepar'd the Minds of Men to receive the Chriſtian Religion, by eſtabliſhing the Authority of the Religion, and of the Books of the Jews, he demonſtrates the Truth of it againſt the Jews themſelves by their own Prophecies. This is the Subject of his Books of *Evangelical Demonſtration*, of which there are only Ten remaining of Twenty which he compos'd. In the Firſt Book he ſhows, that the Law of the Jews was calculated for one Nation only, but the New Teſtament was deſign'd for all Mankind, That the Patriarchs had no other Religion but that of the Chriſtians, ſince they ador'd the ſame God and the ſame Word, honour'd him as they do, and reſembled their holy Lives. In the Second Book he ſhows by the Prophecies, that the Meſſias was to come into the World for all Mankind. In the Third he makes it appear in favour of the Faithful, that Jeſus Chriſt is the Saviour of the World, and demonſtrates againſt the Infidels that he was no Seducer, as his Doctrine, his Miracles, and many other Reaſons do evidently prove.

In the Fourth Book he ſhows, that Jeſus Chriſt is the Son of God, and gives an Account of the Reaſons for which he was made Man; he explains the Name of Chriſt, and cites many Prophecies wherein he was foretold by that Name. In the following Books he brings abundance of Prophecies to demonſtrate that the Coming of Jeſus Chriſt, the time of his Birth, the Circumſtances of his Life and Paſſion, and, in a word, all things that concern'd him, were foretold in the Books of the Old Teſtament. What we have of theſe Books, ends with the laſt words of Chriſt upon the Croſs; And in the following Books he recited the Prophecies concerning his Death, his Burial, his Reſurrection, his Aſcenſion, the Eſtabliſhment of the Church, and the Converſion of the Gentiles: But theſe are wholly loſt.

Theſe Books of *Evangelical Preparation* and *Demonſtration*, are the largeſt Work that has been made by any of the Ancients upon this Subject, where a Man may find more Proofs, Teſtimonies and Arguments for the Truth of the Chriſtian Religion, than in any other. They are very proper to inſtruct and convince all thoſe that ſincerely ſearch after Truth. In fine, *Euſebius* has omitted nothing which might ſerve to undeceive Men of a falſe Religion, or convince them of the true.

The Treatiſe againſt *Hierocles*, was written againſt a Book of that Philoſopher, publiſh'd by him under the Name of *Philalethes*, againſt the Chriſtian Religion; wherein, to render it ridiculous, he has compar'd *Apollonius Tyanæus* with Jeſus Chriſt, and ſays, That *Apollonius* wrought Miracles as well as Chriſt, and aſcended into Heaven as well as he. But *Euſebius* has prov'd in his Anſwer, That *Apollonius Tyanæus* was ſo far from being comparable to Jeſus Chriſt, that he did not deſerve to be rank'd among the Philoſophers, and that *Philoſtratus* who wrote his Life is an Author unworthy of Credit, becauſe he contradicts himſelf very often, he doubts himſelf of thoſe very Miracles which he relates, and he reports many things which are plainly Fabulous. At the End of this Treatiſe *Euſebius* has given ſome Obſervations againſt Fatal Neceſſity.

In the Firſt of the Five Books againſt *Marcellus* of *Ancyra*, *Euſebius* endeavours to prove, That this Biſhop wrote his Book upon no other Motive, but the hatred of his Brethren; he charges him with Ignorance of the Holy Scriptures, and rallies him for the impertinent Explications of ſome Greek Proverbs brought in not at all to the purpoſe. In fine, he blames him for accuſing *Origen*, *Paulinus*, *Narciſſus*, *Euſebius* of *Nicodemia*, and *Aſterius*, of Error touching the Myſtery of the Trinity, and endeavours to juſtifie their Doctrine about it. In the Second Book, he diſcovers the Errors of *Marcellus*, and proves from many Paſſages of his Book, That he believes the Word was not a Perſon ſubſiſting before he was born of the Virgin, That he denies the diſtinction of the Son from the Father, That he is poſitive in aſſerting the Fleſh and not the Word to be the Image of God, the Son of God, the King, the Saviour, and the Chriſt; and in ſhort, That he durſt affirm that this Fleſh ſhall be deſtroyed and annihilated after the Day of Judgment.

After he has diſcovered the Errors and the Malice of *Marcellus* of *Ancyra*, he confutes his Opinions in the Three following Books, Entitled, *Eccleſiaſtick Theology*, and Dedicated to *Flacillus* Biſhop of *Antioch*.

In the Firſt Book he propoſes the Faith of the Church which he explains very exactly, rejecting the Errors of the *Ebionites*, *Paulianites*, *Sabellians* and *Arians*. After this, he ſhows that *Marcellus* is guilty of the *Sabellian* Hereſy, and proves by Third Arguments drawn from Scripture, That the Word is a Perſon ſubſiſting of himſelf. In the Second and Third Books, he goes on to confute the Conſequences of *Marcellus*'s Error, and the Arguments which he alledges for it, and proves by many Paſſages of the Old and New Teſtament, that the Word is a Subſiſtence, or a Perſon Subſiſting diſtinguiſh'd from the Perſon of the Father.

From

From theſe Books we may learn the true Opinion of *Euſebius* concerning the Divinity of the Word. He has declar'd in many places, That the Word is God, and the Son of God; and he ſays plainly, That he was not made of nothing, nor created in time; but begotten from all Eternity of the Subſtance of the Father. He does expreſly reject the Error of thoſe that ſay, The Word was made of Nothing, and ſo place him in the number of Creatures. But he ſeems to inſinuate in ſome places, and chiefly *B.* II. *Ch.* 7. That the Perſon of the Son is not equal to the Perſon of the Father, and that the ſame Adoration is not due to him (*o*). And it is not only in theſe Books that he ſpeaks after this manner; for he does the like in all his other Writings; wherein he rejects the impious Opinion of thoſe that ſay, The Son was made of nothing, That he is not of the Subſtance of the Father, That there was a time when he was not: But then at the ſame time he ſeems to admit ſome inequality between the Father and the Son, and to acknowledge ſome ſort of Dependance upon, and Inferiority of the Son to the Father. For this reaſon it was that he made no ſcruple to declare in the Council of *Nice*, That the Son was God from all Eternity; where he alſo plainly diſavow'd the Impiety of *Arius*, who ſays, That he was made of nothing, That there was a time when he was not: Yet he found ſome difficulty to approve the term *Conſubſtantial*, that is, to confeſs, That the Son is of the ſame Subſtance with the Father; and after he had conſented to it by his Signing, he gave ſuch a Sence of the Word in a Letter which he wrote to his Church, as does not at all Confirm the Equality of the Father and the Son: His Words are theſe, *When it is ſaid, That the Son is Conſubſtantial with the Father, the meaning is only, That the Son of God has no reſemblance to any Creature that was made by him, but a perfect reſemblance to the Father by whom he was begotten, and not by any other Subſiſtence or Subſtance.* This plainly ſhews, That *Euſebius* did not approve this term, as it eſtabliſhes a perfect equality between the Father and the Son (*p*), but only as it ſignifies the reſemblance of the Son to the Father, and that the Son was begotten of the Father. It may be ſaid to excuſe *Euſebius*, That he did not admit this Inequality between the Father and the Son for any other reaſon, but becauſe the Son receiv'd his Subſtance from the Father: But he does every-where make uſe of ſuch Emphatical Expreſſions to denote this Inequality, that it is difficult to explain them in this Sence, eſpecially ſince he wrote his Books againſt *Marcellus*, wherein he ſpeaks after the ſame manner, at a time when this Queſtion was debated and even determined: For thoſe Expreſſions which might be innocent in former times, ought to be ſuſpected after the Deciſion of the Council of *Nice*. We might further add the Correſpondence which he maintain'd with the Biſhops of *Arius*'s Faction, the Praiſes which he always gave them, his affected Silence in his Hiſtory, as to what concerns the Council of *Nice*, and the diſadvantageous Way that he ſpeaks of it in his Books of the Life of *Conſtantine*. But though *Euſebius*'s Doctrine could be juſtified as to the Divinity of the Son, yet it will be much harder to Defend what he ſays of the Holy Spirit; for he aſſerts, not only in his Books, of *Evangelical Preparation* and *Demonſtration*, but alſo in his Third Book of *Eccleſiaſtick Theology*, That he is not truly God: *The Holy Spirit*, ſay he, *is neither God, nor the Son of God, becauſe he does not derive his Original from the Father, as the Son does, being of the number of thoſe things which were made by the Son.* What we have hitherto ſaid concerning the Opinion of *Euſebius* about the Trinity, does plainly demonſtrate on the one ſide, That *Socrates*, *Sozomen*, and ſome late Authors, are to blame, who do wholly excuſe him; and on the other ſide, That it is a great piece of Injuſtice to call him *Arian*, and the very Head of the *Arians*, as St. *Jerom* has done, whom many others have follow'd, ſince he formerly rejected the principal Errors of *Arius*, which are, That the Word was made of nothing, That he is not of the Subſtance of the Father, That he is unlike the Father, and, That there was a time when he was not.

Euſebius of *Caſarea.*
B. 1. *Ch.* 2. *B.* 3. *c.* 7. *B.* 8. *c.* 1. *B.* 1. *c.* 9, 10, 11.

Hiſt. B. 1. *c.* 2. *Præp. B.* 4. *c.* 5. *Dem. B.* 4. *c.* 3. *B.* 5. *c.* 3. *In an Ep. cited in the Second Council of* Nice.

His Sentiments about the other Articles of the Chriſtian Religion, appear to be very Orthodox: He explains the Myſtery of the Incarnation in a moſt Catholick manner (*q*), acknowledging in Jeſus Chriſt

(*o*) *He ſeems to inſinuate in ſome places———That the Perſon of the Son is not Equal to the Perſon of the Father*, &c.] *B.* I. *Ch.* 2. of his Hiſtory, he calls the Son the Miniſter of the Father's Will and the ſecond Cauſe next to him. He ſays, That the Father Commands, and the Son Executes, and that 'tis not poſſible for the Father to aſſume a Humane ſhape. In his Oration at the Dedication of the Church of *Tyre*, he calls the Son of God, the Second Cauſe of our Bleſſings, the Angel of his Counſel, and the Captain of the Armies of God. Yet theſe Expreſſions are more tolerable than that which is found *B.* V. *Of Evangelical Preparation*, Ch. 4. That the Son is not adorable but upon the account of the Father that dwelleth in him; and *Ch.* VIII. That the Son is a Lord inferior to the Father In ſhort, what he ſays, *B* II. *Ch.* 7. *Of Theology*, and in other places, is inexcuſable, That the Glory of the Son is leſs than the Glory of the Father, and that the Son does not deſerve Equal honour with the Father.

(p) *That* Euſebius *did not approve this term* Conſubſtantial, *as it eſtabliſhes a perfect Equality between the Father and the Son.*] St. *Athanaſius* teſtifies in his Treatiſe of Synods, and in his Book of the Deciſion of the Council of *Nice*, that he did by no means approve of the Explication that *Euſebius* gave of this term.

(q) *He explains the Myſtery of the Incarnation in a moſt Catholick manner.*] In a Letter to the Empreſs *Conſtantia*, cited in the Second Council of *Nice*, and aſcribed to *Euſebius*, he ſeems to aſſert, that the humane Nature, was changed into the Divine, from whence ſome took occaſion in the Council to accuſe him of the Error of the *Theopaſſians*: But he teaches the contrary in the Fourth Book of his *Demonſtration*, where he formally denies that the Divine Nature ſuffered. Yet in the 14*th. Ch* he ſays, That after the Reſurrection of Jeſus Chriſt, the Man was ſwallowed up of the Divine Nature, and that the Word was become God as he was before he was Man, the Man being made God. But this is only a Figurative Expreſſion, to denote the Glory of the Humanity of Chriſt, for he plainly rejects this Error, in his Books of *Myſtick Theology* againſt *Marcellus*, eſpecially, *B.* III. *Ch.* 10, 11, *&c.*

two

Euſebius of *Cæſarea.*

Dem. B 4 *c.* 2. *B.* 3 *c.* 13. *Eccl. Theol. B.* 1. *c.* 20. *and* 13. *Dem. B.* 4. *c.* 2. *B.* 3. *c.* 2. *and* 13.

two Natures united in one and the ſame Perſon, and yet diſtinguiſh'd by their Properties. His Diſcourſe is very ſound as to the cauſes of Chriſt's coming and his Death, and the Merits of his Sacrifice which he offered upon the Croſs to make ſatisfaction for Mankind, where he ſaith, that his Divinity ſuffered not, but only his Humanity.

Præp. B. 7. *c.* 6. *Dem. B* 3. *c.* 9. *Præp. B.* 7. *c.* 6. *Dem. B* 3. *c.* 6. *Hiſt. B.* 1. *Dem. B.* 1. *c.* 10, *and* 8. *and B.* 3. *B.* 1. *c.* 9. *B* 5. *c.* 3. *B* 4. *Of the Life of* Conſtantine.

He Diſcourſeth often of the good Offices of the Angels to Men, and of the Worſhip that's due to them; he gives an Account of the fall of the Evil Angels, and demonſtrates that the Ancient Patriarchs had ſome knowledge of Jeſus Chriſt, and that they were ſaved by the Merits of his Death. He attributes much to the Free-will of Man. He praiſes the State of Virginity as more perfect, and the Celibacy of Prieſts, without blaming Marriage. He acknowledges, that the Monuments of the Saints, have a juſt Right to be Honour'd. He Diſcourſes of the oblation of the Body and Blood of Chriſt, of which he ſaith, The Bread offered by *Melchiſedech*, was a Figure. In fine, He approves the Prayers of the Church for the Dead. *Photius*, Epiſt. 144. accuſes him of denying with *Origen* the General Reſurrection, and at the ſame time takes Notice, that many have not obſerv'd this Error in his Writings, and that it is not to be diſcover'd there but by a careful Examination of them. But, however it may be in other Books, there is not the leaſt footſtep of it in thoſe that are now extant.

St. *Jerom* maintains in his Book againſt *Ruffinus*, That *Euſebius* alone was the Author of the Six Books of *Apology* for *Origen*, which have been aſcribed to *Pamphilus*: But it appears by the Teſtimony of *Euſebius* himſelf, *B.* VI. of his *Hiſtory*, *Ch.* 33. and alſo by that of *Photius*, That he compos'd the 1ſt. Five Books, together with *Pamphilus*, and added the 6th. after his Martyrdom. We have the Tranſlation of the 1ſt. of thoſe Books, which he begins with an Invective againſt thoſe that accuſe the Perſon and Doctrine of *Origen*; and then he produces many Paſſages out his Works to juſtifie him, concerning the Trinity and the Incarnation, the Pains of the Damn'd, and concerning the Nature and State of Souls. St *Jerom* accuſes *Ruffinus* of having changed thoſe Places in his Verſion, which ſeem'd to favour the Error of the *Arians*, about the Divinity of the Son and the Holy Ghoſt: *Ruffinus* does not deny the Charge, but only pretends that thoſe Paſſages had been added. Some Books of this *Apology* contain'd the Life of *Origen*, and a Catalogue of his Writings, as appears by the Teſtimony of St. *Jerom* and the Report of *Photius*, *Vol.* 118. of his *Bibliotheque*.

The Book of *Topography*, or the Names that the Hebrews give to ſeveral Countries, tranſlated by St. *Jerom*, and lately publiſh'd in Greek, is a Geographical Explication of all the Countries, Cities and Places, which were mention'd in the Books of the Old Teſtament. This Treatiſe is very Exact and Curious, and ſhews that *Euſebius* was an able Man in every thing.

The *Harmony of the Evangeliſts*, or the *Rules for Reconciling them*, contains Ten Tables, in each of which, he has mark'd by Arithmetical Figures, with wonderful Art, what is related by 4, by 3, by 2, or by 1 Evangeliſt only: So that in reading the New Teſtament, where the Figures of thoſe Tables are mark'd in the Margin, one may preſently know, by having recourſe to that Table, not only by how many, and by which of the Evangeliſts, but alſo in what places it has been related. He compos'd theſe *Rules* according to the *Harmony* of *Ammonius*, to which they were inſtead of a Table, as he himſelf obſerves in his Letter to *Carpianus* at the beginning of them.

We have a Latin Fragment yet extant, of the *Harmony of the Evangeliſts*, upon the Subject of their apparent contradictions about the time of the Reſurrection of Chriſt, tranſlated by the Monk *Ambroſius*, which is believ'd to be *Euſebius*'s.

It's ſaid, There are ſome Greek Commentaries of *Euſebius*'s upon *Iſaiah*, mentioned by *Heinſius*. St. *Jerom* in his Epiſtle to *Pammachius*, ſpeaks of *Euſebius*'s Commentaries upon the Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*. *Theodoret* in the Firſt Book of his *Hiſtory*, *Ch.* 16. ſays, That he made Abridgments of the Scripture. 'Tis reported that in the Library of *Florence*, there are ſome Manuſcript Commentaries upon the *Pſalms*, which are aſcribed to *Euſebius*; and *Gelaſius* in his Book of *the Two Natures*, cites a Paſſage of *Euſebius* taken out of thoſe Commentaries. I don't mention the Commentaries upon the *Canticles*, publiſh'd by *Meurſius* under *Euſebius*'s Name, becauſe they are none of his, but compos'd by a much later Author, as we have already prov'd.

The Treatiſe of the Lives of the Prophets, is a ſhort Abridgment of their Lives, and of the moſt Remarkable Things that are in their Prophecies.

The Tracts or Diſcourſes publiſh'd in Latin by *Sirmondus*, have much of the Air of *Euſebius*; whereof the two firſt were written againſt the Hereſy of *Sabellius*, to refute that Error, and prove by the Scriptures, that the Word is a Perſon diſtinct from the Father, and there he occaſionally Diſcourſes againſt *Marcellus* of *Ancyra*, whom he calls the *Galatian*. In the following Diſcourſe he Treats of the Reſurrection, and having eſtabliſh'd the Providence and Juſtice of God by ſenſible Proofs, he thence concludes, That there is a Reſurrection; becauſe if there were no other Recompence but in this Life, it would follow, that God were unjuſt, ſeeing good Men are oftentimes depriv'd of all the Advantages of this Life, which wicked Men moſt commonly enjoy. He ſhews by the Reſolution that appear'd in *Abraham*, when he went to Sacrifice his Son, and by all the Circumſtances of that Action which he deſcribes very eloquently; he ſhews, I ſay, That this Patriarch muſt needs believe a future Reſurrection, for otherwiſe he would never have attempted with ſo much Confidence and Zeal, to Sacrifice that which was deareſt to him in this World. He confutes the Opinion of the *Phariſees*, who held that Men are raiſed again from the dead to eat and drink, and enjoy the ſame Pleaſures which they had in this Life.

The

Euſebius of Cæſarea.

The Fourth Tract, is a Diſcourſe upon the Day of the Aſcenſion of Jeſus Chriſt, wherein he proves the Truth of his Reſurrection and Aſcenſion, by the Conſtancy of the Martyrs and Apoſtles, and by the wonderful Promulgation of the Goſpel. He obſerves how impoſſible it was, that ever the Apoſtles ſhould undertake to Preach the Chriſtian Religion, and ſucceed in their Attempt, if God had not encourag'd them by his Spirit, and diſpos'd the Hearts of Men to receive their Doctrine. In this Diſcourſe, he deſcribes alſo the Martyrdom of St. *Romanus* Deacon of *Antioch*. In the Six following Tracts, he diſcourſes of things Spiritual and Inviſible; and, in the Firſt, he ſhows, That God is Incorporeal and Inviſible, and demonſtrates, that things Incorporeal and Inviſible, are infinitely more Excellent than thoſe that are Material and Earthly. In the Second and Third, he proves, That the Soul of Man is Immortal and Spiritual, and deſcribes the great Advantages it gives a Man above the Beaſts. The Fourth Tract is, concerning the Thought of Man, which has theſe Remarkable Properties; Firſt, That it knows it ſelf; and, Secondly, That it reſiſts and checks the Motions of Luſt. In the Fifth, He goes on ſtill to prove, That God is Inviſible and Incorporeal, and takes Notice as he goes along, That Angels are Spiritual. In the Sixth, He anſwers ſome Paſſages of Scripture which ſeem to attribute Members to God.

The following Diſcourſe is, concerning the Advantages of the Incarnation of Jeſus Chriſt, and the great Benefits it hath procur'd to Mankind. There he explains that ſaying of our Saviour, *I came not to bring Peace, but War*; by ſhewing, That Jeſus Chriſt, came indeed, to bring Peace; but Men being unwilling to receive it, there muſt be War, by neceſſary conſequence, as riſing only from the bad Diſpoſition of their own Hearts. Towards the end of this Diſcourſe he praiſes thoſe that ſuffer for the Religion of Jeſus Chriſt, and continues the ſame Subject in the following Diſcourſe, wherein he ſhews upon occaſion of thoſe Words of our Saviour, *Preach ye upon the Houſe-tops what has been ſaid to you in ſecret*. That nothing can diſpenſe with a Chriſtian's ſuffering for the Religion of Chriſt. He adds, That tho' there be no Perſecution, yet we are oblig'd to ſuffer, and to be, as one may ſay, continually Martyrs, becauſe we are always to fight againſt the World and our ſelves. The Two laſt Diſcourſes are concerning good Works; in the Firſt of which, he recommends it to Chriſtians, if they would be happy, to follow after that which is Good, and ſhun that which is Evil. And in the Second, he exhorts them to the practice of goods Works, and chiefly to giving of Alms. This is the Subject of thoſe Diſcourſes, which are more concerning Doctrines than Morality, wherein there appears a great deal of Wit, good Sence, and Eloquence, but little of Order and Method.

Euſebius was one of the moſt Learned Men of all Antiquity, as both his Friends and Enemies do equally acknowledge (r); of whom it may be ſaid without fear of miſtaking, That there was no Man of ſo great Reading and Learning amongſt all our Greek Authors. Almoſt all his Books are the effects of prodigious Labour, and very long and laborious Enquiries. And yet it muſt be confeſſed, that he had great Helps by the Memoirs of thoſe who had written before him upon the ſame Subjects, whoſe Works he makes no ſcruple to Tranſcribe. He did not much Study to poliſh his Diſcourſes, which is the common Fault of almoſt all thoſe that make Knowledge and Learning their chief Buſineſs. His Stile is neither Elegant nor Grateful, as *Photius* has many times obſerved, but dry and barren, and extremely unpleaſant. He is very proper to teach thoſe who apply their minds ſeriouſly to Study and ſearch after Truth, and love to conſider it abſolutely naked, deſpoil'd of all the Ornaments of Language; but he is not at all proper to entice thoſe who are taken with the manner of Expreſſing things, and the force of Eloquence. I ſhall not here add any thing to what I have ſaid concerning his Learning: But as to what concerns his Perſon, he ſeems to have been very impartial, very ſincere, and a great Lover of Peace, Truth and Religion. For altho' he maintain'd an intimate Correſpondence with the Enemies of St *Athanaſius*, it does not appear that he was his Enemy, nor that he ſided much with any Party in the Controverſy of the Biſhops of that time. He was preſent, indeed, in the Councils, wherein unjuſt things were done to *Euſtathius* and St. *Athanaſius*; but it does not appear, that he gave any Signs of an angry Temper, nor that he ſerv'd the Paſſions of other Men. He was not the Author of New Confeſſions of Faith, neither did he carry on any Plot, to the Deſtruction of St. *Athanaſius*, or the Ruin of his Party; but he only deſir'd to accommodate Differences, and reconcile the two Parties. He did not abuſe the Credit which he had with the Emperour, to Advance himſelf, nor to Deſtroy his Enemies, as *Euſebius* of *Nicomedia* did; but he only made uſe of it for the Welfare and Advantage of the Church. I do not doubt, but ſo many good Qualities obtain'd him a place among

(r) Euſebius *was one of the moſt Learned Men of all Antiquity, as both his Friends and Enemies do equally acknowledge.*] See here a part of the Teſtimonies which the Ancients have given to the Learning of *Euſebius*. *Conſtantine* in his Epiſtle to thoſe of *Antioch*, and in a Letter which he wrote to himſelf, praiſes his vaſt Learning. St. *Baſil* in his Book of the *H. Spirit*, Ch. 29. calls him an Author worthy of Credit, becauſe of his Univerſal Learning, διὰ πολυπειρίαν ἀξιόπιστος. St. *Jerom*, tho' the great Enemy of *Euſebius*, could not forbear oftentimes to praiſe his Learning, to confeſs that he priz'd his Books, and to ſay in his Second Book againſt *Ruffinus*, That he was a moſt Learned Man, *Vir doctiſſimus Euſebius*; *doctiſſimum dico, non Catholicum*: *The moſt Learned* Euſebius; *I call him moſt Learned, but not Catholick*: It is not to be wondered at, that *Ruffinus* his Friend gives him the ſame Title. *Antipater* of *Boſtria*, tho' he did not favour him, yet gives him the Name of πολυΐστωρ, *i. e.* one very knowing in moſt Matters; and further ſays of him, That he had read all the Books of the Ancients, examin'd and explain'd all their Opinions, and that he had written himſelf moſt uſeful Books. *Philoſtorgius* praiſes him for his Hiſtory, *Socrates* and *Sozomen* vindicate him, *Victorius* calls him a moſt Learned Man. *Gelaſius* the Pope durſt not reject his Hiſtory, becauſe of its great Learning, and ſingular uſefulneſs for information. *Pelagius* aſſures us, That there is no Hiſtory that deſerves greater Eſteem, than that of *Euſebius*. *Photius*, who cenſures the Stile and Doctrine of *Euſebius*, nevertheleſs, commends his Knowledge and Learning. I take no Notice of the Teſtimonies of Modern Authors.

Euſebius of Cæſarea.

the Saints in the Martyrologies of *Uſuardus* and *Ado*, and ſome other Ancient Officers of the Church of *France* (f); for tho' I muſt confeſs he kept not peaceable Poſſeſſion of this Honour of Saintſhip, yet in my mind it would be a raſh Cenſure to judge him altogether unworthy of it.

Since the Works of *Euſebius* have been printed ſeverally, we will now give an Account of the ſeveral Editions of every one of them.

There were but two Greek Editions of his *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory* before that of *Valeſius*. The Firſt was only Greek, printed by *Robert Stephen* in the Year 1544.

The Second was Greek with the Verſion of *Chriſtophorſon*, on the other ſide, printed at *Geneva* in the Year 1612.

The Verſion of this *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory*, made by *Ruffinus*, was printed at *Rome*, in the Year 1476, in Folio, and in the Year 1479, at *Mantua*, and at *Haguenaw* in the Year 1500.

There was an old Edition printed without date at *Paris*, in 8vo. by *Renaut*, and publiſh'd by the Care of *Godfrey Bouſſard*, Dr. of the *Faculty* of *Paris*, who has put an Elegant and Senſible Preface before it, addreſs'd to *Stephen Poncher*, then Preſident of the Parliament of *Paris*. He obſerves in this Preface, That the Hiſtory of *Euſebius*, tranſlated by *Ruffinus*, had been already printed. There have been ſince that time, ſeveral Editions of the ſame Verſion of that *Hiſtory* in ſeveral places, in the Years 1544, and 1528, and at *Lyons*, in 1523, and with all *Euſebius*'s Works in 1542, and 1559, and at *Paris* in 1541.

The Verſion of *Muſculus* was printed at *Baſil*, in 1554.

The Verſion of *Chriſtophorſon*, [Biſhop of *Chicheſter* in *England*,] was printed at *Cologne* and *Baſil*, in 1570, at *Paris*, in 1571, and with the Amendments of *Suffridus*, in 1581.

At laſt, the Verſion of *Valeſius* was printed with the Greek on one ſide, revis'd by Four Manuſcripts, at *Paris*, by *Vitre*, in the Year 1659, together with the Critical Notes of that Learned Man; to which he has added Four Treatiſes or Diſſertations: The Firſt concerning the Schiſm of the *Donatiſts*, where he has clear'd up many Points of that Hiſtory, which before were very dark and confus'd and diſcover'd ſome conſiderable Errors, into which almoſt all the Hiſtorians of our time had fallen. The Second is a Letter to a Friend, where he ſhews. That it is the ſame Church at *Jeruſalem*, which is call'd by the Name of the *Reſurrection*, and which bears the Name of the *Death of Jeſus Chriſt*. The Third, clears up ſome Difficulties concerning the Verſion of the *Septuagint*. And the Laſt, is a Critical Account of ſome Martyrologies. This is the Faireſt and moſt Correct of all the late Editions in Greek and Latin; which has been ſince Revis'd by *Petit*: But this Second Edition falls much ſhort of the Neatneſs of the Firſt. The *Chronicle* has likewiſe been printed apart in 4to. in the Year 1470, and 1512, and together with the *Hiſtory*, and the other Works of *Euſebius*, as has been noted above.

Monſieur *de Pontac*, Biſhop of *Bazas*, publiſh'd it in 1605, at *Bordeaux*, and it has been ſince printed at *Antwerp*, in 1608.

Scaliger's *Theſaurus*, printed in 1606, contains the Latin *Chronicle* of St. *Jerom*, the Supplements of the two *Proſpers*, the *Chronicle* of *Victor*, *John* and *Idacius*, of *Marcellinus*, of *Marcellus*, and an Hiſtorical Collection in Latin, extracted out of the *Chronicles* of *Africanus* and *Euſebius*, by an ignorant Man, together with the Greek Fragments of the *Chronicle* of *Euſebius*, an Abridgment of Hiſtory from *Adam*, down to the Second Year of *Heraclius*, which bears the Name of the *Faſti Siculi*, or the *Chronicon Alexandrinum*, and has been ſince publiſh'd in 4to. Greek and Latin, by *Radeus*, in 1615. [All which Editions have been lately ſuperſeded by an Edition in Folio, printed at the *Louvre* by Mr. *du Cange*.] After this Abridgment, follows the *Chronography* of the Patriarch *Nicephorus*, and an Epitome or Abridgment of many Hiſtories, compos'd by way of Chronicle. After theſe, follow the Notes of *Scaliger*, and a Work, Entituled, *Canon Iſagogicus*, or an *Introduction to Chronology*. There was a Second Edition of this Work, printed at *Amſterdam*, in 1658, wherein the Notes of *Scaliger* are more large and Correct.

The Books of *Euſebius* concerning the Life of *Conſtantine*, have almoſt always been printed with his *Hiſtory*. The Verſion of thoſe Books by *Forteſius* was annex'd to the Verſion of his *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory* by *Ruffinus*.

Chriſtophorſon tranſlated Three of thoſe Books to add them to his *Hiſtory*, and the Fourth was finiſhed by *Suffridus*. *Valeſius* made a New Tranſlation of them. The Oration made in the Praiſe of *Conſtantine*, was alſo printed by it ſelf in Latin at *Cologne*, in 1581. The Verſion of the Four Books of *Evangelical Preparation*, and of the Ten Firſt of *Evangelical Demonſtration*, made by *Georgius Trapezuntius*, was printed at *Venice* in 1497, and at *Paris* in 1534; but it is very unfaithfully done, becauſe that Author gives himſelf the Liberty to add to it, or take away what he pleaſes, in that which concerns the Trinity. The Thirteen Books of *Preparation*, were alſo printed in Greek at *Paris*, by

(f) *Obtain'd him a place among the Saints in the* Martyrologies *of* Uſuardus *and* Ado, *and in ſome ancient Offices of the Church of* France.] The Author of the Life of St. *Valerian* calls him, *Euſebius* of Holy Memory. *Uſuardus* in *June* 21. calls him St. *Euſebius* of *Paleſtine*, Biſhop and Confeſſor, an Excellent Wit and Hiſtorian. *Notkerus* in *June* 21. ſays, The Depoſition of St. *Euſebius* in *Cæſarea*. *Manecharius* in a Letter to *Ceraunius* Biſhop of *Paris*, which is before the Paſſion of the Martyrs, *Speuſippus*, *Elaſippus*, and *Melauſippus*, call him *Saint*. There is in a Manuſcript Breviary at *Limoges*, three Lectures to his praiſe. In an Ancient Breviary of the ſame Church, printed in 1587. at *June* 21. there is an Oration in praiſe of *Euſebius*; and in the *Miſſal*, printed in 1484. a Maſs of St. *Euſebius*. In an ancient Manuſcript Verſion of *Euſebius*'s Hiſtory, at the Church of *Paris*, the Name of *Saint* is given to him. Cardinal *Baronius* ſays, That all this is the miſtake of ſome that took *Euſebius* Biſhop of *Cæſarea*, for *Euſebius* of *Samoſata*, and upon this Conjecture, he raſes the Name of the firſt out of the *Roman* Martyrology. But *Baronius* affirms this without any ground, and againſt the expreſs Teſtimonies of the Martyrologies, which do plainly mention *Euſebius* Biſhop of *Cæſarea*, and diſtinguiſh him from all others by moſt evident Characters, in which no Man can be deceived. *Robert*

Robert Stephen in the Year 1544; and the Year following, the same Printer publish'd the Ten Books of the *Demonstration*. Since that time, the Version of the Ten Books of the *Demonstration* made by *Donatus* of *Verona*, together with that of the Fourteen Books of the *Preparation* made by *Georgius Trapezuntius*, and that of the Fifteenth by *Hepperus*, was subjoyn'd to the Versions of the other Works of *Eusebius*, in the Editions which we have already mention'd. *Eusebius* of *Cæsarea*.

To conclude, The Books of *Evangelical Preparation* and *Demonstration* (which deserve to be separated from the rest, since they belong to different Subjects) have been Printed in Greek at *Paris* in the Year 1628. in Two Volumes in Folio, with a new Version of the Fifteen Books of the *Preparation*, made by the Jesuit *Vigerus*, and *Donatus*'s Version of the Books of the *Demonstration*, which Versions are plac'd over against the Greek. Moreover in this Edition was added the Greek of *Eusebius*'s Treatise against *Hierocles*, which had been already reviſed by *Holstenius*, publish'd by *Morellius* in 1606. together with the Ancient Translation of *Acciolus*, which had also been Printed apart at *Cologne* in 1532, with the Latin Works of *Eusebius*; and in short, the Five Books against *Marcellus* of *Ancyra*, with the Translation of *Richard Montague*, and some Notes of his added at the end, which for the most part are in favour of *Marcellus*, and against *Eusebius*.

The Book of the *Holy Land* has been publish'd in Greek, as we have already observ'd, by *Bonfrerius*, the Jesuit, and printed at *Paris* in 1631. In 1580, *Curterius* put forth some Fragments concerning the Lives of the Prophets, which he has prefix'd to the Commentaries of *Procopius* upon *Isaiah*. The Notes upon the *Canticles* ascrib'd to *Eusebius*, have also been publish'd in Greek, without a Version, by *Meursius*, and Printed with *Polychronius* and *Psellus* in the Year 1617. The Tracts publish'd in Latin by *Sirmondus* were also printed at *Paris* in *Octavo* in 1643. In fine, The Letter to *Carpianus* and the *Evangelical Canons* of *Eusebius*, are to be found at the beginning of some Editions of the New Testament, and in Greek at the beginning of the Greek New Testament, printed at the *Louvre*, by *Robert Stephen* in the Year 1550.

CONSTANTINE *the first Christian Emperour.*

Constantine the Emperour.

THough it be a very rare thing to see the Name of an Emperour, in a Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers, yet this of *Constantine* is commonly to be found among them, because of some Discourses which he made and repeated, if we will believe *Eusebius*, and it may be also upon the account of the many Letters which he wrote, and Edicts which he made in favour of the Christian Religion: But before we say any thing of the Writings of this Emperour, it will be necessary according to our usual Method, to give a short Abridgment of his Life.

Constantine was the Son of the Emperour *Constantius Chlorus*, who was the only Person of all those that shar'd the Empire in his time, that did not Persecute the Christians (*a*). His Mother was call'd *Helena*, a Woman of mean Birth, who had not the Title of Empress, while *Constantius* liv'd (*b*).

Constantine in his youth, gave early proof of what might be expected from him afterward; His Conduct and Courage appear'd a little before his Father's Death: For being detain'd as an Hostage by the Emperour *Galerius*, and forseeing plainly that he and his Associates had a design to kill him, that they might Invade that part of the Empire which belong'd to his Father *Constantius*, who could not live long, he made his Escape out of the Hands of the Tyrants, took Post and went in great hast to find his Father in *Britain*. He kill'd all the Horses which he found at the Post-houses on the Road which he past, to hinder his Enemies from pursuing after him. When he came into *Britain*, he found his Father on his Death-Bed, who chose him for his Successor. After his Death, he was Proclaim'd Emperour by the Souldiers on the Sixth day of *August*, in the Year of Jesus Christ 306. He was no sooner Emperour, but he gain'd the love of all his Subjects, by visiting the Provinces under his Government, to give them necessary Orders, and by beating back the *Barbarians*, who would have pass'd the *Rhine* to enter into his Territories; but they were defeated, and two of their Kings kill'd in the Year 312. After this he attack'd the Tyrant *Maxentius*, who had laid *Rome* desolate by his Cruelties. He march'd towards *Italy* with an Army of 40000 Men, seiz'd upon all the Cities that oppos'd his Passage, or constrain'd them submit, and defeated three several times the Troops of *Maxentius*. In short, The Tyrant coming to meet him with a great Army near *Rome*, was entirely conquer'd, and perished by the fall of a Bridge, over which he was passing to save himself. *Eusebius* says, That *Constantine* assur'd

(a) *Who was the only Person of those that shar'd the Empire in his time, that did not Persecute the Christians.*] *The Donatists* in a Petition which they presented to *Constantine*, say, That he was the Son of a Just Father, who did not Persecute the Christians. *Euseb Hist. B.* VIII. *Ch.* 13, 15. And *Ch.* 16. he relates, That *Constantius* was very favourable to the Christians: And *Constantine* himself in his Edict, recited by *Eusebius*, in his Books of the Life of that Emperour, says, That his Father was the only Emperour, who was favourable to the Worship of the True God.

(b) *Who had not the Title of Empress, while* Constantius *liv'd.*] *Eusebius*, *St. Jerom*, *Cassiodorus*, and *Orosius*, make no scruple to give her the Title of *Constantius*'s Concubine; *Eutropius*, altho'a Pagan, sweetens this Expression, by saying, That *Constantine* was born of a Marriage that was but little known, *i. e.* That tho' *Helena* was Married to *Constantius*, yet she had not the Title of Empress; (and those Women that had not the honourable Name of *Augustæ*, were call'd the Concubines of Emperours.) *Helena* had not this Dignity till after the Death of *Constantius*, and then her Son gave it her, as *Eusebius* observes. She was of *Drepane* a City of *Bithynia*, to which *Constantine* gave the Name of *Helenopolis*, in honour of his Mother. It is agreed on all hands, That she was of mean Extraction; and St. *Ambrose* says, She was an Hostess, and by this means *Constantius* first became acquainted with her.

Conſtantine the Emperour.

him, he ſaw then in the Heavens, a Croſs of Light with this Inſcription, [*By this Sign you ſhall overcome your Enemies,*] and that Jeſus Chriſt appear'd to him when he was Sleeping, and commanded him to make a Standard after the form of a Croſs, which he did in Obedience to this Revelation, and after his Victory, he plac'd his Standard among the Trophies in the midſt of the City of *Rome*, with this Inſcription: [*By this Salutary Sign, which is the Mark of the true Power, I have deliver'd your City from the Yoke of Tyranny, and Eſtabliſh'd your Senate and People in their ancient Splendor.*] After he had regulated the Affairs of *Rome*, *Conſtantine* came to *Milan*, where he celebrated the Nuptials of his Siſter with the Emperour *Licinius*. In this City 'twas that the two Emperours publiſh'd their Firſt Edict in favour of the Chriſtian Religion, in which they granted Liberty of Conſcience to all their Subjects; and a little after, at their going out of *Milan*, they allow'd the Chriſtians by a ſecond Edict, the Publick Exerciſe of their Religion, and commanded that thoſe places ſhould be reſtor'd to them wherein they had uſually kept their Aſſemblies. A ſhort time after this, the two Emperours quarrelled, and declar'd War againſt one another in the Year 314. *Licinius* loſt at firſt a great Battel in *Pannonia*; but at the ſecond in *Thracia*, the Advantage was equal on both Sides, which induc'd the Emperours to make Peace for that time.

The Wars and Affairs of the Empire did not hinder *Conſtantine* from concerning himſelf with the Affairs of the Chriſtians: For having receiv'd Complaints in behalf of the *Donatiſts* againſt *Cæcilian* and other *African* Biſhops, he appointed for Judges, ſuch as liv'd out of *Africk*, and ſummon'd a Council to meet at *Rome* under *Miltiades*, about this Matter. But the *Donatiſts* ſtill complaining of this Deciſion (c), he call'd a Council at *Arles*, where they were condemn'd anew; and at laſt when they appeal'd from the Determination of this Council to the Emperour, either becauſe he believ'd that he might take cognizance of the Matter, ſince there was nothing alledg'd, but a particular Accuſation againſt *Cæcilian*, which was Matter of Fact; or becauſe he would oblige the *Donatiſts* to yield, as St. *Auſtin* obſerves, he himſelf gave Judgment at *Milan* in favour of *Cæcilian*, condemn'd the *Donatiſts*, and wrote againſt them in *Africk*; caus'd an Information to be drawn up againſt *Silvanus*, who was of their Party, and their Temples to be taken from them; but yet he recommended them to be gently dealt withal, as a means to bring them back again into the Boſom of the Church. About this time he made many Laws in favour of the Chriſtians. He permitted Maſters to grant Liberty to their Slaves that were within the Church, in preſence of the Biſhop and the People. He made Laws for the due obſervation of *Sunday*, forbidding all ſorts of Perſons to Travel on that Day; and allow'd Men to leave their Goods to the Church by Teſtament. On the contrary, *Licinius*, Emperour of the *Eaſt*, publiſh'd Edicts againſt the Chriſtians, caus'd their Churches to be demoliſh'd and themſelves to be Perſecuted, or at leaſt conniv'd at thoſe that did ſo. *Conſtantine* declar'd War againſt him in 324. conquer'd him near *Adrianople* and *Chalcedon*, and then beſieged him in *Nicomedia*, whither he had retir'd after his Defeat. *Licinius* ſeeing that he was not able to maintain the Siege, came and threw himſelf at *Conſtantine*'s Feet, who gave him his Life at the inſtance of his Wife, who was *Licinius*'s Daughter, and then ſent him to *Theſſalonica*, where a little after he cauſed him to be put to Death, under pretence that he deſign'd to ſtir up Sedition. After this, *Conſtantine* Abrogated the Edicts of *Licinius* againſt the Chriſtians, and commanded that thoſe who were Condemn'd to the Mines or Baniſhment, or had been depriv'd of their Honour or Goods upon the account of Religion, ſhould be releas'd and re-eſtabliſh'd in their former Eſtate; That the Goods of the Martyrs which had been Confiſcated ſhould be return'd to their Heirs, That the Churches of Chriſtians ſhould be Rebuilt, and their Burial-places reſtor'd unto them: Then he Exhorted all his Subjects very earneſtly in a Letter, to embrace the Chriſtian Religion.

And he did not only take care to preſerve the Church in Peace againſt the Attempts of its Enemies but he us'd his utmoſt endeavours to hinder all Diviſions in its Bowels by the Diſputes of thoſe who were its profeſs'd Members. He applied himſelf to allay the Controverſy between *Arius* and *Alexander*, by writing a Letter to them, wherein he earneſtly Exhorts them to peace, in a moſt moving and perſuaſive manner, aſſuring them that he had delay'd his Voyage to the *Eaſt*, for fear of finding them there at Variance, and praying them to open by their good Agreement, his Paſſage to the *Eaſt* which they had hitherto, as one may ſay, ſtopt up by their Differences. He ſent this Letter by *Oſius* Biſhop of *Corduba*, a Man commendable for his Worth and Prudence. This Biſhop having call'd a Synod in the City of *Alexandria*, did all that in him lay to appeaſe their Differences, but not being able to compaſs his Deſign, *Conſtantine* judged, that the beſt way to reſtore Peace to the Church, was to ſummon a General Council of the *Eaſt* and *Weſt* in the City of *Nice* in *Bithynia*. He himſelf Aſſiſted at it, Exhorted the Biſhops to Peace, and refus'd to receive the Accuſations which one party form'd againſt the other. He made them agree in the ſame Doctrine, and approv'd the Deciſion of the Council, to which they all Subſcribed, except *Secundus* and *Theonas*. He wrote himſelf to all the World, and Exhorted all the Biſhops to receive the Decrees of this Council. He baniſh'd *Arius* and two Biſhops that had taken his Part in the Synod; he caus'd the Books of that Heretick to be burnt; forbad all his Subject, to keep them: and wrote in particular two very earneſt Letters againſt *Arius*, and his followers. In ſhort, He treated the Biſhops of the Council magnificently, teſtified a great deal of Friendſhip to them, and ſent them away laden with Preſents. *Euſebius* and *Theognis* having publiſh'd anew their Errors after the Council, altho' they had Subſcribed to its Decrees, were by him ſent into Baniſhment.

(c) *But the* Donatiſts *ſtill complaining of this Deciſion.*] *Valeſius* has prov'd in his Diſſertation about the Hiſtory of the *Donatiſts*; That the *Donatiſts* did not appeal from the Synod at *Rome*; but only complain'd to the Emperour that their Cauſe was not fully examin'd; and that they appeal'd afterwards from the determination of the Council at *Arles*, to that of the Emperour.

After

After this, he caus'd the Sepulchre of Jeſus Chriſt to be found out in *Jeruſalem*, and built a ſtately Church there, as well as at *Bethlehem*, and at the *Mount of Olives*. It's ſaid, That he diſcover'd the Croſs of Chriſt, and ſome pretend that many Miracles were then done by it. And yet it is very ſtrange, that *Euſebius*, an Eye-witneſs of thoſe things, who has exactly deſcrib'd all the Circumſtances of the Diſcovery of Chriſt's Sepulchre, and who forgets nothing that may be to the Advantage of Religion, ſhould not ſay one word, neither of the Croſs of Chriſt, nor of the Miracles that are pretended to be wrought by it. About the ſame time, he gave the Name of *Conſtantinople* to the City of *Byzantium*, and endow'd it with the ſame Privileges which *Old Rome* enjoy'd, from whence it had the Name of *New Rome*. After this, he labour'd more than ever he had done, to aggrandize the Church; he made Laws againſt Hereticks, wrote to the King of *Perſia* in favour of the Chriſtians, deſtroy'd the Temples of Idols, gave great Gifts to Churches, and caus'd magnificent Copies of the Bible to be made: In a word, he did ſo much for Religion, that he had good right to be call'd Biſhop of the Church, as to thoſe things that concern its External Policy. And truly the Church had no reaſon to complain of his Conduct, till the latter end of his Life, when he gave ear to the Accuſations that were brought to him againſt St. *Athanaſius*, by thoſe Biſhops that favour'd *Arius*'s Faction: For they being offended with him becauſe he would not appear at a Council held at *Cæſarea*, whither he had been cited to come, mov'd the Emperour to Summon a Synod in the City of *Tyre*, to Judge his Cauſe. There St. *Athanaſius* appear'd, and finding that his Enemies had injuriouſly oppreſs'd him, he had recourſe to the Emperour, and went to him at *Conſtantinople*. *Conſtantine*, although prejudic'd againſt him, yet heard him favourably, and commanded the Biſhops of the Council of *Tyre*, who had called another afterwards at *Jeruſalem*, to come to him and render an account of their Proceedings. They deputed Six Biſhops to go to the Emperour, and accuſe St. *Athanaſius*; but thoſe Deputies durſt not alledge the Facts, of which they had accus'd him at the Council of *Tyre*, for fear leſt the Emperour, being a lover of Juſtice, ſhould diſcover their Falſity, and declare him Innocent. They conſult therefore how they might charge him with a Crime againſt the State, by ſaying, that he threatned to hinder the Tranſportation of Corn from *Alexandria* to *Conſtantinople*. This Accuſation made ſuch Impreſſion upon the Emperour's Mind, and ſo ſtirr'd him up againſt St. *Athanaſius*, that he immediately Baniſh'd him to *Triers*, a City of *Gaul*. The Enemies of St. *Athanaſius* having thus procur'd his Baniſhment who was the great Oppoſer of *Arius*, they call'd back again this Heretick, and us'd all the Endeavours to reſtore him to the Communion of the Church. But *Conſtantine* would not hear of it, till after he had drawn up a Confeſſion of Faith, which appear'd contrary to his Errors, and had Sworn and Proteſted that this was his Doctrine; yet, even after he had done this, the Emperour, being always jealous of the Man ſaid to him, " *If thy Faith be right, as thou would'ſt make us believe, thou haſt done well to* " *Swear; but if not, then let God condemn thee to ſome Puniſhment for this falſe Oath.* Which words were follow'd with a ſuitable Effect; for in a little time after, *Arius* periſh'd miſerably, the day before he ſhould have been admitted to the Communion of the Church at *Conſtantinople*.

Conſtantine the Emperour.

The Reader no doubt may wonder that I have not ſpoke a word all this while of the Baptiſm of this Emperour; for it ſeems very ſtrange, that one who took ſo great care of the Affairs of Chriſtians, one who was convinc'd of the Truth of their Religion, and was ignorant in no point of their Doctrine, ſhould continue ſo long a time without initiating himſelf into the Church by the Sacrament of Baptiſm. And yet this was certainly ſo, either becauſe he waited to receive Baptiſm, when he ſhould be near his Death, that by this Sacrament he might throughly expiate his Sins, and ſo appear Innocent before God; or elſe becauſe he had ſome other reaſon for this delay; however it came to paſs, he never thought of preparing himſelf for Baptiſm until he felt himſelf Sick, nor had he ever the Impoſition of the Biſhops hands, to make him a *Catechumen*, till the Year 337 (*d*), a few days before his Death, being then at *Helenopolis*, as *Euſebius* obſerves in the Fourth Book of this Emperour's Life, *Chap.* 61. After this, he receiv'd Baptiſm from the hands of *Euſebius* of *Nicomedia*, in the Suburbs of that City, as *Euſebius* of *Cæſarea*, St. *Athanaſius*, St. *Jerom* and St. *Ambroſe*, *Socrates*, *Sozomen*, *Theodoret*, *Evagrius*, and all the reſt of the Ancients unanimouſly affirm (*e*). It is therefore a fabulous Story which is related in the Acts, falſly attributed to Pope *Sylveſter*, That the Baptiſm of *Conſtantine* was celebrated at *Rome*. And indeed, nothing can be more fabulous than the Account ſet down in thoſe Acts: For there it is feign'd, that *Conſtantine*, being an Enemy to the Chriſtian Religion, and deſiring to perſecute it, was ſmitten with Leproſie; That the Soothſayers ſaid unto him, the only way to cure him, was to bath himſelf in the Blood of New-born Infants; That many of them were ſought out to have their Throats cut, but *Conſtantine* being mov'd by their Tears, and the Cries of

(d) *To make him a* Catechumen, *till the Year* 337.] *Euſebius* ſays expreſly, That *Conſtantine* then firſt receiv'd Impoſition of Hands, and that he aſſiſted at the Solemn Prayers of the Church; which plainly ſhews, that he was not a *Catechumen* before. Neither does the Title of the Firſt Book, *Chap* 32. of the Life of *Conſtantine*, contradict this Obſervation, for there it is only ſaid that *Conſtantine* was Catechized, Κατηχηθεὶς, the meaning of which is, only that he was inſtructed in the Chriſtian Doctrine, which does not prove that he was a *Catechumen*, and we never read before this time that he aſſiſted at the Publick Prayers of the Church.

(e) *All the Ancients unanimouſly affirm.*] *Euſebius*, B. I. Of the Life of *Conſtantine*, Ch. 32. St. *Jerom* in his *Chronicle*, ſays, *Conſtantius ultimo vitæ ſuæ tempore baptizatus eſt.* St. *Ambroſe* in his Funeral Oration upon *Theodoſius*, ſays of *Conſtantine*, *Cui licet baptiſmatis gratia in extremis conſtituto omnia peccata dimiſerit.* The Fathers of the Council of *Ariminum*, in a Letter written at the beginning of that Synod, ſay, That he died a little after he was baptiz'd: which is certainly ſpoken of *Conſtantine the Great*, after they had mention'd in the ſame place his aſſiſting at the Council of *Nice*. I might add to this many other unqueſtionable Witneſſes, ſuch as *Socrates*, *B.* I. *Ch.* 39. *Sozomen*, *B.* II. *Ch.* 34. *Theodoret*, *B.* I. *Ch.* 32. *Evagrius*, *B.* III. *Ch.* 42. the Author of the *Alexandrian Chronicle*, &c.

their

Conſtantine the Emperour.

their Mothers, reſtor'd them again, without putting them to Death: That he was afterwards admoniſh'd in a Dream by St. *Peter* and St. *Paul*, that he ſhould be cur'd if he were baptiz'd by *Sylveſter*; which having done, he was preſently Purify'd by Baptiſm both from his Sins and from his Leproſie. What Forgeries, what Fables are here! What inconſiſtent Ravings of Madmen! *Conſtantine* was never an Enemy to the Chriſtian Religion; he did never Perſecute it; he was always a Chriſtian from his heart before he came to *Rome*. There is no Hiſtorian that ſpeaks of his having a Leproſie, or that he was cur'd of it by Baptiſm. How came *Euſebius* to forget ſo conſiderable a Miracle in the Life of *Conſtantine*? With what Face could *Julian* the Apoſtate object to the Chriſtians, that Baptiſm never cleans'd any perſon from the Leproſie, if his own Grandfather had been cur'd by it; St. *Cyril*, to confute this Falſhood, never alledg'd an Example ſo Illuſtrious as this of the Emperour had been. But I forbear to mention any more of the many Abſurdities and Impertinencies which are contain'd in thoſe Acts *(f)*. It's certain, *Conſtantine* died in a little time after his Baptiſm in the Year 337, of the vulgar Account, *May* 22d. in the Conſulſhip of *Titianus* and *Felicianus*, the 64th Year of his Age, after he had reign'd Thirty Years and Ten Months.

This Emperour was one of the greateſt Princes that ever was, whether you conſider his Conduct or Policy, or take a View of the great Actions of his Life, or reflect on the great Services he had done to the Church. Some accuſe him of being an *Arian*, but that's a Calumny; for though he favour'd ſome Biſhops, that were of *Arius*'s Faction, and unjuſtly Baniſh'd St. *Athanaſius*, yet he always maintain'd the Creed of the *Nicene* Council, and ſuffer'd it not to be violated while he liv'd. The Greeks have given him exceſſive Praiſes, and plac'd him among the number of Saints, but I think the Latines have done more wiſely, in ſuſpending their Judgment as to that. We can ſay nothing of his Stile, becauſe it is very probable, that the Writings which bear his Name, were compos'd by others, though done by his Order: They may be diſtinguiſh'd into three ſorts; his *Diſcourſes*, his *Letters*, and his *Edicts*.

Euſebius aſſures us, *B.* III. of the Life of this Emperour, *Ch.* 2. That he had acquir'd ſo profound a Knowledge of the Liberal Sciences, that even to the end of his Life, he compos'd Harangues for the Inſtruction of his Subjects; and that the Method which he obſerv'd in his Diſcourſes, was, firſt to begin with the Refutation of the Errors of the Pagans, who ador'd many Gods; and then he proceeded to prove the Unity of God, and his Providence by which he governs the Univerſe: After which, he explain'd the Motives which brought the Son of God down from Heaven to this Earth, and deſcrib'd the Circumſtances of the Life which he led here; from whence he paſs'd on to the Deſcription of the laſt Judgment, and terrified his Hearers with the vehemence of his Diſcourſe, threatning the Vengeance of God, and the Juſt Puniſhment of their Sins againſt the Covetous, the Paſſionate and the Violent. The ſame *Euſebius*, gives us, *B.* III. *Ch.* 12. a ſhort Harangue of *Conſtantine*'s to the Fathers of the Council of *Nice*, exhorting them to Peace; to which may be added, that Form of Prayer which he

(f) *I forbear to mention any more of the many Abſurdities and Impertinencies which are contain'd in thoſe Acts.*] There 'tis ſaid, That St. *Sylveſter* firſt appointed the Celebration of *Sunday*, that he held a Synod of 75 Biſhops at *Rome* in the Year 315, where they found 109 Jewiſh Prieſts. The ſame Author tells a Story of a Font and its Ornaments, which ſmells rank of a Fable. He makes Laws for *Conſtantine* which are ridiculous, and which never any heard of before. He reports, That *Conſtantine* laid the firſt Foundation of the Church of *Rome*, and carried thither 12 Baskets full of Earth in honour of the 12 Apoſtles. Theſe Remarks, and many more of that ſort, make it as clear as day, that thoſe Acts are Suppoſititious. And yet there is brought to maintain them, Firſt, The Authority of Pope *Gelaſius*, who places them among thoſe Monuments that are Genuine; And, that of *Adrian*, who cites thoſe Acts in his Letter to the Empreſs *Irene*, for maintaining Images; To which are added, the Teſtimonies of the Author of a Book call'd, *The Pontifical of* Damaſus; of *Nicholas* the Firſt in his Letter to the Emperour *Michel*; of *Anaſtaſius*, *Nicephorus*, and ſome other Modern Authors. But are all theſe Authorities to be compar'd with thoſe of the Ancients whom we have cited? and what elſe do they prove, but that thoſe Acts were forg'd ſince the time of *Gelaſius*? This Pope therefore had never ſeen them himſelf, nor does he approve them of his own knowledge, but only ſaith, That he heard that ſome Perſons had read them. As to *Adrian* 'tis very well known, that he was not very Critical in the choice of the Monuments which he cited, and that he alledges ſometimes thoſe that are forg'd, as well as thoſe that are Genuine. The following Teſtimonies are ſtill of leſs Authority.

Secondly, *Gregory* of *Tours* is cited for thoſe Acts, who *B.* II. *Ch.* 31. of his Hiſtory, ſaith to King *Clovis*, *Behold, a new* Conſtantine, *who goes to Baptiſm to heal the Malady of an Inveterate Leproſie, and to waſh out the Spots and Stains of his paſt Life by thoſe moſt holy Waters.* But this paſſage proves nothing, becauſe he does not mean the Leproſie of his Body, but only of his Soul; And moreover, it were not at all ſtrange that *Gregory* of *Tours*, a very credulous Man, ſhould give credit to thoſe forged Acts.

In ſhort, Our Adverſaries not finding any ancient Chriſtian for their turn, have recourſe to *Zoſimus* a Pagan Author, and a great Enemy to *Conſtantine*, who ſays, That *Conſtantine* was tormented with remorſe of Conſcience, after he had kill'd *Criſpus* his Son, and *Fauſta* his Wife; and having ſought in vain for ſome Expiation by the Sacrifices of the Pagans, he applied himſelf to an Egyptian, who told him, That the Chriſtian Doctrine had Power to expiate all Sins; after which Diſcourſe, he abandon'd the Religion of his Anceſtors. But thoſe who employ this paſſage to prove the Baptiſm of *Conſtantine* at *Rome*, do great Injury to *Conſtantine*'s Reputation, by giving Credit to the Lye of an Heathen, who for this is convicted of Forgery by all Our Writers. Secondly, They do not conſider that the Death of *Criſpus* and *Fauſta* happen'd after the Council of *Nice*, and ſo this whole Story of *Zoſimus* is nothing to their purpoſe. In fine, *Zoſimus* ſays not that he was Baptiz'd, but that he Embrac'd the Chriſtian Doctrine. I ſhall not now ſtay to refute thoſe that pretend *Conſtantine* was twice Baptiz'd, the firſt time at *Rome* by *Sylveſter*, the ſecond time at *Nicomedia* by *Euſebius*, for the ſame Authorities we have alledg'd, deſtroy this Suppoſition; and beſides, it is altogether incredible that *Euſebius* and the other Biſhops with him, ſhould have Re-baptiz'd *Conſtantine* with ſo much Pomp and Ceremony, if he had been Baptiz'd before; eſpecially at a time when the Diſpute about the Trinity was not ſtarted.

preſcrib'd

preſcrib'd to his Souldiers, related in *B.* IV. and the Admonition he gave a Covetous Man of his Court, which is to be found *Ch.* 30. of the ſame Book: But doubtleſs the moſt conſiderable of his Monuments, is, that great Oration which he made to the Convention of the Saints, tranſlated by *Euſebius* into Greek, and annexed to his Life. The Preface of this Oration is about the Feaſt of *Eaſter*, the Goodneſs of our Saviour, and the Ingratitude of Men; but he concludes it with an Apoſtrophe to the Church. In the Body of this Diſcourſe, he diſputes againſt Idolatry and the multiplicity of Gods; and ſhows that there is but one only true God, the Creator of all things, and the Father of the World, who is begotten of Him, tho' the Father ſuffer no Diminution by it, and who is united to Him: He confutes Deſtiny, eſtabliſhes Providence and Free-will, and overthrows the Errors of the Philoſophers: He diſcovers the Advantages which Mankind receiv'd by the Incarnation of the Son of God, and ſhows that his Coming was foretold by the Prophets, to whoſe Authority he adds the Prediction of the *Sybils*, which he endeavours to verifie by the Teſtimony of *Virgil*: He deſcribes the unhappy death of thoſe Emperours who perſecuted the Church, and finiſhes this Diſcourſe with ſaying, That we ought to attribute all the Good we do to God, and before we undertake any thing, always to implore his Aid by Prayer, as being the Fountain of all Good. The whole Diſcourſe is Sublime, and worthy of the Majeſty of ſuch an Emperour as *Conſtantine* was. *Conſtantine the Emperour.*

The Letters of *Conſtantine*, are much more numerous than his Diſcourſes. Here's a Catalogue of them, an Account of their Arguments, the Times when they were written, and the Places where they are to be found.

1. There is a Letter of *Conſtantine* to *Cæcilian* Biſhop of *Carthage*, for diſtributing the Alms which he gave to the Poor of *Africa*, written in the Year 312, and ſet down by *Euſebius*, *Hiſt. B.* X. *Ch.* 6.

2. There is a Letter of his to *Anulinus* for the Immunity of the Clergy, written the ſame Year, *B.* X. *C.* 7.

3. His Letter to *Miltiades* Biſhop of *Rome*, empowering him to Judge the Cauſe of the *Donatiſts*, written in the Year 313, *Euſeb. B.* X. *Ch.* 5.

4. His Letter to *Ablabius*, [Dr. *Cave* calls him, *Ælaphius* or *Ælianus*,] commanding him to ſend the Biſhops of *Donatus*'s Party, and *Cæcilian*, to *Arles*, to be judg'd there; written in 314, at the end of *Optatus*.

5. His Letter to *Chreſtus* Biſhop of *Syracuſe*, commanding him to repair to the Council of *Arles*; written the ſame Year, related by *Euſeb. Hiſt. B.* X. *Ch.* 5.

6. His Letter to *Cæcilian*, wherein he commands him to come to *Rome*, to be judg'd there a-new; written in 315, which is to be found at the end of *Optatus*.

7. His Letter to *Probianus*, Proconſul of *Africa*, to ſeize upon a *Donatiſt*, call'd *Ingentius*, ſet down by St. *Auſtin*, *Ep.* 68. and in his Third Book againſt *Creſconius*, *Ch.* 73. written in 315, as appears from hence, becauſe *Probianus* did not ſucceed *Ælianus* in the Office of Proconſul of *Africk*, till this Year.

8. His Letter to *Celſus*, Deputy of *Africk*, written about the end of the ſame Year, or the beginning of the next, wherein he recommends it to him, to advertiſe the Biſhops of both Parties, that he ſhould come e'er long to judge them; and to adviſe them in the mean time, to continue in Peace. He teſtifies in this Letter, That he had a mighty Paſſion to Eſtabliſh a good Agreement among them.

9. Another Letter of his to the ſame *Celſus*, written by his Order by the *Præfectus Prætorio* in favour of Four Biſhops of the *Donatiſts*, and one Presbyter who had obtain'd their Liberty.

10. His Letter to *Eunalius*, Deputy of *Africk*, in which he gives him Notice of the Judgment he had given in favour of *Cæcilian* againſt the *Donatiſts*, recited in the Conference of *Carthage*, *Ch.* 516. There is a Fragment of it in St. *Auſtin*'s Third Book againſt *Creſconius*, *Ch.* 71. It was written in 316.

11. His Letter to the Biſhops of *Africa*, wherein he teſtifies, That he had done all that was in his Power, to procure Peace to the Church; but ſince he could not compaſs it, he muſt wait till God himſelf afforded a Remedy for their Diviſions. This Letter is at the end of *Optatus*.

12. His Letter to the Biſhops of *Numidia*, in which he grants them a place to build a Church upon, in the room of that which the *Donatiſts* had taken by force, and diſcharges the Eccleſiaſticks from Publick Taxes. *Ibidem.*

13. His Letter to *Euſebius*, for building of Churches at the Charge of the Emperour, written in 324 or 325, *B.* II. of the Life of *Conſtantine*, *Ch.* 46.

14. His Letter to the Biſhop of *Alexandria* and *Arius* the Presbyter, concerning their Differences, wherein he exhorts them to Peace, written about the end of the Year 324, and related by *Euſebius*, *B.* II. of the Life of *Conſtantine*, *Ch.* 64, &c.

15. His Letter to all the Biſhops about the Deciſions of the *Nicene* Council, *B.* III. of the Life of *Conſtantine*, *Ch.* 17.

16. His Letter to the *Egyptians* upon the ſame Subject, *Ibid.*

17. His Letter to *Alexander* upon the ſame Subject, *Ibid.*

18. His Letter againſt *Arius*, mention'd by *Socrates* in the Firſt Book of his *Hiſt. Ch.* 9. and related at the end of the *Hiſtory* of *Gelaſius Cyzicenus*.

19. His Letter to the *Nicomedians* againſt *Euſebius* and *Theognis*, related in part by *Theodoret*, *Hiſt. B.* I. *Ch.* 20. and entirely by *Gelaſius Cyzicenus*.

20. His Letter to *Macarius* Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, for building a Church in that City, in *Euſeb. B.* III. of the Life of *Conſtantine*, *Ch.* 30.

21. His Letter to *Euſebius* for building a Church in the place where the Oak of *Mamre* ſtood, where *Abraham* had a Viſion; in *Euſeb. B.* III. of the Life of *Conſtantine*, *Ch.* 52.

22. His Letter to thoſe of *Antioch*, upon the Depoſition of *Euſtathius*, written in 330, ſet down by *Euſeb. B.* III. of the Life of *Conſtantine*, *Ch.* 60.

23. His Letter to *Euſebius* upon his Refuſal of the See of *Antioch*, *B.* III. of the Life of *Conſtantine*, *Ch.* 61.

24. His Letter to the Synod upon the ſame Subject, *Ibid. Ch.* 62.

25. His

Conſtantine the Emperour.

25. His Letter to *Sapor* King of *Perſia*, in favour of the Chriſtians, *B.* IV. of the Life of *Conſtantine Ch.* 9, &c.

26. His Letter to *Euſebius* upon his Boock of *Eaſter*, *Ibid. Ch.* 35.

27. Another Letter to him, concerning the Copies of the Bible, *Ch.* 36.

28. His Letter to St. *Athanaſius*, in favour of *Arius*, in *Athan. Apol.* 2. *p.* 778.

29. His Letter to the Church of *Alexandria*, in favour of St. *Athanaſius*, *Ibid. p.* 779.

30. His Letter to St. *Athanaſius*, againſt the Cheats of his Enemies, *Ibid. p.* 785.

31. His Letter to *John*, the Head of the *Meletians*, wherein he congratulates his Reconciliation to St. *Athanaſius*, *Ibid. P.* 787.

32. His Letter to the Council of *Tyre*, in *Euſeb. B.* IV. of the Life of *Conſtantine*, *Ch.* 42.

33. His Letter to the Biſhops of the Council of *Tyre* to cite them to *Conſtantinople*, in *Athanaſius*, *Apol.* 2. *P.* 803.

34. His Letter to *Publilius Optatianus Porphyrius*, who Dedicated ſome Poems to him, that were wrote in Priſon; publiſhed by *Paulus Velſerus*, and annexed to the *Nurenburg* Edition of *Marcus Velſerus*'s Words. [The 6th. Letter to *Cæcilian* is only hinted at in a Letter of *Conſtantine*'s to the *Donatiſt* Biſhops, wherein he tells them, That tho' he had before given Orders that they ſhould return into *Africa*, there to have their Controverſy with *Cæcilian* Examin'd; yet he was now reſolved that they ſhould of both Sides go to *Rome*, as he himſelf had written already to *Cæcilian*. This Letter is in the Collection of Records at the end of *Optatus*.

As alſo another Letter to the Catholick Biſhops in the Council of *Arles*, wherein he congratulates the Concluſion of their Differences, and expreſſes his deteſtation of thoſe Perſons who would not abide by what was already determined: Adding withal, That if the *Donatiſts* would not be quiet, they ſhould be brought before the *Vicarius Præfecturæ*, to whom he had given Orders to ſend them to his Palace, where they ſhould meet with ſuch treatment as they deſerved.]

There are many other Letters, of which *Euſebius* deſign'd to make a diſtinct Volume, as he himſelf teſtifies, *B.* III. of the Life of *Conſtantine*, *Ch.* 24.

Tho' the *Edicts* which bear Names of the Emperours, are commonly Penn'd by their Secretaries of State, yet I muſt give an Account of thoſe that *Conſtantine* publiſh'd in favour of the Chriſtians.

The firſt Edict of *Conſtantine* for the Liberty of Religion, was publiſh'd at *Milan*, in the Year 313, whereof there is mention made in the following Edict.

The ſecond Edict of *Conſtantine*, by which he gave full Liberty to Chriſtians of the publick Exerciſe of their Religion, and commanded that their Churches ſhould be reſtor'd to them, was publiſhed ſometimes after the firſt, and is ſet down by *Euſebius*, *Hiſt. B.* X. *Ch.* 5.

His third Edict reſtrains this favour to Catholicks. 'Tis found in the ſame place.

His fourth Edict in favour of Religion, is dated the laſt of *October*, the ſame Year: It continues the Immunity of Eccleſiaſticks, whom the Hereticks had caus'd to be charg'd with publick Taxes, contrary to the Privileges which had been granted them. The Emperour commands that thoſe who were taxed, be diſcharg'd, and that a Courſe be taken to hinder any ſuch Proceedings for the future.

Amongſt the number of thoſe Edicts, made in favour of the Chriſtians, that which was directed to *Ablabius*, may be reckoned, bearing Date, *May* 12. 315. in which *Conſtantine* commands, That Proviſion be made for the Maintenance of the Children of the Poor in *Italy*.

The fifth Edict of *Conſtantine* for the Chriſtian Religion, is dated *November* 16. the ſame Year, wherein he condemns the *Jews* to the fire, that ſhould abuſe the Chriſtians. It is to be found in the *Juſtinian* and *Theodoſian* Code.

His ſeventh Edict directed to *Protogenes*, dated *June* 7th. 316, grants a very conſiderable favour to the Chriſtian Church, by appointing a new way of giving Liberty to Slaves, in the preſence of the Biſhop and the People. This Law is related in the *Juſtinian* Code, *Tit.* 13. *l.* 1. Beſides this, There are two other Edicts upon the ſame Subject: The firſt, which is dated in the Year 321, related in the ſame place, is added to that, which we have been ſpeaking of, That the Clergy may give Liberty to their Slaves, even out of the Church. The third Edict upon the ſame Subject is loſt.

The firſt which we have of thoſe Edicts of *Conſtantine*, that Eſtabliſhes the Juriſdiction of Biſhops as to Temporals, ſeems to be that which is related in an Addition to the *Theodoſian* Code, publiſh'd by *Sirmondus*, under Title 17th. It imports, That if thoſe who plead a Cauſe, ſhall appeal to the Judgment of the Biſhops, they ſhall be referred thither, altho' the Proceſs be enter'd before another Judge. This Edict is dated *June* 21*ſt.* 318. There is beſides this, another on the ſame Subject, without the date of the Year, related in the ſame Collection under the firſt Title, wherein he Confirms and Explains the former Order, concerning the Judicial Deciſions of Biſhops, and he will have them to ſtand firm, even tho' they are given between Minors, commanding, that at all times, and as oft as any one of the two Parties ſhall deſire an Appeal to the Judgment of the Biſhop, it ſhall be granted him. He Ordains alſo in this Edict, That the Teſtimony of a Biſhop ſhall be received by all the Judges.

In the Year 319, *November* 19th. He confirmed the Immunity of the Clergy by a new Edict, declaring, That they ſhould be free from all publick Taxes. This Law is related in the *Theodoſian* Code, *Lib.* 16. *Tit.* 2. *l.* 2.

There are many more Edicts of the Year 320, and 321, concerning the Church, among which may be plac'd that which abrogates the *Papian Poppæan* Law, which was made againſt thoſe that continued unmarried; this Law, *Conſtantine* ſeems to have aboliſh'd, in favour of the Chriſtians, who honour thoſe that make Profeſſion of continuing in Celibacy all their life. *Euſebius* makes mention of this Edict, *B.* IV. of the Life of *Conſtantine*, *Ch.* 26. and after him *Sozomen*, *B.* I. of his *Hiſt. Ch.* 9. and St. *Ambroſe*, *B.* III. of *Virgins*.

It was alſo about this time, that he made ſome Edicts againſt the *Donatiſts*, The firſt is related by St. *Auſtin*, *B.* II. againſt *Petilianus*, *Ch.* 92. and in his Letters 167, and 168, wherein he commands that the Churches ſhould be taken from them which they poſſeſs'd: It bears Date, *Anno* 320. *Conſtantine the Emperour.*

The ſecond Edict directed to *Verinus*, dated *May* the 4*th.* in the Year 321, moderates a little the Rigor of the firſt, for it permits them to return to their own Country, and to live there in quiet, reſerving to God the Puniſhment of their Crime. This is alſo related by St. *Auſtin*, *Ep.* 152. and in his Book written after the Conference of *Carthage*. The Edict for the due obſervation of *Sunday*, of which *Euſebius* makes mention, *B.* IV. of the Life of *Conſtantine*, *Ch.* 18, and 19. related in the *Juſtinian* Code, *Lib.* III. under the Title, *De Feriis*. *B.* III. is dated *March* 6*th.* in the Year 321. It imports, That all Judges, People and Artificers, ſhall ceaſe from their Labour on this Day; yet he excepts Country-men, who are permitted to Till the Ground on this Day, becauſe it often happens, ſays the Emperour, That a more ſeaſonable time cannot be found to ſow their Corn, or Plant their Vines, and it is not fit, that we ſhould loſe a favourable Opportunity which Divine Providence has put in our Hands.

There is another Edict of the firſt of *July*, the ſame Year, by which he permits all ſorts of Perſons to leave their Goods by Teſtament, to the Catholick Church.

In the Year 323, he publiſh'd an Edict againſt thoſe who conſtrain'd Chriſtians to Sacrifice to Idols, which is in the *Theodoſian* Code, *Tit.* 2. *B.* V.

In the next Year he made many Edicts after the defeat of *Licinius*, for the Liberty of Chriſtians, and for the Reſtitution of their Goods and their Honour. *Euſebius* relates them, *B.* II. of the Life of *Conſtantine*, *Ch.* 20, 24, &c.

He produces likewiſe in the ſame place, his Edicts againſt the Worſhip of Falſe Gods, and for the Eſtabliſhment of the Church. *Ibid.* and *Ch.* 48.

After the Council of *Nice*, he publiſh'd an Edict, in which he condemns the Books of *Arius* to be burnt, and commands his followers to be call'd *Porphyrians*.

The Edict of the Month of *May*, in the Year 326, prohibiting the admitting of rich Perſons into the Order of the Clergy, or thoſe that were the Children of ſuch as had born publick Offices, appears but little favourable to the Clergy; but it was neceſſary, becauſe many rich and great Perſons, took Holy Orders, to exempt themſelves by this means, from the publick Taxes, which tended to the Oppreſſion of the Poor. Wherefore *Conſtantine*, ſays wiſely in this Edict, That it Was juſt, the Rich ſhould maintain the heavy Expences of the State, and that the Poor ſhould be fed with the Riches of the Church. We have this Law in the *Theodoſian* Code, *B.* XVI. *Tit.* 2. *l.* 6. Beſides this, there is alſo another Edict publiſh'd in the Month of *July*, in conſequence of the former, altho' it bears the Names of the Conſuls for the Year 320, which forbids the diſturbing of thoſe that had taken Holy Orders, before the preceeding Law was publiſh'd, and commands at the ſame time, that ſuch as had taken Orders ſince its publication, on purpoſe to avoid the publick Taxes, ſhould be remov'd from the Clergy, and ſent back into the World, and left liable to publick Taxes. This Edict is related in the ſame place, B. III. After all, by another Edict of the firſt of *September*, the ſame Year 326, it is ordain d, That Clergy-men who were Hereticks and Schiſmaticks, ſhould not enjoy this Privilege of Exemption, but ſhould be ſubject to Taxes and Impoſitions. This Edict is in the *Juſtinian* Code, *B.* I. *Tit. de. Hæret.* and in the *Theodoſian*.

He treats the *Novatians* with more moderation than the other Hereticks, permitting them by an Edict of the Month of *September* in the ſame Year 326, to keep their Churches, their Cœmeteries, and the Goods which they had purchas'd after their Separation from the Church. In the Code of *Theodoſius*, *Tit.* 5. *B.* II.

In the Year 330, he publiſh'd an Edict againſt the Hereticks, in which he forbids their Aſſemblies. It is related in *Euſeb.* *B.* III. of the Life of *Conſtantine*, *Ch.* 63. &c.

There is in the *Theodoſian* Code, another Edict of the ſame Year, in favour of the Clergy that were accus'd, or evil treated by Hereticks.

The Laws concerning the Jews, are the laſt which *Conſtantine* made in the favour of the Chriſtian Religion.

By an Edict *September* 27*th.* 330, He grants to the Patriarchs of the Jews, *i. e.* to thoſe that preſided in their Aſſemblies, Exemption from the publick Taxes. He renews the ſame favour by another Edict *December* 1*ſt.* in the Year following. It is probable that he granted theſe favours to the Jews for no other reaſon, but becauſe they Worſhip the ſame God with the Chriſtians, and to leave them ſome kind of Conſolation, as he ſays in one of his Laws, becauſe their's was once the only true Religion: For at the ſame time he made very ſevere Laws againſt the Jews that ſhould purchaſe or detain Chriſtian Slaves, and condemn'd thoſe to death, that circumcis'd them. There are many other Laws in the *Theodoſian* Code upon this Subject, of the Years 330, 331, and 336.

I do not place among the Number of *Conſtantine*'s Edicts, the Donation which bears his Name, in which he is ſuppos'd to give to the Biſhop of *Rome* and his Succeſſors, the Soveraignty of the City of *Rome*, and of the Provinces of the *Weſtern* Empire; becauſe this Act has ſo many ſigns of Forgery, that it's impoſſible it can be attributed to *Conſtantine*. I ſhall here ſubjoin ſome of thoſe Reaſons which clearly prove, that it is an Impoſture.

1. Not one of the Ancients mentions this pretended Liberality of *Conſtantine* to the Church: But who can believe that *Euſebius*, and all the other Ancient Hiſtorians, who have exactly deſcrib'd all the Benefits of this Emperour to Chriſtians, and eſpecially to the Biſhops, ſhould paſs over in ſilence one ſo conſiderable as this of the *Weſtern* Empire, to the Biſhop of *Rome*?

2. Not one of the Popes who mention the Benefits of Kings and Emperours to the See of *Rome*,

Conſtantine the Emperour.

or who defend their Temporal Patrimony, did ever alledge this pretended Donation, tho' it had been very much for their Advantage ſo to do.

3. The Date of this act is falſe, for it bears the names of the Conſuls, *Conſtantine* (for the fourth time,) and *Gallicanus*: Now *Conſtantine* in his fourth Conſulſhip, had not *Gallicanus*, but *Licinius*, for his Collegue: And this Conſulſhip anſwers to the Year 315, at which time *Conſtantine* was not baptiz'd, even in the Opinion of thoſe that believe he was baptiz'd at *Rome* by St. *Sylveſter*; and yet mention is made of his Baptiſm in this Edict of Donation. We muſt add to this Argument, another Error in Chronology: *Byzantium* is there call'd *Conſtantinople*, tho' it had not that Name, till Ten Years or thereabouts, after the Date of this Edict.

4. The Stile of it is barbarous, and very different from that of the Genuine Edicts of *Conſtantine*: It is full of new Modes of ſpeaking, the Expreſſions are affected, and the Terms ſuch as were never us'd in any publick Acts, till after the time of *Conſtantine*.

5. Who can believe that *Conſtantine* ſhould give the City of *Rome*, all the Provinces and Cities of the *Weſt*, that is to ſay, one half of his Empire, to the Biſhop of *Rome*, and that this ſhould never be known till the Eleventh Age of the Church?

6. There are infinite Numbers of Falſities and Abſurdities in this Edict, which demonſtrate that it was compos'd by an ignorant Impoſtor: take ſome of them as follows. In it the Pope is permitted to wear a Crown of Gold, like that of Kings and Emperours, whereas in thoſe times, Kings and Emperours did not were a Crown at all, but a Diadem. The Fabulous Hiſtory of *Conſtantine*'s Baptiſm by *Sylveſter*, and the miraculous Cure of his Leproſy, is reported there as a thing Certain. There are reckon'd up in this Edict, five Patriarchal Churches, and that of *Conſtantinople* is put in the ſecond place, whereas it had not this Honour, till a long time after. And yet it is ſuppos'd, That *Sylveſter* had already acknowledg'd it for a Patriarchal See. Theſe Falſities and many others that occur in this Edict, do plainly prove, That it is a Forgery.

In ſhort, to deſtroy entirely this pretended Edict, it is ſufficient to obſerve, That while *Conſtantine* liv'd, and a long time after his Death, the City of *Rome*, and the Empire of the *Weſt*, were always ſubject to the Power of the Emperours; That the Popes themſelves acknowledg'd them as their Sovereigns, without pretending that the City of *Rome*, or *Italy*, or any part of the *Weſtern* Empire, belong'd to them: That all the Temporal Power they have obtain'd ſince, is owing to King *Pepin* and the Emperour *Charlemaigne*. The Account of this, deſerves a little Digreſſion, which will not be tedious to the Reader, and will not carry us too far from our preſent Subject.

'Tis certain, that the City of *Rome*, *Italy*, and all the other Provinces of the *Weſtern* Empire, were under the Power of *Conſtantine* and the Emperours that ſucceeded him. Hiſtory informs us, That they were abſolute Maſters of it, That they ſent Governours thither, That the City of *Rome* depended upon their Laws, upon their Power, and the Magiſtrates whom they ſhould appoint; That they made ſuch Changes there as they pleas'd: In a word, That they were no leſs Maſters of it, than of all the other Cities of the World. When afterwards the *Barbarians* begun to invade *Italy*, they ſent thither Generals of Armies to defend it, as being a Country that belong'd to them: But in ſpite of all their Endeavours *Theodorick* King of the *Oſtrogoths* having Conquer'd it, made it Tributary, and govern'd the City of *Rome* with a Power as abſolute as that of the *Roman* Governours. His Succeſſors, *Athalaric* and *Theodat*, maintain'd the Poſſeſſion of it, untill they were chas'd thence in the time of *Juſtinian* by *Beliſarius* the *Roman* Captain, who took the City of *Rome* by Force. A little time after, Count *Narſetes* delivered all *Italy* from the Tyranny of theſe *Barbarians*, and reduc'd it under the Power of the Greek Emperours, to which it had belong'd.

His Succeſſor, nam'd *Longinus*, finding it was difficult to govern all *Italy*, which was divided into many Petty Principalities, appointed Dukes or Governours over the Principal Cities, and reſerv'd to himſelf the Sovereignty over them; taking the Title of Exarch or Viceroy, and all this while acknowledging the Emperour for his Lord. From this time forward, the Emperour ſent Exarchs into *Italy*, who commonly reſided at *Ravenna*, and govern'd all *Italy*. But this Exarchate was diminiſh'd by little and little, and at laſt was wholly deſtroy'd, when the *Lombards* made themſelves Maſters of *Italy*. Until this time it does not appear that the Popes were Sovereigns of the City of *Rome*, and of *Italy*; on the contrary, they themſelves were ſubject to the Emperour or King of *Italy*, and obey'd him as all his other Subjects. The Hiſtory of the Popes furniſhes us with many Inſtances, which prove this clearly. The Firſt is that of Pope *Liberius*, whom the Emperour *Conſtantius* order'd to be made Priſoner, and carried out of *Rome* by *Leontius* Governour of that City, as St. *Athanaſius* teſtifies. The Schiſm of *Damaſus* and *Urſicinus*, does alſo prove, that the Popes were ſubject to the Emperours. *Maximus*, that then govern'd the City of *Rome* for the Emperour, compos'd the Differences that aroſe between thoſe two Competitors, and the Biſhops themſelves addreſs'd to the Emperour, praying him that *Urſicinus* might be forc'd to depart out of the City of *Rome*. The ſame Obſervation may be made upon the Schiſm of *Eulalius* and *Boniface*, which was alſo cur'd by the Order of the Emperour, and afterwards by King *Theodorick*, when he became Maſter of *Italy*. 'Tis remarkable, that this King exercis'd his Power over the Church of *Rome* and its Biſhop with ſo much Haughtineſs, that he appointed a Viſitor to this Church, and ſent poor Pope *John*, being very ſick, to the Greek Emperour, to obtain a Revocation of the Edict he had made againſt the *Arians*; which *John* not being able to obtain, *Theodorick* caus'd him to be impriſon'd at *Ravenna*, where he died. *Theodatus* ſent in like manner from *Rome*, Pope *Agapetus*, to the Emperour *Juſtinian*, and when he became Maſter of *Italy*, he us'd the Popes no leſs roughly than *Theodorick* had done; for he exacted of them great Summs of Money to confirm their Ordination, and caus'd the Popes, *Silverus* and *Vigilius*, to be carried to *Conſtantinople*, where he made them approve the Reſtauration of *Anthimus*, to the Patriarchal See of that City.

Martin

Martin the First, was also banished to the Province of *Pontus*, by the Exarch of *Ravenna*, according to the Orders he had receiv'd from the Emperour. *Justinian* the Younger banish'd also Pope *Sergius*. In short, The Emperour *Leo Isauricus*, would have put to Death, Pope *Gregory* the Second: But the *Italians* growing weary of their subjection to the Power of Strangers, who could not secure them against their Enemies, began to shake off the Yoke and to acknowledge their Dukes for Sovereigns. The Pope nevertheless oppos'd them in it, and did all that lay in his Power to retain them in their Allegiance, acknowledging, as he himself speaks in his Letter written to the Duke of *Venice*, That the Republick of *Rome* was subject to the Dominion of the Emperours. But the *Lombards* afterwards invading *Italy*, and having no expectation of Succors from the Greek Emperour who was entangled by other Wars, the Popes, *Gregory* the Third, and *Zachary*, were oblig'd to have recourse to *Charles Martel* Governour of the *French*. This Prince by menaces obtain'd of *Luitprand* King of the *Lombards*, and his Successor *Rachiseus*, the Restitution of the Exarchate of *Ravenna*, which by his means was twice restor'd to the Exarchs depending upon the Greek Emperours. But at last *Astolphus* the Brother of *Rachiseus* made himself Master of it for ever, and oblig'd *Eutychius*, the last Exarch of *Ravenna*, to retire into the *East*.

Constantine the Emperour.

Stephen the Second being afraid, for the City of *Rome* was oblig'd to make a Truce with *Astolphus* for Forty Years in the Name of the *Roman* Republick. But this King breaking his Word, came four Months after with a great Army to Take and Sack the City of *Rome*. In this extremity, *Stephen* writes presently to the Greek Emperour for Succors, but seeing there were no hopes of any from thence, he had recourse to King *Pepin*, who coming to besiege *Pavia*, forc'd King *Astolphus* to sue for Peace; which was granted him, upon Condition that he should not only restore to the Church of *Rome*, all the Lands and Territories which he had possess'd in *Italy*; but also should yield up the Exarchate of *Ravenna*, and the Cities of the *Roman* Dutchy. This Peace was quickly broke by the perfidiousness of this *Lombard* King, who perceiving that *Pepin* was gone out of *Italy*, went forthwith and besieg'd the City of *Rome*. *Pepin* presently relieved it, and raised the Siege; and yet *Astolphus* found himself in too good a Condition to perform the Articles of Peace, which he had made: But *Pepin* forc'd him to give Hostages, and enlarg'd the Bounds of the Exarchate of *Ravenna*, which *Fulradus* the Abbot of St. *Denys*, receiv'd in his Name, and presently restor'd into the Hands of the Pope. It is observable, that in the time of these two Expeditions of *Pepin*, an Ambassador came from the Greek Emperour, and demanded back again the Exarchate of *Ravenna*, as belonging of right to his Master: But *Pepin* believing that he was lawfully dispossess'd, thought it more convenient to give it to the Pope. In the mean time, the Greek Emperour was still Master of *Sicily*, *Apulia*, *Calabria*, and all the extreme Parts of *Italy*, and had a Governour call'd *George* in the City of *Naples*, who combin'd with *Desiderius* the Successor of *Astolphus*, to Invade the Exarchate of *Ravenna*.

Paul the First knowing of this League, and seeing himself attack'd by this *Lombard*, wrote presently to *Pepin*, his Protector. *Desiderius* fearing the Power of this King, push'd the Matter no further at this time, and promis'd to restore to the *Roman Church* what he had taken from it: But, as it plainly appeared after the Death of *Pepin*, Pope *Adrian* implor'd the Aid of *Charlemaigne*, who came with a great Army, defeated *Desiderius*, and shut him up in *Pavia*. From thence *Charles* went to *Rome*, and restor'd to the Pope all the Cities which his Father *Pepin* had given him, and all the Estates which the *Roman* Church had possess'd in *Italy*. In consideration of which Benefits, *Adrian*, as Head of the *Roman* Republick, granted him, with the consent of the People of *Rome*, the Title of *Patricius*, and gave him the Sovereignity over the City and all the Republick of *Rome*; insomuch that all the People and even the Bishop himself, took an *Oath of Allegiance* to him. After this, *Charles* wanted nothing but the Title of Emperour, which he received in the Year 800, being then Proclaim'd Emperour by the People of *Rome*, and afterwards Consecrated and Crown'd by the Pope. When *Charles* had gotten the Title of Emperour, he regulated all the Affairs of *Italy*; he permitted the *Lombards* to live peaceably under his Dominion; he gave the Name of *Romania* to the ancient Exarchate, and shar'd *Italy* with the Greek Emperour, on condition, that all which was on this side *Naples*, should belong to him; and that the City of *Naples* and all that was on the other side of it, should continue in the Greek Emperour's Power.

From this time the Successors of *Charles* were Kings of *Italy*, and Sovereigns of *Rome*; though the Popes were Temporal Lords of the Cities that anciently belong'd to the Exarchate of *Ravenna*, and some others. *Ludovicus Pius*, the Son of *Charlemaigne*, sent *Bernard*, to *Rome*, to allay the Dissentions that were risen there. After the Death of this *Bernard*, *Lotharius* comes to *Rome* with an Army, to punish some Rebels, and ordains, That for the future the Magistrates of *Rome* should be created by the Emperours. But *Charles the Bald* parted with this Noble Right, and Surrendred up to the *Romans* the Sovereign Power, restoring them, if I may so say, to their ancient Liberty.

In the mean while, the Popes begun to lay by little and little the Foundations of their Sovereign Dominion. For although the Sovereign Power did as yet remain in the Body of the People, who created the Magistrates in *Rome*, and the Neighbouring Cities, nevertheless, the Popes who were now grown Rich and Powerful, us'd all their Endeavours to make themselves Sovereigns, and that the shadow of Sovereginty should only remain in the People. Yet the *Romans* had two Consuls, one Prætor, and one Governor of the City, whom they chose; and oftentimes cast off the Yoke which the Popes would impose upon them; which was the Cause of those cruel Wars that happen'd between the Popes, the Principal Citizens of *Rome*, and the Emperours of *Germany*: But at last the Popes got the better on't, and remain'd sole Masters and Sovereigns of *Rome*, and the Countries about it.

All that we have said concerning the Foundation and Growth of the Pope's Power, plainly shews

Conſtantine the Emperour.

that the Settlement of their Empire is not owing to *Conſtantine*, but to the Kings of *France*; and by conſequence, that the Edict of Donation that bears the Name of *Conſtantine*, is wholly Suppoſititious; but it is not ſo eaſie to find out who was the Author of this falſe Monument, and upon what Motives he Forg'd it. 'Tis certain, that it is more ancient than *Hincmar*, ſince that Biſhop cites it in his Third *Ep. Ch.* 13. and *Iſidore* * has put it in his Collection. It is alſo alledg'd by Pope *Leo* the Ninth, in is Epiſtle to *Michael Cerularius*; and St. *Anſelm*, *Ivo Carnutenſis*, and *Gratian*, have inſerted it into their Collections. To conclude, *Balſamon* a Greek Author, has related a part of it in Greek, in his Commentaries upon *Photius*'s *Nomocanon*. *Baronius*, and thoſe that blindly follow his Conjectures, have ſuſpected the Greeks of this Forgery, pretending that they forg'd this Monument to eſtabliſh the Antiquity of the Patriarchate of *Conſtantinople*, by affirming, that the Church of *Rome* owes its Grandeur to the Emperour *Conſtantine*. But beſides, that 'tis no ways probable that the Greeks ſhould forge an Act contrary to their own pretended Right over *Italy*, this Edict is found cited by the Latines 200 Years before it was known to the Greeks. *Morinus* believes that it was written by *John*, a Deacon of the Church of *Rome*, who liv'd in the Year 963: But that cannot be, ſince it was cited before that time by *Hincmar*. Monſieur *de Marca* maintains, That the Popes fram'd this Monument with the conſent of the French Kings, That they might oppoſe it againſt the Greek Emperours, who demanded back again the Exarchate of *Ravenna*, as belonging to them: But what probability is there, that the Popes and French Kings ſhould have recourſe to this Forgery, which might eaſily be diſcover'd, having much better Reaſons to alledge to the Greeks, why the Exarchate of *Ravenna* did not belong to them. Some have attributed this falſe Monument to the Author of the Collection of *Iſidore*, a notorious Forger of ſuch kind of Pieces; and this Conjecture is more probable than the reſt, but neither is it certain, and therefore it is better to ſuſpend our Judgment about this Matter, than to build it upon Conjectures that have ſo little ſolidity.

* *Mercator.*

Beſides the Greek Fragments of this Edict recited by *Balſamon*, 'tis ſaid, there are Four Greek Manuſcripts of the whole Edict in the *Vatican Library*. The Latin Editions of it do not altogether agree; for *Iſidore*'s is different from that which is found in the ancient Manuſcript of *Fuſtellus*. One *Bartholomew Picernas*, boaſts that he made a new Tranſlation of it from a Greek Manuſcript in the *Vatican Library*, which he printed with a Dedication to Pope *Julius* the Second: But he has done nothing but corrected the ancient Latin Edition. A Prieſt of *Deventer* has alſo printed this Edition at *Cologne* in the Year 1535. The Differences of all theſe Editions are to be ſeen in Father *Labbe*'s Firſt Volume of the Councils. It ſeems more probable to me, That the Greek was taken out of the Latin, than that the Latin was tranſlated from the Greek. However it be, this Monument has neither Authority nor Uſefulneſs.

JUVENCUS.

Juvencus.

HItherto we have not met with any Poet among the Chriſtian Writers. Here is a very excellent one who flouriſh'd under the Reign of *Conſtantine*; he was call'd *C. Vettius Aquilinus Juvencus*, and was deſcended of one of the Nobleſt Families in *Spain*. St. *Jerom* aſſures us that he was a Prieſt, and that's all that he tells us of his Life. He compos'd a Poem about the Year 329, divided into Four Books; wherein he deſcribes the Life of Chriſt in *Hexameter* Verſe without wandring from the Text of the Four Evangeliſts. St. *Jerom* alſo teſtifies, That he wrote ſome Books in *Hexameter* Verſe about Myſteries; and 'tis ſaid, That he compos'd ſome Hymns, of which St. *Jerom* ſays not a Word: But 'tis probable enough, that one who had ſo fertile a Vein in Poetry, as he had, wrote ſeveral other Books. However that be, we have now only Four Books of the Hiſtory of the Goſpel under his Name: In the Exordium of this Poem he ſays, That if the Verſes of thoſe who have publiſh'd the Actions of mortal Men, which they adorn'd with their Fictions, have purchas'd them a Reputation ſo laſting for many Ages, he ought to be aſſur'd of Immortal Glory, who writes the Life of Jeſus Chriſt, and needs not fear that the Day of Judgment ſhall conſume his Work.

Quod ſi tam longam meruerunt carmina famam,
Quæ veterum geſtis hominum mendacia nectunt;
Nobis certa fides æternæ in ſæcula laudis
Immortale decus tribuet, meritumq; rependet:
Nam mihi carmen erunt Chriſti vitalia geſta,
Divinum in populis falſi ſine crimine donum;
Nec metus ut mundi rapiant incendia ſecum
Hoc opus.

After this, he invocates the Aſſiſtance of the Holy Spirit, to enable him to recount the Actions of Chriſt, in ſuch a manner as is ſuitable to their Greatneſs.

Ergo age ſanctificans adſit mihi carminis autor
Spiritus, & puro mentem riget amne canentis
Dulcis Jordanis, ut Chriſto digna loquamur.

After

After this Invocation, he begins the History of Christ, and relates in Verse, all that has been said by the Four Evangelists, without wandering from the Text, and without adding any thing uncertain or fabulous. He concludes those Four Books with a Complement to the Emperor *Constantine*, whom he thanks for the Peace of the Church, and mightily commends, because he was the only King who would not allow the peculiar Names of God to be attributed to him. *Juvencus.*

The Air of the Poem is very Poetical, the Cadence of the Verse is fine and soft; but the words are not always Poetical, and sometimes they are not very good Latin. That which is chiefly to be commended in this Author, is the Faithfulness of his Translation; wherein he has rendred almost word for word the Text of the Evangelists This was a difficult Undertaking which he has performed with good Success, and one may say, that 'tis almost impossible to have done it better.

There are a great many Editions of this Author. His Book was printed with *Sedulius* and other Christian Poets at *Cologne*, in *Octavo* 1537; at *Basle* in *Octavo*, 1537, 1550; at *Venice* by *Aldus*, in *Quarto* 1502; at *Basle* by *Oporinus*, in *Quarto* also, 1564; at *Lyons* by *Torneſius*, 1588; at *Paris*, in 1543, 1575, 158., 1624; at *Vienna*, in *Quarto* 1519; and in many other places: And, it is also to be found in the *Bibliotheca Patrum.*

RHETICIUS.

RHETICIUS Bishop of *Autun*, had so great a Reputation in the time of *Constantine*, that the Emperour chose him to be one of the Judges in the Cause of the *Donatists*. He assisted at the Council of *Rome*, wherein *Cæcilian* was Absolv'd, and afterwards at the Council of *Arles*, held in the Year 314. St. *Jerom* says, that in his time, this Bishop's Commentaries upon the *Canticles*, were extant, and also a large Volume against *Novatian*; but he met with no other Books of his. The same St. *Jerom*, speaking of this Author's Commentaries, in his Second Letter to *Florentius*, says, That he gives a lofty sence of the *Canticles*: And lastly, in his *Ep.* 133. to *Marcellus*, he gives a Critical Judgment of these Commentaries, which is very little to their Advantage. He says, They are full of Extravagent Explication; That he found an infinite number of Errors and base Things in them; That the Stile, indeed, is lofty and swelling, but such as is not suitable to an Interpreter, who ought not to aim at the discovery of his own Eloquence, but the true sence of his Author. He relates in the same place some of the gross Mistakes of this author; *e. g.* That he confounds *Tharsis* which is mention'd in the *Psalms*, with the City of *Tarsus* where St. *Paul* was born: that he believ'd the Hebrew word *Ophaz*, which signifies *Gold*, signified a *Stone*, and so confounds it with the Name *Cephas*, which is given in the Gospel to St. *Peter*. In short, St. *Jerom* wrote to *Marcellus*, That he had not sent the Commentaries of this Author as he desir'd; because there were many things in them that displeas'd him, and but few things that he could approve of: And we have nothing more of these Commentaries, nor of the other Works of this Author. *Rheticius.*

EUSTATHIUS *Bishop of* Antioch.

EUSTATHIUS, a Native of *Sydа*, a City of *Pamphylia* (*a*), was chosen Bishop of *Antioch*, after he had govern'd the Church of *Berœa* for some time (*b*), in the room of *Philogonus*, in the year 323 from the birth of Christ. He assisted at the Council of *Nice*, where he sate in one of the chief Places (*c*), and there maintain'd the Faith of the Church with great Constancy. After the Council of *Nice*, being one of the Zealous Defenders of its Decisions, and one of the greatest Adversaries to the *Arians*, he *Eustathius of Antioch.*

(a) Syda, *City of* Pamphylia.] As St. *Jerom* observes, this is a Sea-Port Town, call'd at present *Forte*.

(b) *After having govern'd the Church of* Berœa *for some time.*] It is agreed upon all hands that he was Bishop of *Berœa*. St. *Jerom*, *Theodoret*, *Socrates* and *Sozomen* testifie it. He was also Bishop of that Church, when *Alexander* of *Alexandria* wrote his Letter against *Arius*, for *Theodoret* notes expressly, that it was directed to him. *Sozomen* says in the first Book of his Hist. *Ch.* 2. That the See of *Antioch* was vacant after the Death of *Romanus*, and that *Eustathius* was ordain'd Bishop of *Antioch* in the Council of *Nice*: and in *Ch.* 17. of the same Book, he says, that he was already Bishop of *Antioch* when he assisted at this Council; yet S. *Romanus* was not Bishop, but only a Martyr of *Antioch*, and *Eustathius* Succeeded immediately to *Philogonus* some time before the Council of *Nice*, but after the beginning of the *Arian* Controversy, that's to say, in the Year 323, or 324.

(c) *He sate in one of the Chief Places.*] *Proclus of Constantinople*, in a Synodical Letter to the Oriental Bishops, set down by *Facundus*, *B.* I. *Ch.* 1. says, That he was the chief of the Fathers in the Council of *Nice*. *Facundus* gives him the same Title, *B.* XI. *Ch.* 1. and Pope *Felix* III. calls him, in his 6th *Ep.* to *Zeno*, President of the council. *Theodoret*, *B.* I. of his Hist. *Ch.* 9. says, That he spoke to the Emperour in the Name of the Council; and *Eusеb. B.* I Life of *Const. Ch.* 11. says That he who first Harangued the Emperour, was seated in the Chief Place on the right Hand: But he seems to say at the Beginning of his Books of the Life of *Constantine*, That it was himself that made this Harangue, as *Theodoret* assures us, Hist *B.* I. *Ch.* 19. The Author of the *Tripartite* Hist. willing to joyn these several Opinions together, says, That *Eusebius* did not speak till after *Eustathius*. *Theodorus* of *Mopsuestia*, says, That *Alexander* of *Alexandria*, was entrusted with that Office. Be that as it will, it does not follow, that he who spoke first must therefore be President of the Council, as having the first Place upon the right hand: for besides that this might be given him only for the time while he spoke, it may be that this place was not the most honourable: Moreover, *Eustathius* might be call'd the Chief, because he was one of the first; But it is more probable, that *Hosius* was President of the Council.

drew

Euſtathius of Antioch.

drew upon himſelf the Hatred of the Biſhops of *Palæſtine*, which burſt forth immediately upon the firſt occaſion they found: which offer'd it ſelf in the Year 329, when *Euſebius* of *Nicomedia*, and *Theognis* of *Nice*, return'd from their Baniſhment, and went to *Palæſtine*, under pretence of viſiting the Church of *Jeruſalem*: for then they paſs'd by *Antioch*, where they were honourably received by *Euſtathius*, and they on their part gave marks of their Friendſhip to him. But at their Return they brought with them to *Antioch*, *Euſebius* of *Cæſarea*, *Patrophilus* of *Scythopolis*, *Aecius* of *Lydda*, *Theodotus* of *Laodicea*, with ſome other Eaſtern Biſhops, with a deſign to depoſe *Euſtathius*. Theſe Biſhops being then Aſſembled at *Antioch* in the Year 330 (d), did not only falſly charge him with the Error of the *Sabellians*, but alſo accus'd him of infamous Crimes. *Theodoret* ſays, That they hir'd a Woman of an ill Life (e) to ſay, that ſhe had a Child by *Euſtathius*; That this wicked Woman entred with a Child in her Arms into the place of their Aſſembly, and declar'd with a loud Voice, That ſhe had it by *Euſtathius*; That this holy Biſhop having ask'd her, if ſhe had any Witneſs of what ſhe affirm'd; ſhe anſwer'd, ſhe had none; and yet notwithſtanding this, the Biſhops believ'd it upon her Oath, and Condemn'd *Euſtathius* as convicted of the Crime. St. *Athanaſius* ſays nothing of this Story, which appears otherwiſe to be fabulous enough; but he obſerves only that they accus'd *Euſtathius* of having treated the Emperour's Mother reproachfully (f), and that immediately he was ſent into Baniſhment, with many of his Prieſts and Deacons; but the place of his Exile is not certainly known(g). In whatſoever place it was, there he ended his days, and 'tis probable, that he liv'd not long after his Condemnation; for there is no mention made of him in Hiſtory, and 'tis falſe, whatever *Socrates* and *Sozomen* ſay, That he return'd again from Baniſhment in the time of the Emperour *Jovian* (h). This Biſhop is the Firſt, if we will believe St. *Jerom*, that wrote againſt the *Arians*. He compos'd many Books againſt their Doctrine, abundance of Homilies, and infinite number of Letters, many Treatiſes of the Soul, and a Diſcourſe of the *Pythoniſs* againſt *Origen*.

Facundus quotes in Latin, *Ch.* 1. of his *B.* XI. Four Paſſages of *Euſtathius* of *Antioch* whereof the two firſt are taken out of *B.* VII. and the two laſt out of *B.* VIII. againſt the *Arians*. He alledges them in this place to prove, That this Biſhop of *Antioch*, in ſpeaking of the Incarnation, made uſe of Expreſſions, at leaſt as harſh as thoſe that were objected to *Theodorus* of *Mopſueſtia*: in effect, the Paſſages which he relates, ſeem to favour the Error of *Neſtorius* (i). But his Doctrine muſt not be ana-

(b) *Being then Aſſembled at* Antioch *in the Year* 330.] All Hiſtorians agree, That *Euſtathius* was depos'd under the Reign of *Conſtantine*. *Euſebius* an unqueſtionable Witneſs, gives us an Account, *B.* III. *Life of* Conſtantine, *Ch.* 59. of the Tumult that aroſe in the Church of *Antioch* upon the Depoſition of *Euſtathius*, as a thing that happen'd after the Council of *Nice*, but before the Death of the Emperour *Conſtantine* St *Athanaſius* begins with this Depoſition, the Hiſtory of the *Arian* Perſecution under *Conſtantine*; and though there be in the Text *Conſtantius* for *Conſtantine*, that is a miſtake, for 'tis plain from S. *Athanaſius* that *Flacillus*, who was ordain'd in the room of *Euſtathius*, had the Title of Biſhop of *Antioch*, at the Council of *Tyre*, held under *Conſtantine* from whence it evidently follows that *Euſtathius* was then depos'd. The like Error appears in ſome Editions of St *Jerom*'s Books of *Eccleſiaſtical Writers*; but in the ancient Editions & in the Greek Verſion, we read *under Conſtantine*, & not *under Conſtantius*.

(e) Theodoret *ſays, That they hir'd a Woman of an ill Life.*] *Philoſtorgius* reports alſo this Story, *B.* II. *Ch.* 7. *Socrat.* and *Sozom.* allude to it, when they ſay, That *Euſtathius* was accus'd of Infamous Crimes. S. *Jerom* mentions it in his Apol. againſt *Ruffinus*; *Euſtathius* ſays, he found ſons which he knew not of; *Filios dum neſcit invenit*: and the Emperour *Conſtantine* ſeems to hint it in his Letter to the Biſhops, *the infamous Perſons being driven away*, as he ſpeaks.

(f) *Of having treated the Emperor's Mother reproachfully.*] 'Twas to *Conſtantine* that they wrote this Calumny; for *Euſtathius* having recourſe to the Emperour, and being come to *Conſtantinople* to complain of the Injuſtice that was done him, the Biſhops aſſembled at *Antioch* made uſe of this Calumny to ſtir up the Emperour againſt him. They added alſo, that he was the Author of that Sedition which aroſe at *Antioch* after his Depoſition. Theſe things mov'd the Emperour to baniſh him preſently, without inquiring into the Merits of his Cauſe. The *Euſebians* alſo did afterwards make uſe of an Artifice juſt like this againſt St *Athanaſius*.

(g) *But the place of his Exile is not certainly known.*] *Theodoret* ſays, that he was ſent to *Illyricum*; *Philoſtorgius* ſays only, that he was ſent into the Weſt: But St. *Jerom* aſſures us, that he was carried away to *Trajanopolis*, a City of *Thracia*. St. *Chryſoſtom* ſays, That he died in *Tracia*: And in fine, *Theodorus Lector* at the beginning of the Second Book of his Hiſtory, ſays, That *Calendion* the Patriarch of *Antioch*, caus'd the Reliques of *Euſtathius* to be tranſported from *Philippopolis* in *Macedonia* to *Antioch*.

(h) *'Tis falſe,— that he turn'd again from baniſhment in the time of the Emperour* Jovian.] *Theodoret* ſays, That *Euſtathius* was dead when *Meletius* was ordain'd Biſhop of *Antioch*. And certainly *Meletius* ought not to have been ordain'd in his place before, and the *Euſtathians* (ſo call'd becauſe they would not communicate with any Biſhop of *Antioch* that was ordain'd by the *Arian* Faction) would never have ſuffer'd, if *Paulinus* had been ordain'd while *Euſtathius* liv'd. There is no mention of him in all the Diſputes that follow'd after, neither did he return after the Death of *Conſtantine*, when all the baniſh'd Biſhops were recall'd; for it does not appear that he was preſent in any Council, or that he ever demanded to be reſtor'd to his Biſhoprick: In a word, there is nothing more ſaid of him in Hiſtory. From all which I conclude, that 'tis ſomething probable, that he died before the Year 337.

(i) *In effect, the Paſſages which he relates, ſeem to favour the Error of* Neſtorius.] In the Firſt, he ſays, [*That God who united the Humane Nature to the Word for the Salvation of Mankind, has conceal'd from this humane Nature the Day of Judgment, leſt the man ſhould teach Mankind the time of his ſecond Coming.*] In the Second he ſeems to ſay, That Jeſus Chriſt incarnate is another Perſon than the Word, but the word *Perſon* is not always taken in a ſtrict ſence. In the Third, he ſays, *That the word* dwells *in the Humane Nature as in its Temple*: an Expreſſion which *Neſtorius* often made uſe of. In the laſt, he ſays, That the Scepter which God prepar'd for his Son, does not agree to the Father, nor to the Word, but only to the Man Chriſt; *Who is*, ſays he, *the Lord of all the Creatures, becauſe of the Mixture of the Divine Word.*] 'Tis evident, that theſe Expreſſions are not exact; but then we ought not for this to accuſe him of Error, for 'tis eaſie to excuſe him, not only becauſe of the time when he wrote, but alſo becauſe 'tis common enough with thoſe that liv'd a long time after him, to make uſe ſometimes of Expreſſions very like this, to diſtinguiſh the Humanity of Chriſt from his Divinity to which it is united. To which we may add, That 'tis plain from the paſſages related by *Theodoret*, that he was far enough from the error of the *Neſtorians*.

thematiz'd,

thematiz'd, says *Facundus*, upon the account of some Expressions that are less exact, which he made use of at a time when he spoke simply and without precaution, because the Error of *Nestorius* did not yet appear. The Passage of *Eustathius* which *Theodoret* gives us in Greek, *Hist. B.* I. *Ch.* 8. is much more considerable than those which are cited by *Facundus*: It is taken out of the same Work against the *Arians*, and probably out of the two First Books. Take it whole as Monsieur *Cousin* has Translated it. *Eustathius of Antioch.*

" A very numerous Council being Assembled about this Matter in the City of *Nice*, where 270 " Bishops. or thereabouts, assisted, (for the Number was so great that I cannot precisely set it down, " and besides, I took on great care to inform my self of it.) When they first began to enquire into the " Faith, a Libel of *Eusebius*'s was produc'd, which contain'd a convincing Proof of his Blasphemies. " The reading of it, caus'd a sensible Grief in all that heard it, and great Confusion in its Author. " The Malignity of *Eusebius*'s Associates being discover'd, and the impious Writing being publickly " tore in pieces, some under pretence of the Peace which they proposed, impos'd Silence upon those " that used to speak better than others. The *Arians* apprehending that they should be cast out of the " Church by the Judgment of so great an Assembly, condemn'd the Impious Doctrine, and sign'd the " Confession of Faith. But having secur'd by their Cabals the principal Dignities to themselves, instead " of suffering Canonical Penance as they ought, they maintain'd the Doctrine that was Condemn'd, " sometimes in private, and sometimes in Publick, by several Arguments which they had invented for " that purpose. The desire they had to sow the Seeds of Division, made them shun meeting with the " Learned, and attacquing the Defenders of the Faith; but we do not think that these Atheists can " overcome God, for whatever Efforts they make will be vanquish'd according to the authentick Te- " stimonies of the Prophet *Isaiah*. *Theodoret* adds, See here what *Eustathius* has written of the *Arians*. There is also another passage in Greek taken out of this Work, related by *Anastasius* in his Collections, wherein *Eustathius* maintains, That Jesus Christ cannot be said to be Created and Begotten according to the same Nature; for if he was Created he was not Begotten, and if he was Begotten he was not Created. The same *Theodoret* citeth in his Dialogues many passages of *Eustathius* about the Incarnation, taken out of his Book upon the soul, and his Discourse upon these words of the Proverbs; *God hath created me in the beginning of his ways*: out of his 15th. and 92d. Homilies upon the *Psalms*, and out of two other Treatises upon the Inscriptions or Titles of some Psalms (k).

All the passages of *Eustathius*, reported by *Theodoret* (l), prove, That there are two Perfect Natures in Jesus Christ, the Divine and the Humane Nature; That He has a Body and a Soul like us; That He is passible according to the Humane Nature, and, That the Humanity is not chang'd into the Divinity: From whence it appears, that *Eustathius* did more formally reject the Error of the *Eutychians*, than that of the *Nestorians*, although there are some Expressions in the same Passages, which plainly enough show that he was perswaded, That these two Natures were united in one and the same Person. But the Oriental Writers have always more applied themselves to remark the distinction of the two Natures in Christ, than their intimate Union; whereas on the contrary, the Egyptians are more addicted to discourse of their Union, than their Distinction; Which things afterwards was the Subject of the great Disputes that were amongst them about the Mystery of the Incarnation.

The Treatise of *Eustathius* concerning the *Pythoniss* (m) cited by St. *Jerom*, was publish'd in Greek in the Year 1629, and translated into Latin by *Allatius*; together, with a Discourse of this Author upon the same Subject. The Question there treated of is, Whether the Witch mention'd *B.* I. of

(k) *Upon the Inscriptions or Titles of some Psalms.*] The First is taken from the Treatise, Εἰς ἐπιγεγραφὰς τῶν ψαλμῶν, and the Second from the Treatise, Εἰς τὰς ἐπιγεγραφὰς τῶν ἀναβαθμῶν. The 6th. Psalm which is our 5th. has for its Title in the *Septuagint*, Ψαλμὸς ᾠδῆς τῷ Δαβὶδ, *i. e.* the Inscription of a Title for *David*; and the 57, Τῷ Δαβὶδ εἰς στηλογραφίαν, *i. e.* an Inscription to *David*, or to *David* for an Inscription Στηλογραφία is properly an Inscription upon a Pillar. The Psalms 57, 58, and 59. have the like titles. The Treatise which *Theodoret* cites in this place, Εἰς ἐπιγεγραφὰς στηλογραφίας, was compos'd upon these Inscriptions; as the Second, Εἰς τὰς ἐπιγεγραφὰς τῶν ἀναβαθμῶν, was compos'd upon the Inscriptions of the Psalms of Degrees. St. *Gregory Nyssen* has since made a Treatise upon the Inscriptions of the Psalms. This Observation I owe to the Learned *Cotelerius*.

(l) *All the Passages of* Eustathius, *reported by* Theodoret.] In the Passages cited from the First & Second Dialogue, he asserts, That Christ had a Body and Soul of the same Substance with ours, and there he calls the Flesh of Christ, the Temple in which the Divinity dwelt. He observes in the last passage of his second Dialogue, that Christ had no need of the legal Sacrifices to purifie himself, because he purifies himself, and sanctifies all things; but he voluntarily submitted to the Law, to deliver us from that Bondage, us who were enslav'd under, and liable to the Malediction of Sin: In the Passages recited out of the last Dialogue, he proves, That the divinity of Jesus Christ was not subject to any Pains or Sufferings but only his Humanity: There he affirms, That Jesus Christ had a Soul, That he truly suffer'd, though voluntarily; and that the Word dwelling in the Body of the Man as in a Temple, restor'd by the Resurrection that temple which Death had destroy'd. In a word, he shows, that all the Properties of the Humane and Divine Nature were found in Christ; but that we must not attribute to the Divinity that which agrees only to the Humanity, or deny because of his Divinity, the Properties which agree only to the Humane Nature.

(m) *The Treatise* of Eustathius *concerning* the Pythoniss.] 'Tis entituled in Greek, Εἰς τὸ τὸν ἐγγαστρίμυθον, in Latin, *De ventriloquo*, which cannot be rendred in English, but by a Circumlocution; that is to say *The Discourse which those Pronounce who have a Devil in their Belly*. To understand this, we must observe that the Ancients believ'd, That the *Dæmon* which the Pagans honour'd under the Name of the God *Python*, entred into the Bowels of the Priests and Priestesses, and by strange agitations excited in them a kind of Fury, which made them say many things which were taken for Predictions: For which reason the women that profess'd to divine things to come, were call'd *Pythonisses*. Such was she, to whom *Saul* address'd himself for consulting *Samuel*, whose History is the Subject of this Dissertation, and therefore I have entituled it, *Concerning the* Pythoniss.

Kings,

Euſtathius of Antioch.

Kings, *Ch.* 28. did really bring back the Soul of *Samuel* into this World to ſpeak unto *Saul*? *Euſtathius* maintains the Negative againſt *Origen*, who had taught the Affirmative in one of his Homilies: And after he has related in a pleaſant manner all the Circumſtances of the Hiſtory, he refutes the Explication of *Origen*. He lays it down for a Principle, that the Devil cannot bring back Souls from the other World: He ſays, It is ridiculous to give him this Authority over the Souls of the Juſt, and that there is none but God only who is Lord over them. He demands of *Origen*, Whether the Witch made *Samuel* appear in body and Soul together, or if ſhe only brought back his Soul; and then he ſhews, that neither the one, nor the other is probable. He rallies *Origen* for attributing to the Holy Spirit the Words which the Witch pronounc'd when ſhe was acted by an Evil Spirit. He maintains that *Saul* did not at all ſee the Ghoſt of *Samuel*, but only was aſtoniſh'd with the extraordinary Speeches, and violent Motions of the Witch, and therefore caſt himſelf down upon the Ground to worſhip. He proves, That 'tis contrary to common ſence, to ſay, as *Origen* does, That the Gods which the Witch ſays ſhe ſaw aſcending out of the Earth, were the Souls of the Juſt and the Angels: He obſerves, that the Prediction of the *Pythoniſs* was found to be falſe; and tho' it had been true, it would not therefore follow, that it was from the Holy Spirit, ſince the Devil has often made ſuch like Predictions, which Chance and the Circumſtances of things, that are known to him, have ſometimes verified. He does alſo make it appear from the Circumſtances of this Prediction, That it was an Impoſture of the Devil, and that it cannot be attributed to the Holy Spirit, without ſome kind of Impiety. After this, he anſwers the chief Objection of *Origen*, taken from the Scripture, which gives the Name of *Samuel* to that Apparition: To which he ſays, That he was aſtoniſh'd at an Author, who durſt explain the whole Scripture Allegorically, treat as a Fable the Hiſtory of *Moſes* concerning the Terreſtrial Paradiſe, and give Myſtical Sences to all the Hiſtories of the Old Teſtament, that he ſhould endeavour to put off for Truth, the Fictions of a Woman acted by an evil Spirit. He ſhews, That when the Scripture gives the Name of *Samuel* to this apparition, 'tis not to be underſtood as if *Samuel* himſelf in Body and Soul were there; but only that this Woman made him believe by the Repreſentation which ſhe gave *Saul* of this Spectre, that this was the Prophet *Samuel* whom he deſir'd to conſult. In ſhort, he demonſtrates from all the Circumſtances of this Story, That there was nothing real in this Apparition; but that it was only an Apparition repreſented in the imagination of *Saul* and this Propheteſs, by the Devil which poſſeſs'd them. This is the Sentiment which *Euſtathius* confirms in this Diſſertation, which is ſhort, beautiful and very cloſe; for as he ſays nothing ſuperfluous, ſo he omits no Proof which might be of Advantage to his Opinion. There appear in it much Learning and a well-poiz'd Judgment, and one may venture to ſay, That there are few Works of this nature in all Antiquity ſo perfect as this Diſcourſe. Yet I think, he has treated *Origen* a little too harſhly, in a Queſtion that does not at all belong to Religion, but is purely Critical. To conclude, The Opinion of *Euſtathius* is ſince his time grown the more common Opinion (n), and I muſt confeſs, that 'tis more probable than the other, tho' I cannot affirm any thing for certain in this Matter.

We cannot give any Judgment ſo much to the Advantage of that Commentary upon the work of the Six Days, or the *Hexameron* which bears the Name of *Euſtathius*, publiſh'd by the ſame *Allatius*; but on the contrary, 'tis a Work altogether unworthy of a Man of his Senſe, and which cannot be attributed to *Euſtathius*, without doing him great Diſhonour; and there is no probability that it was his. For Firſt, Not only St. *Jerom* and *Theodoret* make no mention of it, but it is not found cited by any Author. Secondly, It is an ill contriv'd Collection of Paſſages out of *Euſebius*, St. *Baſil*, the Old Teſtiment, *Joſephus*, *Artapanus*, the Goſpel falſly aſcrib'd to St. *James*, and many other Authors. Thirdly, The Stile is perfectly different from that of his Diſſertation concerning the *Pythoniſs*, and the Fragments of *Euſtathius*'s Sermons. Fourthly, The things treated of in this book, do not at all ſuit with the Genius of *Euſtathius*, for in his Diſſertation concerning the *Pythoniſs*, he reproves *Origen* for ſtudying to make too many uſeleſs Remarks and Allegories in explaining the Scriptures, while he neglects the literal ſence of them, and the Moral Reflections that ſhould be made upon them: Now this Treatiſe upon the *Hexameron*, is almoſt wholly compos'd of ſuch unprofitable Remarks, which

(n) *The Opinion of* Euſtathius *is ſince his time grown the more common Opinion.*] St. *Juſtin* in his Dialogue againſt *Tryphon*, is of the ſame Opinion with *Origen*, and concludes, That all Souls, even thoſe of the Juſt, fall under the Power of *Dæmons*: But *Tertullian* is of *Euſtathius*'s Opinion, in his Book of the *Soul*, Ch. 57. where he ſays expreſly, That we muſt not believe that it was the Soul of *Samuel* which the *Pythoniſs* brought back from the other World; but that 'twas only a Cheat of the Devil. Since *Euſtathius*'s time, there are but few Authors of *Origen*'s Opinion, excepting *Sulpitius Severus*. St. *Auſtin* makes a Problem of this Queſtion, in his Letter to *Simplicianus*, but he inclines to *Euſtathius*'s ſide. *Eucherus*, *Bede*, St. *Anſelm*, *Rabanus* and St. *Thomas*, follow St *Auſtin*. *Theodoret* and ſome others, have ſaid, That God form'd this Apparition of *Samuel*, or that he made an Angel appear under the form of *Samuel*. St. *Baſil* is of *Euſtathius*'s Opinion in his Commentary upon Ch 8. of *Iſaiah*; but he ſeems to approve the contrary Opinion in his Letter to *Euſtathius* the Phyſician. St. *Gregory Nazianzen* touches both theſe Opinions in his firſt *Oration* againſt *Julian*. But *Gregory Nyſſen*, in a Letter written on this Subject, expreſly refutes the Opinion of *Origen*, and proves that of *Euſtathius*. 'Tis no wonder that *Methodius* and St. *Jerom* condemn *Origen*'s Opinion, but 'tis ſurprizing that *Philaſtrius* has tax'd it of Hereſy, *Hæreſ.* 28. The Author of the Queſtion aſcrib'd to St. *Auſtin*, Queſt. 52. The Author of the Queſtions concerning the wonderful things in Scripture, *B* II. *Ch.* 2. and of the Queſtions of the Old and New Teſtament attributed to St. *Auſtin*, Queſt. 26. *Iſidore*, *B.* VIII. *Ch.* 8. of his *Origines*, *Zonaras* Hiſt. Tom. 1. *Syncellus* in his *Chronicle*, and many others, approve the Opinion of *Euſtathius*. The modern Commentators, are much divided about it: And indeed, the Opinion of *Origen* may better be maintain'd when 'tis ſuppos'd, That 'twas by the Permiſſion of God, and not by the Power of the Devil, that the *Pythoniſs* brought back the Soul of *Samuel*; and ſo it ſeems to be more agreeable to the Letter of Scripture; but the other is more rational, and explains the Matter in Diſpute more naturally.

concern

concern neither Religion nor Manners. Fifthly, This Author begins with an Extract out of the *Chronicon* of *Eusebius*, concerning the Antiquity of *Moses*, and then repeats the first Verses of *Genesis*, from whence he takes occasion to make a particular Enumeration of all the different sorts of Plants, Herbs, Trees, Fishes, Birds and Beasts; and to discourse of their Nature and Properties, saying many things very fabulous of them: After this, he makes a very imperfect Abridgment of the History of *Genesis*, adding many Circumstances to it taken out of *Josephus*. He makes a Digression concerning the Genealogy of Jesus Christ, in which he copies out a passage of *Africanus*, and then gives an Abridgment of the Fables which are in the *Proto Evangelium* of St. *James*, concerning the Virgin, St. *Joseph*, *Joachim*, and *Zachary*. Afterwards he resumes the Continuation of his Abridgment of History, which goes as far as the End of *Joshua*'s Government, being nothing else but Extracts out of the Books of Scripture, and the History of *Josephus*; whereby it appears, that there is neither Order nor Design in all this work, and that 'tis nothing else but a heap of Passages confusedly jumbled together by a Man of no Learning or Judgment: which cannot be said of *Eustathius* of *Antioch*, who was a very Learn'd, Judicious and Eloquent Man, as any one may easily perceive by his Dissertation, and the Fragments we have of his Works. *Allatius* has no proof that this Work is *Eustathius*'s of *Antioch*, under whose Name he has publish'd it; but he endeavours to prove, that it was made by some ancient Author, because in speaking of the End of the World, he maintains that it will not continue above 6000 Years, and in giving the Chronology of Time already past, he does not go beyond the 30th. Year of *Constantine*. But this proof is not at all convincing, for 'tis probable, that this Author has taken what he says in those places from one of the Ancients, without adding any thing of his own: But suppose he were the Author of what is related concerning the End of the World, may not an Impostor affect to speak so, on purpose to make us believe that his Work was Ancient? Be it as it will, there is no manner of probability that it was written by *Eustathius* of *Antioch*.

Eustathius of Antioch.

I shall not now commend this Bishop for his Zeal in defending the Faith, his invincible Constancy, his Wisdom, and singular Moderation, which appear'd in suffering patiently the reproachful Accusation, wherewith his Enemies charg'd him, and the unjust Deposition which they pronounc'd against him; but shall content my self to consider him as an Author, and observe with *Sozomen*, *Hist. B.* II. *Ch.* 19. that he had acquired a rare Eloquence, *As appears*, says he, *by his Works, which are most worthy of Commendation, as well for the ancient Purity of Style, as the Sublimity of Thought, the Beauty of Expression, and the Curiosity of his Discourses.* These rare Qualities of this good Writer appear in his Dissertation of the *Pythonists*, and in his Fragments set down by *Theodoret*, which confirm the Judgment that *Sozomen* gives of this Author. I have not seen any other Edition in Greek and Latin of his Works, but that which we have already spoken of, Printed at *Lyons* by *Durandus* in *Quarto*, in the Year 1629.

PETER *of* Alexandria.

PETER of *Alexandria* had his Head cut off *(a)* for the Faith, by the Commandment of the Emperour *Maximinus*, in the Ninth Year of *Diocletian*'s Persecution, that's to say, in the Year 311 from the Birth of Christ: We have the Acts of his Martyrdom; but since they do not agree with the *Ecclesiastical History* of that Time, we ought not to give much credit to them *(b)*. Though St. *Jerom* and others, who have given an Account of *Ecclesiastical Writers*, do not place this Bishop among

Peter of Alexandria.

(a) *Had his Head cut off.*] *Baronius* sets down the Martyrdom of *Peter* at the Year 310; but *Eusebius* says, in two places of his History. That he Suffer'd the 9th. Year of the Persecution, which is 311. according to the vulgar *Æra*: The Author of the *Chronicon Alexandrinum* follows *Eusebius*. *Baronius* cites for himself, *Ch.* 13. of the Eighth Book of *Eusebius*, where *Peter* is numbred amongst the Martyrs; but in this place of his History, he does not reckon up the Martyrs in order of time, but only Discourses of many famous Bishops and Martyrs.

(b) *We ought not to give much credit to them.*] These Acts were publish'd by *Surius*, and afterwards in Greek by *Combefis*: But they neither agree with the History of the Time, nor with that of *Peter*. 1. This Author says in two places, that *Peter* died under *Diocletian*, which is false; since this Emperour abdicated the Empire a long time before the Year 311. 2. *Eusebius* says, That *Peter* was seiz'd, and executed upon the spot. These Acts suppose that he was a long time in Prison, and that he must have written of it to the Emperour who was at *Nicomedia*. 3. He places amongst the Bishops of *Alexandria*, one *Milius*, when, in truth, there was never a one of that Name. 4. He places *Heraclas* after *Dionysius* and *Maximus*, though he certainly preceded them. 5. He feigns that *Heraclas* had Disputes with *Origen*, when there was never any such thing. 6. He says, That the Body of *Peter* was carried into the Church of *Theonas*, which was built by *Alexander* the Successor of *Achillas*, who came after *Peter* to the See of *Alexandria*. In short, he relates, that *Arius* was Excommunicated by *Peter* of *Alexandria*, because of his Impious Doctrine: But the Ancients say not a word of this Excommunication, neither does *Alexander*, nor St. *Athanasius* object it to *Arius*: And indeed can there be any probability, that *Achillas* should receive *Arius* if he had been Excommunicated by *Peter*? Especially, if it be true which is related in those Acts, that *Peter* advertis'd *Achillas* and *Alexander*, that he had seen a Vision, wherein he was given to understand, that *Arius* should rend in pieces the Church of Jesus Christ. Besides, we read no-where that *Arius* publish'd his impious Doctrine before the Pontificate of *Alexander*, and therefore if he had been Excommunicated by *Peter*, it must have been for some other cause. There are found indeed in a Treatise of *Justinian* against *Origen*, some words ascrib'd to *Peter* of *Alexandria*, which are much like those that are found in those Acts; but besides that, they are not altogether the same, *Justinian* is neither so Ancient, nor of so great Authority, as to counter-balance the Reasons which we have alledg'd.

Peter of Alexandria.

them; yet he certainly wrote ſome things. There is in the Council of *Epheſus*, a paſſage or two about the Incarnation, taken out of his Book about the Divinity. *Juſtinian* in his Edict to *Menna* againſt *Origen*, quotes two paſſages of *Peter* of *Alexandria*: The Firſt out of a Homily againſt Pre-exiſtence of Souls; The Second out of a Myſtagogical Diſcourſe compoſed by him a little before his Martyrdom, this is very remarkable: *I exhort you*, ſays this holy Martyr, *to watch, for you ſhall once more be in Affliction; you know how the Heathens cauſed S.* Thomas *my Father and my Biſhop, who bred me up, and my Predeceſſor in this See, to ſuffer. Would to God I had alſo been his Succeſſor in Holineſs too. You know the Perſecution which the great Saint* Dionyſius *endured, and how he was obliged to hide himſelf, and to be continually changing the place of his Abode, whilſt the Heretick* Sabellius *tormented him in another manner: What ſhall I ſay of the holy Biſhops* Heraclas *and* Demetrius? *What Tribulations did not they endure from* Origen, *who ſow'd Diviſions in their Church, and who cauſed Diſturbances there which are not yet quieted?* And we have in *Balſamon* in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, and in the laſt Edition of the Councils, the Canons which are ſaid to be drawn out of one of his Diſcourſes upon Penance. Theſe were written in the Fourth Year of the Perſecution in 306, about the Feaſt of *Eaſter*; for they begin with theſe words, [*Seeing this is the Fourth* Eaſter *ſince the beginning of the Perſecution.*] In theſe Canons, he regulates the time of Penance. In the firſt, he ordains, That thoſe who after long Reſiſtance had at laſt laps'd, being conquer'd by the Severity of Torments, and had been under Penance for Three Years, ſhould after Forty Days not be receiv'd into Communion; during which time, he exhorts them to watch and pray. In the Second, he adds, yet another Year of Penance for thoſe who had faln without enduring Torments, only to deliver themſelves from Priſon. In the Third, he brings an inſtance from the Parable of the Fig-Tree, to impoſe Four Years Penance upon thoſe who had voluntarily faln into Idolatry, without being put in Priſon. In the Fourth, he deplores the unhappineſs of thoſe that are altogether deſperate, and do no Penance at all. In the Fifth, he limits their Penance to Six Months, who had pretended, that they had offer'd unto Idols, or that they had approach'd their Altars, or given up their Names; or had ſent Pagans to offer in their ſtead. In the Sixth he obſerves, That there were ſome that ſent thither their Slaves, though they were Chriſtians; and in the Seventh Canon he impoſes upon them Three Years of Penance, but upon the Slaves one Year only. In the Eighth, he ſays, That 'tis but juſt to make them Partakers of the Communion of the Body and Blood of Chriſt, of the Prayers of the Church and the Word of God, who after they had been once vanquiſh'd, return'd again to the Combate, and were committed to Priſon: or thoſe who ſuffer'd Torments, after they had confeſs'd the Faith of Jeſus Chriſt. In the Ninth Canon, he blames their Conduct, who expoſe themſelves indiſcreetly to Danger, and by this means bring Perſecution upon themſelves and their Brethren. He proves by the Example of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, that their Conduct is very much to be blam'd; and yet he thinks we ought not to refuſe the Communion to thoſe who thus raſhly expoſe themſelves to Temptation, becauſe they do it in the Name of Chriſt. In the 10th. Canon, he ordains, That the Clergy who had laps'd, ſhould be depriv'd of their Miniſtry, and content themſelves with Lay-Communion, which is not to be deny'd them. In the 11th. Canon, he adviſes to treat them with Meekneſs, and receive thoſe Chriſtians into Communion, who having expos'd themſelves to Martyrdom for the Encouragement of others by their Example, had at laſt faln by the Cruelty of their Torments. In the 12th. he ſays, That thoſe who had given Money to deliver themſelves from Torments, were free from Sin in ſo doing, and moreover praiſes their Conduct. In the 13th. he makes an Apology for thoſe that fled to avoid Perſecution, and juſtifies their Carriage by many Examples. In the 14th. he ſays, That they ought to be plac'd in the Rank of Confeſſors, who had been forc'd againſt their wills to taſte of Meats offer'd unto Idols. The laſt Canon has no connexion with the former, for there he approves the Faſts of *Wedneſday* and *Friday*, [*On which*, he ſays, *we are enjoyn'd to Faſt, according to Tradition; On* Wedneſday, *becauſe on that Day the Jews took up a Reſolution to deliver up Jeſus to Death; and on* Friday, *becauſe he ſuffer'd on that Day for us: But as to the Lord's-Day, that's a Day of Rejoycing, becauſe on that Day Jeſus Chriſt was rais'd from the Dead, and therefore we do not Kneel on that Day at our Prayers.*] Of all the Canons of Antiquity concerning the Penance of the Lapſed, there are none more Judicious or more Equitable than thoſe we have now deſcrib'd. There appears in them a Wiſdom and Prudence that's altogether ſingular, in tempering the rigour of Puniſhment by a reaſonable Moderation; without which, Juſtice would be weakned by too much Indulgence. He examines carefully all the Circumſtances which might augment or diminiſh the quality of the Crime; and as he does not lengthen out Penance by too ſevere Methods, ſo neither does he deceive the Sinner by too remiſs an Eaſineſs. 'Tis probable, that about the time when thoſe Canons were compos'd, *Peter* of *Alexandria* depos'd *Melitius* Biſhop of *Egypt*, being convicted of Idolatry, who was afterwards the Author of the Sect of the *Melitians*; as *Athanaſius* reports in his Second Apology.

ALEXANDER *Biſhop of* Alexandria.

Alexander Biſhop of *Alexandria.*

AFter the Death of *Peter* Biſhop of *Alexandria*, who ſuffer'd Martyrdom in the 9th. Year of the Perſecution begun by *Dioclesian*, *Achillas* was choſen in his room to the See of *Alexandria*. *Alexander*, of whom we now write, Succeeded this *Achillas* in the Year 321, if we follow the Teſtimony of St. *Jerom*; or according to others, towards the Year 315. He oppos'd the Hereſie of *Arius* vigorouſly, and endeavour'd to ſtifle it in its Birth, by Excommunicating him who was the Author of it, and his Followers. This he did in a Council aſſembled into the City of *Alexandria* for that purpoſe. But *Arius* and thoſe of his Faction, having found ſome Biſhops that receiv'd them into their Communion, though they were Condemn'd by their Biſhop, *Alexander* complains in a Letter which he wrote to his Fellow-Biſhops, which is related by *Theodoret*, *Ch.* 4. of the Firſt Book of his Hiſtory; wherein he deſcribes the Troubles that were caus'd in the Church by *Arius* and his Faction, he lays open their Heretical Doctrine, and obſerves that they had withdrawn to ſome Biſhops who had received them into their Communion, and ſign'd Letters in their Favour, becauſe they diſguis'd their true Sentiments, and conceal'd the Poiſon of their corrupt Doctrine. He reprehends the Conduct of thoſe Biſhops, and accuſes them of having violated the Canon of the Apoſtles, by Patronizing the Actions of thoſe who deny'd the Divinity of Jeſus Chriſt. Afterwards he refutes the impious Opinion of the *Arians*, and proves from Teſtimonies of Scripture, That the Word was not a Creature made of Nothing, but that he ſubſiſted from all Eternity, and is equal to his Father, being of the ſame Nature with him, and that there never was a time when the Son of God was not, and that the Father was always a Father. After having thus Eſtabliſh'd the Divinity of the Son of God by moſt convincing Proofs drawn from the holy Scriptures, he proceeds to the Explication of the Articles contain'd in the Creed, concerning the Holy Spirit, the Incarnation of Jeſus Chriſt, and the Reſurrection of the Dead. He obſerves that Jeſus Chriſt had a real Body, and not an imaginary one, that he was Crucified and was dead; but his Divinity ſuffer'd nothing. He adds, That this is the Doctrine of the Apoſtolick Church, for which he is ready to die; and ſays, that *Arius* and *Achillas* were caſt out, becauſe they taught another Doctrine: wherefore he exhorts his Fellow-Biſhops to avoid them, and to joyn with him to repreſs their Inſolence. After all, he prays them to ſend him their Letters approving what he had done, and concludes his Letter with the Names of thoſe Hereticks whom he had Condemn'd and caſt out of the Church.

When the Biſhops who maintain'd *Arius* wrote alſo on their Side in his favour, *Alexander* found himſelf oblig'd to write again a large Letter on this Subject to all the Biſhops in the World, which is ſet down by *Socrates* and *Theodoret*, *Ch.* 6. of the Firſt Book of their Hiſtory. I know very well, that 'tis commonly thought that this Letter was written immediately after the Excommunication of *Arius*, before that which is in the Fourth Chapter of *Theodoret*: But this is a miſtake, ſince this Letter was written at the time when *Euſebius* of *Nicomedia* was fully declar'd a Patron of *Arius*. Wherefore *Alexander* having obſerv'd in this Letter, That ſince *the Catholick Church was but one Body, and all the Biſhops were oblig'd to preſerve Peace in it, It was expedient, that they ſhould reciprocally advertiſe one another of what happen'd in each Dioceſs; to the end, that when one Member was afflicted, all the reſt ſhould mourn, or elſe rejoice together with it.* " After he had begun his Letter " with this handſom Reflexion, he adds, That he had once a deſign to have buried this Diſorder in " Silence; but ſince *Euſebius* had taken upon him the Patronage of theſe Apoſtates, and had written " on all hands in their favour, he thought himſelf oblig'd to break Silence, and to give Notice to all " the World of this New Error, and to hinder his Fellow-Biſhops from giving credit to the Letters " which *Euſebius* might have written. After this, he inſerts the Names of theſe Hereticks, lays open " their Error, and refutes it in a few words. He ſays, That their Impiety was the cauſe why they were thrown out of the Church and ſmitten with an Anathema; and though he acknowledges that he was ſenſibly troubled for their loſs, yet he muſt not wonder that ſuch falſe Teachers ſhould ariſe and corrupt the Faith and Doctrine of Jeſus Chriſt, ſince we are forewarn'd of them by Chriſt and his Apoſtle.

Theſe Two Letters of *Alexander* were ſharp and vehement; wherein he purſues *Arius* and his Party vigorouſly, and having repreſented their Doctrine after ſuch a manner, as diſcovers all that's odious in it, he diſputes againſt it by many ſolid Arguments, and writes to his Fellow-Biſhops with great Aſſurance, and yet with due reſpect. In ſhort, one may ſay, That theſe Letters are the beſt in their kind.

Cotelerius has alſo publiſh'd a Letter, or a Paſtoral Advertiſement of *Alexander* to his Prieſts of *Egypt* and *Mareotis*, written after theſe Two Letters, in which he tells them, That tho' they had ſubſcrib'd to the Firſt Paſtoral Advertiſement which he had addreſs'd to *Arius* and thoſe of his Faction, wherein he exhorted them to return from their Impiety, and make Profeſſion of the Catholick Faith; yet he thought it ſtill neceſſary once more to Aſſemble the Clergy of *Alexandria* and *Mareotis*, to ſhew them the Letter which he had written to all the Biſhops ſince the firſt Condemnation of the *Arians*, and to give them Notice, that *Carus* and *Piſtus* Prieſts, *Serapion*, *Potamon*, *Zoſimus* and *Irenæus*, Deacons, having join'd themſelves to the other *Arians*, were depos'd. He demands their Conſent and Approbation, becauſe, ſays he, 'tis reaſonable that ye ſhould know what I have written, and imprint it in your Minds, as if you your ſelves had written it. This Monument of Antiquity, gives us to underſtand, That according to the Diſcipline of the Church of *Alexandria*, which was agreeable to that of other Churches, the Biſhop of that great See, held Synods of his Prieſts or Curates

Alexander Biſhop of *Alexandria.*

not only of thoſe that were in the City, but alſo of thoſe that were in the Country, and that he would do nothing without the Conſent and Approbation of his Clergy.

The Cauſe of *Arius* being afterwards carried into the Council of *Nice*, *Alexander* aſſiſted there, and held one of the Chief Places, as appears by the Council's Letter, to the *Alexandrians*, wherein they ſay, That he was Head of the Council and had a great Hand in all its Deciſions. He liv'd but five Months after this Council, and left *Athanaſius* Succeſſor to his See, and to his Zeal againſt the *Arians*.

St. ATHANASIUS.

St. *Athanaſius.*

ST. *Athanaſius* was born at *Alexandria* (*a*), but the preciſe Year of his Birth is not certainly known, neither do the Ancients tell us any thing of his Kindred (*b*). He was ſo young during the Perſecution of *Dioclefian* and *Maximian*, that when he ſpeaks of it, he does not ſay, that he had ſeen what he ſays, but only that he learn'd it of his Fathers (*c*). We know nothing either of his Infancy, or Education. *Ruffinus*, indeed, tells us, That St. *Athanaſius* being yet a Child, and playing with other Children, imitated the Ceremonies of the Church, and baptiz'd his Comrades; and that St. *Alexander* Biſhop of *Alexandria*, perceiving it, and having enquir'd the manner in which they were baptiz'd, he approv'd the Baptiſm, and from that time, deſign'd St. *Athanaſius* for the Clergy. But this Story, which, beſides its being ſo very improbable, cannot agree with the Age of St. *Athanaſius*, paſſes among Learned Men, rather for a Fable than a Truth (*d*). St. *Gregory Nazianzen*, aſſures us, in his Panegyrick on St. *Athanaſius*, that this Saint applied himſelf but a ſhort while to the profane Sciences, and proceeded quickly to the Study of the holy Scriptures. Afterwards he entred into the Clergy, and diſcharg'd his Function, when he was in Orders, with general Approbation, according to the Obſervation of *Theodoret*. He was particularly taken Notice of by *Alexander* his Biſhop, whom he accompanied to the Council of *Nice*, being then but a Deacon, and yet the firſt of the Deacons of his Church. He oppos'd there the Hereſy of *Arius*, and 'tis believ'd likewiſe, that he maintain'd a Diſputation againſt the Hereticks. When he return'd again to the City of *Alexandria*, *Alexander* caſt his Eyes upon him to make him his Succeſſor. *Apollinarius*, ſays, in a Paſſage related by *Sozomen*, *B.*II.*Ch.*17. of his *Hiſtory*, That St. *Athanaſius* fled to avoid being choſen Biſhop, and that *Alexander* being near his Death, did ſeveral times call for him. After the Death of this Biſhop, he was choſen Biſhop of *Alexandria*, in the beginning of the Year 326 (*e*), by the common Voice of all the People, and ordain'd by the Biſhops of *Egypt*, *Libya* and *Pentapolis* aſſembled in the City of *Alexandria*. This is the Teſtimony which the Biſhops of theſe Provinces give of his Ordination in a Synodical Letter reported by St. *Athanaſius*; Apol. 2. p. 726, where at the ſame time they refute the Calumny of the *Arians*, who ſaid, That *Athanaſius* was privately Ordain'd by ſeven Biſhops againſt the Will of all the reſt. The *Arians* and the Biſhops which Patroniz'd them, aſſoon as they ſaw St. *Athanaſius* their Adverſary promoted to this See, look'd upon this Promotion as a great Obſtacle to their Deſigns, and therefore reſolv'd to drive him out of the Church. And that they might execute this Deſign the more eaſily, they join'd with the Schiſmaticks call'd *Meletians*, (or rather (f) *Melitians*) becauſe they had follow'd the Party of an *Egyptian* Biſhop call'd *Meletius* or *Melitius*, who being depos'd in a Synod by *Peter* of *Alexandria*, for having Sacrific'd to Idols (*g*), ſeparated himſelf from the Church, and made a conſiderable Faction in *Egypt*.

(*a*) *At* Alexandria.] He was a Clergy-man of this Church, and the Clergy were commonly of that Place where they diſcharg'd their Office; but beſides this Conjecture, 'tis plain alſo that he was originally of *Alexandria* by the Letter of *Conſtantius*, who recalling him from his Exile, ſays that he would reſtore him to his own Country, *&c. Apol.* 2. *p.* 769, 770. and he takes his Country and Church for the ſame thing. *Orat.* 1. *contr. Ar.*

(*b*) *Of his Kindred.*] The Greek Author of his Life, who is very late, ſays that they were very noble and of great Piety; but he gives us no Name, nor cites any Author to warrant his groundleſs Aſſertion: His Aunt was a Catholick, and died during the Tyranny of *Gregory*, *Ep. ad Solit. p.* 817. You may ſee in a Latin Letter of this Saint related at the end of *Lucifer*'s Works, that during his Perſecution, he had not the Liberty to ſee his Parents, which may be underſtood of his Father and Mother, according to the proper Signification of the Latin Word.

(*c*) *But only that he learn'd it of his Fathers.*] In his Letter *ad Solitar p.* 855. *I heard from my Fathers, that the Perſecution was rais'd under* Maximian *Grandfather to* Conſtantius.

(*d*) *Rather for a Fable than a Truth.*] 1. This Story of Children baptiz'd by *Athanaſius*, does not at all agree with the Diſcipline of the Church of *Alexandria* upon the Subject of Rebaptization, and 'tis a thing unheard of that it ſhould be approv'd of, or that any could approve a Baptiſm of this Nature, as *Alexander* of *Alexandria* is ſuppos'd to have done. 2. It does not agree with the Age of St. *Athanaſius*, for *Alexander* was not ordain'd Biſhop of *Alexandria*, according to the Teſtimony of St *Jerom*, untill the Year 321. and St. *Athanaſius* being ordain'd Biſhop in 326. was not, in this Interval, of an Age to play ſuch little Pranks. And though it were ſuppos'd, againſt the Authority of St. *Jerom*, that *Alexander* was ordain'd in 315, this would not remove the Difficulty; for it cannot be ſaid, that St. *Athanaſius* play'd at this Sport when he was above 10. or 12. Years old, from whence it would follow that he was ordain'd Biſhop at the 25. or 27*th.* Year of his Age, which is not very probable.

(*e*) *In the Beginning of the Year* 326.] *Alexander* died five Months after the Council of *Nice*, and St. *Athanaſius* ſucceeded him immediately. St. *Epiphanius* ſays in *Hæreſ.* 68. and 69. that *Achillas* was choſen by the Catholicks after the Death of *Alexander*, and *Theonas* by the *Melitians*, and that *Athanaſius* was ordain'd three Months after: But all this Story is fabulous, becauſe *Achillas* was Biſhop of *Alexandria* before *Alexander*, and all Hiſtorians teſtify that St. *Athanaſius* ſucceeded *Alexander* immediately; and St. *Athanaſius* ſays as much expreſly in his 2*d* Apology.

(f) *Or rather* Melitians.] Their Leader is call'd by all the Ancients Μελίτιος, and never Μελέτιος.

(*g*) *For having ſacrific'd to Idols.*] St. *Athanaſius* teſtifies, that this was the Occaſion of the Schiſm of *Melitius*, which is much more credible than what St. *Epiphanius* reports to be the Origin of this Schiſm, after a fabulous manner, being deceiv'd by the Memoirs of ſome *Melitians*.

Thus

Thus the Biſhops that favour'd *Arius*, not being able to perſuade St. *Athanaſius* to receive him into his Communion, no more than his followers, tho' *Euſebius* had written him a threatning Letter to that purpoſe, did for that reaſon accuſe him of laying a New Tax upon all the Linen or Woollen Veſtments of the *Egyptians*, for the uſe of the Church of *Alexandria*; and deputed *Iſion*, *Eudemon*, and *Callinicus*, *Melitian* Biſhops, to carry this Accuſation to the Emperour. But *Alipius* and *Macarius*, Prieſts of *Alexandria*, being then at Court when this Accuſation was brought againſt St. *Athanaſius*, defended him, and demonſtrated his Innocence to the Emperour *Conſtantine*, who thereupon wrote to *Athanaſius* to come and appear before him. At that time *Euſebius* of *Nicomedia*, being reſolv'd at any rate to ruin St. *Athanaſius* at Court, caus'd theſe three Informers to ſtay there, who invented new Accuſations, alledging that the Prieſt *Macarius* had broken a Sacred Chalice by *Athanaſius*'s Order, and that *Athanaſius* himſelf had conſpir'd againſt the Emperour, by ſending a Cheſt full of Gold to *Philumenus* who deſign'd to Uſurp the Empire. But the Emperour himſelf having examin'd this Accuſation in one of their Suburbs of *Nicomedia*, call'd *Pſammathie*, declar'd St. *Athanaſius* Innocent of thoſe Crimes, and ſent him back to *Alexandria* with a very obliging Letter in his favour. This was done in the Year 331. The Enemies of St. *Athanaſius* not reſting ſatisfied with this Judgment, the next Year renew'd the Accuſation of the Chalice broken by *Macarius*, founded upon the Depoſition of one *Iſchyras* who call'd himſelf a Prieſt, altho' he was ordain'd by *Collythus*, who was not truly a Biſhop, and therefore had not Power to give him a valid Ordination. *Iſchyras* had dwelt at *Mareotis*, a Country of *Egypt*, where there was neither Biſhop nor Suffragan, but only a great many Pariſhes govern'd by Prieſts. He had one of theſe Churches, which *Athanaſius* underſtanding, ſent *Macarius* to forbid him when he viſited his Dioceſs, to Celebrate the Divine Myſteries, and to execute any part of the Sacerdotal Function. This gave the occaſion of accuſing *Macarius*, that he had broken one of the Sacred Chalices, altho' he found *Iſchyras* out of the Church and in his Bed. But to render St. *Athanaſius* more odious, they accuſe him of having put *Arſenius* to Death, who was Biſhop of *Hipſelz* in *Thebais*, and of the Faction of the *Melitians*. The Emperour who had already examin'd the firſt Accuſation, (which was likewiſe confounded by the Letter of *Iſchyras*, who acknowledg'd, that he was forc'd to invent this Calumny,) did not take any further notice of that Article, but wrote to *Dalmatius*, to enquire into the ſecond Accuſation, concerning the Murder of *Arſenius*. This oblig'd St. *Athanaſius* to ſearch every-where for this Biſhop whom the *Melitians* had hid in the Monaſteries at their Devotion: And at laſt, he was found at *Tyre*, where he was made known before *Paul* the Biſhop. Then St. *Athanaſius* having given notice to *Conſtantine*, that his Accuſers were convicted of an Impoſture, the Emperour wrote to *Dalmatius*, to ſtop all further Proceſs, and ſent a very obliging Letter to St. *Athanaſius*, wherein he exhorts him to Moderation, condemns the Rage of the *Melitians*, and promiſes him Protection. But for all this, the *Arian* Faction loſt not their Courage, nor did they ceaſe to contrive ſtill new Accuſations againſt him: Whereupon the Emperour being tormented with their continual Importunity, thought fit to call a Council, to put an end to all theſe Differences; which he order'd to meet at *Cæſarea*, in *Paleſtine*, where St. *Athanaſius* was Summon'd to appear. But this Saint, perceiving that the Council was compos'd of his Enemies, would not appear there. His Abſence, irritated the Emperour againſt him, who call'd another Council to meet at *Tyre*, in the Year 335, and wrote to St. *Athanaſius*, that he ſhould not fail to come there, which he did in ſuch Terms, as might make him ſenſible, that he was not ſatisfy'd with his Conduct. St. *Athanaſius* was forc'd to appear there in the quality of a Criminal; but he anſwer'd the Accuſation of the Murder of *Arſenius*, by producing him before the Council. *Ruffinus* ſays, That they ſtill went on to accuſe St. *Athanaſius*, by a Woman of an ill Life, who was preſently convicted of being a Cheat, becauſe ſhe took for him a Deacon call'd *Timotheus*, who feign'd himſelf to be *Athanaſius*. But this Hiſtory which is ſupported by no other Authority, but that of *Ruffinus*, appears very doubtful, becauſe neither St. *Athanaſius* nor the Council of *Alexandria*, which relates exactly all the Calumnies and Forgeries which were invented againſt St. *Athanaſius*, ſay any thing of it, which they had never omitted, if it had been propos'd. There were ſome other wandring Reports alledg'd againſt him, but wanting Proof, they inſiſted upon that of the Chalice, which was ſuppos'd to be broken by *Macarius*; and to inquire into this Crime, they ſent Six Biſhops to *Mareotis*, who were very reſolute againſt St. *Athanaſius*, who heard many Witneſſes to this purpoſe, in ſpite of all the Proteſtations of the Clergy of *Mareotis* and *Alexandria*. In the mean time, St. *Athanaſius* retires, and appeals to the Emperour; but the Synod condemns and depoſes him upon the Information at *Mareotis*. This was no ſooner done, but a Letter was brought from the Emperour, directed to the Biſhops of the Council, to come preſently to *Jeruſalem*, to Celebrate the Dedication of a Church. In the mean time, St. *Athanaſius* arrives at *Conſtantinople*, and deſires Audience of the Emperour to juſtify himſelf: But this was not granted, and all that he could obtain, was an Order, wherein the Emperour ſends for the Biſhops that had condemn'd him, to come to Court, and give an Account to him of their Proceedings. But inſtead of coming in a Body, they ſent only *Euſebius* of *Nicomedia* with Five other Deputies, who without ſaying any thing of the former Accuſations fram'd againſt St. *Athanaſius*, accus'd him now of having threatned to hinder the Exportation of Corn from *Alexandria* to *Conſtantinople*. The Emperour was ſo provok'd by this Accuſation, that without hearing St. *Athanaſius*, he baniſh'd him preſently to *Triers*, a City in *Gaul*; but would not ſuffer his Biſhoprick to be fill'd.

St. *Athanaſius*.

After the Death of *Conſtantine the Great*, the Three *Cæſars* his Sons, *Conſtantine*, *Conſtantius* and *Conſtans*, permitted all the Baniſh'd Biſhops to return to their Churches. St. *Athanaſius* was ſent back to *Alexandria* with Letters from *Conſtantine*, after he had been a Year and ſome Months in Exile.

St. *Athanaſius.*

Exile (*b*). This Emperour praiſes St. *Athanaſius* in his Letter, and ſays, That his Father would not have Baniſh'd him, but that the *Euſebians* had a deſign upon his Life, and that he had intended to recall him before his Death. He was no ſooner return'd to *Alexandria*, but his ancient Enemies attack him anew: They ſay, That ſince his Return, he had ſtirr'd up Sedition in the City, and caus'd ſome Perſons to be put in Priſon, and others to be us'd harſhly: but they chiefly inſiſted upon his Depoſition by the Synod, alledging that he was incapable, according to the Canons, of returning to his Church, or performing his Epiſcopal Function, till he was reſtor'd by another Synod. They inſinuated themſelves into the favour of *Conſtantius*, and moreover accuſe St. *Athanaſius* of Selling and taking Money for the Corn, which the Emperour had given to be diſtributed among the Poor, and the Widows of *Alexandria*. This Accuſation drew upon St. *Athanaſius* a very ſharp Letter from the Emperour. And the *Euſebians* not contented to have *Conſtantius* on their ſide, would alſo have gain'd the other two *Cæſars*, and therefore wrote to them againſt St. *Athanaſius*, but they fail'd of their aim, and were refus'd. They endeavour'd alſo to render Pope *Julius* favourable to them, by offering him the Arbitration of all their differences with St. *Athanaſius*. But this Pope having accepted their offer, and Summon'd them to come to a Council, they refus'd it. In the mean time, St. *Athanaſius* was abſolv'd by a Synod of almoſt a Hundred *Egyptian* Biſhops in the Year 339, who gave an Authentick Teſtimony of his Innocence in all the Heads of his Accuſation. On the other ſide, the *Euſebians* aſſembled a Council at *Antioch* in 341, where after they had made a new Creed different from that of *Nice*, they reſolv'd to ſend a Biſhop to *Alexandria*: for which end, they firſt pitched upon *Euſebius* of *Emeſa*; but he refuſing, they choſe one *Gregory*, and went to find out the Emperour, and pray'd that this *Gregory* might be ſent to *Alexandria*. St. *Athanaſius* having only heard of this Choice, withdrew to *Rome* in the Year 341 (*i*); where he was kindly receiv'd by Pope *Julius*, who admitted him to Communion, and ſent preſently Legates with Letters to *Euſebius*, and the other Biſhops, to cite them to *Rome*. But the *Euſebians* did not come at the day which *Julius* had appointed them, detain'd his Legates till the Month of *January* 342 (*k*), and ſent *Gregory* to *Alexandria*, who made himſelf Maſter of that Church by force, and uſed thoſe of *Athanaſius*'s Party very ill. While the *Euſebians* thus deſolated the Church of *Alexandria*, the Pope held a Council at *Rome* in the Church of *Vito* the Presbyter (*l*), towards the end of the Year 341 (*m*). There all the Accuſations of the *Euſebians* againſt St. *Athanaſius* were examin'd, he himſelf was juſtified, declar'd Innocent by all the Biſhops of the Council, and continued in Eccleſiaſtical Communion: but they determin'd nothing particularly about his Reſtauration (*n*) to the See of *Alexandria*. The Eaſtern Biſhops after a long delay at laſt made anſwer, towards the Beginning of the Year 342, by the Pope's Legates whom they ſent back, excuſing themſelves becauſe of the War of the *Perſians*, that they could not come to *Rome* at the Day that he had appointed, and blaming *Julius* for receiving *Athanaſius* into Communion after he was condemn'd, and for hearing a Cauſe anew, after it had been already determin'd. This Letter was written by a Synod of *Antioch*, held almoſt a Year after that which we have mention'd: And that which perplexes this Part of Hiſtory to this Day, is the want of diſtinguiſhing theſe two Councils of *Antioch*, or the placing them at different times. *Julius* having received this Letter, took ſome time before he anſwer'd it, thinking that ſome-body at leaſt would come from the Eaſtern Biſhops, but no-body coming, he wrote them a long Letter (*o*), which is ſet down by St. *Athanaſius*; wherein he gives an account of all his Proceedings, and reprehends theirs with great ſharpneſs.

The Cauſe of St. *Athanaſius* continued in this State till the Council of *Sardica*, Summon'd by the Emperours in the Year 347. The Biſhops of the Eaſt and the Weſt met there; but thoſe of the Eaſt

(*h*) *A Year and ſome Months in Exile.*] *Theodoret B.* II. *Ch.* 1. ſays, that he was there two Years and four Months, but he is miſtaken; for he was ſent into Baniſhment at the End of the Year 336, and was reſtor'd again *June* 15. 337. before the Sons of *Conſtantine* had taken upon them the Title of Emperors.

(*i*) *Withdrew to* Rome *in the Year* 341.] *Baronius* makes him go in the Year 339, and ſuppoſes he was twice there; but *Valeſius* has very well prov'd, that he was but once there, ſince he mentions but one Voyage. When he withdrew, he had only heard of the Ordination of *Gregory*, and the Perſecution which was preparing againſt him and his Church, as he himſelf ſays in theſe Words, μόνον ἀκούσας.

(*k*) *Till the Month of* January 342.] For ſo it muſt be read in the Letter of *Julius*, and not as *Baronius* thought.

(*l*) *In the Church of* Vito *the Presbyter.*] So the Words of *Julius* muſt be underſtood, συνελθόντες Ἐπίσκοποι ἔνθα ὁ Βίτων πρεσβύτερος συνήγαν, which are ill-tranſlated in theſe Words, *In the Church where* Vito *the Presbyter aſſembled them*: For he did not aſſemble the Biſhops but the People, according to the common Phraſe, *colligere Populum*, to hold a publick Aſſembly of their People in the Church. St. *Irenæus* ſays, *qui præterquam quod oportet colligunt*, which is ſpoken of Schiſmaticks, who made Aſſemblies out of the true Church.

(*m*) *Towards the end of the Year* 341.] *Valeſius* thinks that the Council of *Rome* was not held till the Year 342, after the Return of the Legates: But *Julius*, ſays plainly, that the Biſhops of *Italy* met at the Day appointed, and that the Legates were detain'd a long time after till the Month of *January*, in the Year 342.

(*n*) *They determin'd nothing particularly about his Reſtauration.*] *Julius* and St. *Athanaſius* ſay expreſly, that he was only aſſur'd of that Communion which had been granted him, and that his Enemies complain'd of nothing elſe.

(*o*) *He wrote them a long Letter.*] *Valeſius* thinks that this Letter was written by the Council, but that cannot be; for the Pope's Legates were return'd when it was written, and they were detain'd in the *Eaſt* after the Day appointed for the Council, as we have already noted. It does not at all appear by this Letter, whatſoever *Valeſius* ſays, that the Legates were return'd when it was written: On the contrary it is evident that the Council was held on the Day prefix'd, and that the Legates were then in the *Eaſt*. And therefore to reconcile theſe things, it muſt be ſaid, that the Letter was written after the Council, although by Order of the Council, which had charg'd *Julius* to write his Deciſion, and to anſwer the *1ſt*. Letter from the Eaſtern Biſhops, but not the *2d*, which was not yet arriv'd.

would

would not aſſiſt at the Council, unleſs St. *Athanaſius*, *Marcellus* of *Ancyra*, and the other Biſhops depos'd by them, would appear as Criminals and Perſons Excommunicated, and thoſe of the Weſt would not agree to this Condition: Whereupon the former withdrew, and the latter being left alone to the number of a Hundred, or thereabouts, pronounc'd the Sentence of Abſolution of *Athanaſius*, of *Marcellus* of *Ancyra*, and the other Biſhops that had been condemn'd, reſtor'd them to their Dignities, and condemn'd their Principal Adverſaries; while the Biſhops of the Eaſt on the other ſide, being Aſſembled at *Philippopolis*, wrote againſt thoſe Biſhops whom they condemn'd and Excommunicated *Julius*, *Hoſius* and the other Zealous Partiſans of St. *Athanaſius*. Things being at this paſs, there was no Security for St. *Athanaſius* to return to the Eaſt, without the Authority of the Emperour *Conſtantius*, who was Lord of that part of the World, and therefore he ſtay'd then at *Naiſſe*, a City of *Dacia*, till *Conſtans* commanded him to come to *Aquileia*, and granted him his Protection. St. *Athanaſius*.

The Death of *Gregory*, which happen'd in the Year 348, came very ſeaſonable to remove the chief Obſtacle of *Athanaſius*'s Return: For then, either becauſe *Conſtantius* knew his Innocence, and the Malice of his Accuſers, or becauſe he was deſir'd to do ſo by his Brother, he would not ſuffer any to be ordain'd Biſhop of *Alexandria*, recall'd St. *Athanaſius* who was gone from *Aquileia* to *Rome*, to take his Farewell, of the Church of that City and its Biſhop, and was come from thence to find out *Conſtantius*, and pray him to call his Enemies before him, that he might convict them in his Preſence. The Emperour would do no ſuch thing, but only ſent him back to *Alexandria*, with Letters directed to the Biſhops of *Egypt*, to the Clergy and the People of *Alexandria*, to which he adjoyn'd two Edicts to abrogate and annull all that had been done againſt this holy Biſhop. St. *Athanaſius* returning triumphantly with theſe Letters, was receiv'd even by the Biſhops that had been leſs favourable to him; and two of his greateſt Enemies, *Urſacius* and *Valens*, ſeem'd to be outwardly reconcil'd to him. The Emperour *Conſtans*, *Athanaſius*'s Patron, dying in the Month of *February*, 350, he had ſome jealouſie leſt *Conſtantius* ſhould renew that Perſecution which he had already made him ſuffer. But the Emperour ſent him word, that he ſhould not trouble himſelf on that account; That he deſign'd to keep him always in his See, and forbade his Enemies to attack him. Thus *Athanaſius*, who was not yet entred within his Dioceſs, arriv'd there at laſt in the Month of *March*, 350; where he was receiv'd with the Publick Rejoycing of the Biſhops of *Egypt*, his Clergy, and all the People. But he enjoy'd this Repoſe but a few Years, which ſeem'd to be granted him for ever; for after the Year 354, the Emperour *Conſtantius* ſent a Courtier of his to the City of *Alexandria* with Letters to him, wherein he gives him leave to retire from *Alexandria*, ſuppoſing that he had deſir'd it. St. *Athanaſius* ſeeing that this Order was founded upon a Falſe Suppoſition, was of opinion, that he ought not for this to go out of *Alexandria*. Twenty ſix Months after, *Diogenes* comes to *Alexandria*, and ſpreads a Report that the Emperour had given Order to drive away St. *Athanaſius* from this City; but ſince *Diogenes* brought no Letters from the Emperour, St. *Athanaſius* made Anſwer, that he ſhould either ſhow him a Letter from the Emperour, commanding him to depart from *Alexandria*, or at leaſt, that the Governour of *Egypt*, or General of the Army, ſhould deliver him an Order in writing to this purpoſe. Twenty three Days after, *Syrianus*, General of the Army in *Egypt*, entered with his Souldiers into the Church, on the 27*th*. of *January*, 356, abus'd the Clergy, the People and the Virgins that were there aſſembled. During this Tumult, St. *Athanaſius* being carried out by ſome Monks, ſav'd himſelf, and retir'd into a Deſart (*p*). *Conſtantius*, underſtanding what had paſs'd, ſent an Edict to thoſe of *Alexandria*, wherein he approves what was done againſt St. *Athanaſius*, and exhorts the Youth to purſue him. The Count *Heraclius* publiſh'd this Edict, and encouraged ſome lewd young Men of *Alexandria*, who entred into the Churches, beat all thoſe they met with, tore the Veils, the Seats and the Ornaments, and broke the Epiſcopal Chair in pieces, with ſuch Violence, that none could check thoſe Diſorders; which were yet further heightned upon the Arrival of *George*, who was ordain'd Biſhop of *Alexandria* by the Enemies of St. *Athanaſius*. For this Man being come into the City of *Alexandria* ſome Days before *Eaſter*, entred forcibly into the Church, and caus'd all thoſe that were for St. *Athanaſius* to be driven away. Who meeting together in the Cœmetery and the deſart Places, for the Celebration of the Divine Myſteries on *Eaſter*-Day, and the following *Sundays*, were driven from thence and beaten by the Souldiers; nay, and ſome of them loſt their Lives. In ſhort, becauſe the Biſhops of *Egypt* and *Libya*, were all for St. *Athanaſius*, they drove away Eighty of them, and ſent Six into Baniſhment. Theſe Outrages were authoriz'd by the Letter which *Conſtantius* wrote to the *Alexandrians*, in which he declares againſt St. *Athanaſius*, and enjoins them to obey *George*. Thus it was impoſſible for St. *Athanaſius* to return into the City of *Alexandria*, and therefore he was forc'd to lie hid in the Deſart, where he compos'd many Books.

St. *Athanaſius*.

After the Death of *Conſtantius*, *Julian* the Apoſtate became Maſter of the Empire, who taking no ſide in the Diſputes of Religion that were among the Chriſtians, permitted all the exil'd Biſhops to return to their Country. It happen'd at the ſame time, that *George*, who had intruded himſelf into the Church of *Alexandria*, was kill'd in a popular Sedition in the Year 362. His Death facilitated the Return of St. *Athanaſius* to the City of *Alexandria*, and his Reſtauration to his See in that City. When he was return'd, he aſſembled a Council to regulate the manner of receiving the *Arians*, who had a deſire to return into the boſom of the Church, and to compoſe ſome Differences which had happen'd in the Church of *Antioch*. But he could not long employ himſelf for the good of the Church, for the Pagans having rendred him odious to the Emperour *Julian*, he ſent an Order, directed to thoſe of *Alexandria*, importing that *Athanaſius* ſhould depart from their City, becauſe he had only permitted the

(p) *Retir'd into a Deſart.*] *Sozomen* and *Ruffinus* ſay, that he was hid in a Ciſtern, but *Athanaſius* ſays, that he retir'd into a Deſart, and continued there ever after.

Exil'd

St. *Athanaſius.*

Exil'd Biſhops to return into their Country, but not to re-enter upon their Sees. The People of *Alexandria*, who lov'd St. *Athanaſius* extremely, ſent Deputies to the Emperour, to pray him, that he would not force him out of *Alexandria*: But this Meſſage only provoked the Emperour againſt him, who thereupon preſently baniſh'd him, not only from *Alexandria*, but alſo from all *Egypt*. It is ſaid alſo, That he gave Secret Orders to put him to Death. St. *Athanaſius* having heard this News, fled beyond the River *Nile*: And 'tis reported, That he was follow'd very cloſe by thoſe that were ſent to ſtop him, and he returning the ſame way that they purſu'd him, met them on the Road; but when they enquir'd if he had ſeen *Athanaſius*, one of his Company anſwer'd, That he was not far off, and if they would make haſte, they might overtake him; and ſo having deluded them, he return'd to *Alexandria*. But be this as it will, 'tis certain, That he lay conceal'd till the Reign of *Jovian* a Chriſtian Prince, who ſucceeded *Julian*. In the Year 363, this Emperour came and found him with ſome other Biſhops of *Egypt*, at the City of *Antioch*, where they held a kind of a Synod (*q*); and there they drew up a Letter which was addreſs'd to the Emperour, wherein they propoſe to him the *Nicene* Creed, as the Rule of Orthodox Faith, and condemn thoſe that denied the Divinity of the Holy Spirit.

St. *Athanaſius* was alſo perſecuted under the Reign of *Valens*, who being baptiz'd in 367, by *Eudoxus*, an *Arian* Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, made an Edict, wherein he ordains, That all the Biſhops that had been depos'd under *Conſtantius*, ſhould be forc'd away from their Sees. The Governour of *Egypt* having receiv'd this Edict, prepar'd to put it in Execution againſt St. *Athanaſius*, but was hindred by the People. In the mean time, this Saint fearing leſt he ſhould be ſeiz'd, (as they really intended to do afterwards) and ſeeing the Commotions of the People appeas'd, retir'd to the Country into the Sepulchre of his Fathers, and lay there conceal'd for the ſpace of Four Months; but *Valens* was oblig'd to recall him. We are inform'd by the 47*th*. Letter of St. *Baſil*, That at this time St. *Athanaſius* had ſome Difference with the Governour of *Libya*, whom he Excommunicated; but we know nothing of the occaſion of this Quarrel. At laſt, St. *Athanaſius*, after ſo many Revolutions and Perſecutions, did happily end the courſe of this troubleſome Life, in the Year 373 of Jeſus Chriſt (*r*), after he had been Biſhop of *Alexandria* more than 48 Years. And thus I have given you in a few words the Hiſtory of this Saint, taken out of his own Works, and the Authors that wrote either his Life, or the Hiſtory of his time: Let us now give an Account of his Writings.

St. *Athanaſius* was one of thoſe Authors who were forc'd to write, and were engag'd to take Pen in hand, rather by an Obligation to defend themſelves, than upon any deſign to make Books; and therefore the greateſt Part of his Books, are either Apologies to juſtify himſelf, or Invectives againſt his Enemies, or Treatiſes of Controverſy againſt the Errors of the *Arians*. They are all written in the form of Letters, a way of Writing which is moſt ſimple in the Compoſure, and at the ſame time moſt natural, and moſt proper for one that is in a place of Retirement.

There is a great probability, that his Two Treatiſes againſt the Gentiles, were the firſt which he compos'd, becauſe he does not there attack the *Arians*, as he does in all the other Books which he made, after he had any perſonal Differences with them. The laſt of theſe Two Books, is entituled at preſent, *Concerning the Incarnation*, and *Theodoret* cites it under that Name; but St. *Jerom* gives them both the Title of, *Treatiſes againſt the Gentiles*, and indeed, they are both written rather to Convert Pagans, than to Inſtruct Chriſtians.

The next Work of St. *Athanaſius*, after theſe Two Treatiſes, is his Apologetick (*ſ*) to the Emperour *Conſtantius*, which he wrote ſometime after he was forc'd away from *Alexandria*, in the Year 356. He wrote alſo the ſame Year, Two Letters (*t*) upon the Perſecution which the Chriſtians of

(q) *At the City of* Antioch, *where they held a kind of a Synod.*] 'Tis commonly thought that this Synod was held at *Alexandria*: But *Valeſius* has well obſerv'd, that the Beginning of the Letter ſhows, that it was written by the Biſhops, deputed from the Provinces of *Egypt*, who were come to *Antioch*, where the Emperour was at that time.

(r) *In the Year* 373 *of Jeſus Chriſt.*] *Proterius* Biſhop of *Alexandria*, places the Death of St. *Athanaſius* in this Year, in a Letter to St. *Leo*; and St. *Jerom* ſays, that *Peter* of *Alexandria* was choſen the ſame Year. Theſe Authors are more credible than *Socrates*, *Ruffinus* and St. *Cyril*, who place it in the Year 371.

(ſ) *The next Work of St.* Athanaſius, *after theſe two Treatiſes, is his Apologetick.*] This was compos'd immediately, after his Retiring. Which he did with a Deſign to ſpeak it in the Preſence of *Conſtantius*: But underſtanding the Miſchiefs he had done to thoſe that favour'd him, he thought it not ſafe to come near him. His two Apologies and his Epiſtle to thoſe that lead a Monaſtick Life, were written after this, where he ſpeaks with much Sharpneſs and Freedom againſt *Conſtantius*, particularly, in his Letter to thoſe that lead a Monaſtick Life.

(t) *He wrote alſo the ſame Year, Two Letters.*] I ſay that theſe Two Letters were written a little while after the Enthroning of *George*, though I know *Baronius* is of Opinion, that the 1ſt. was written a long time before, when *Gregory* ſeized upon the Church of *Alexandria* and that the 2d. was written in 361. but this Opinion is not defenſible. As to the 1ſt. *Baronius* was deceiv'd by the Verſion, where he found ſometimes the Name of *Gregory*, and ſometimes that of *George*; but this Confuſion is avoided in the Greek, where one may always find the Name of *George*, when mention is made of him that came to intrude into the Church of *Alexandria*: But that which can never be anſwer'd, is, That *Gregory* is mention'd there as one that had been condem'd, long ago, and was no more. See the Place, *p.* 948. *For after all the Churches in the World had anathematiz'd* Gregory, *whom the* Arians *had formerly, πρότερον, made Biſhop; yet the ſame* Arians *preſently ſent* George *thither.* Here you ſee how *Gregory* and *George* are well diſtinguiſht We may add to this Authority, That the Circumſtances related in This Letter agree with the Enthronizing of *George*, and not at all with that of *Gregory*. It may be alledg'd for the Opinion of *Baronius*, 1. That 'tis ſaid in the Letter, *Philagrius* the Governour of *Egypt* introduc'd him, who is there ſpoken of, and 'tis very well known, that *Philagrius* carried *Gregory* to *Alexandria*: But I cannot ſee why he might not as well be employ'd to conduct *George* thither likewiſe. 2. 'Tis alledg'd, that 'tis ſaid in the Letter, that he who was ſent to *Alexandria* by

Alexandria

Alexandria ſuffer'd, when *George* took Poſſeſſion of that Epiſcopal See. The Firſt which was addreſs'd to the Biſhops of *Egypt*, is improperly call'd *The firſt Diſcourſe againſt the* Arians. The Second is written to all the Orthodox Biſhops. A little time after, he compos'd his Two Apologies in the place of his Retirement: 'Tis likewiſe very probable, that he wrote at that time his Four Treatiſes againſt the *Arians*, which he addreſs'd to the Monks, as we learn from the beginning of his Letter to *Serapion*, concerning the Death of *Arius*. His Letter to thoſe that lead a Monaſtick Life, is made up of two different Pieces: The Firſt is a Letter written to the Monks, which is a kind of Preface to ſome Treatiſe againſt the *Arians*, and may be ſo to that which follows; it contains about a Page and a half, and ends at theſe words in Page 810. *Gratia Domini Jeſu Chriſti ſit vobiſcum. Amen.* The following Treatiſe which was addreſs'd to thoſe that lead a Monaſtick Life, is a Hiſtory of all that paſs'd from the beginning of *Arianiſm*, to the fall of *Hoſius* and *Liberius*, *i.e.* to the Year 358. There are ſome Periods in the beginning, which are loſt, that not only this Treariſe has no Connexion with the Letter that precedes it, but alſo there is no Sence in the beginning of it: And I am aſtoniſh'd to think, that ſo many able Men ſhould read this Book without perceiving, or at leaſt without obſerving it. The Letter to *Serapion*, concerning the Death of *Arius*, was written after the Treatiſe which is directed to thoſe that lead a Monaſtick Life, as appears by the beginning of it. The Book of Synods was compos'd in 359 (*u*), before the Councils of *Seleucia* and *Ariminum*, were ended: He afterwards added in this Book, what concerns the Council of *Conſtantinople* in 360, and what is there ſaid concerning the Death of *Conſtantius*. The two Latin Letters which are at the End of the Works of *Lucifer Calaritanus*, were alſo written under *Conſtantius*. The Letter of the Council of *Alexandria*, to thoſe of *Antioch*, was written after the Death of that Emperour, in 362; the Letter of the Council of *Antioch*, under *Jovian*, was written in 363: That which is directed to all the Biſhops of *Egypt* and *Arabia*, *Syria* and *Phœnicia*, was written in 368, under the Reign of *Valens*, as well as that which is directed to the *Africans* (*x*). And the Letter to *Epictetus* was written laſt (*y*).

St. *Athanaſius*.

There are beſides, many other Works of St. *Athanaſius*, of which the Chronology is not known, which it concerns us to diſtinguiſh well from thoſe that are doubtful or ſuppoſititious. Theſe Works are in the Firſt Volume. The Homily upon theſe Words, *My Father hath given me all things*, p. 149. The Epiſtle to *Adelphius*, p. 155. That to *Maximus*, p. 162. Two Letters to *Serapion*, to prove, that the Son and the Holy Spirit are not Creatures, *p.* 166, and 173. An Expoſition of the Faith, *p.* 240. A Letter concerning the Hiſtory of the Deciſion of the Council of *Nice*, p. 248. A Letter of the Judgment of *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria* upon the Trinity, *p.* 548. A Treatiſe of the Union of the

the *Arians*, was ordain'd by *Euſebius*; and *Euſebius* was certainly dead in *George*'s time: But 'tis eaſy to anſwer this Difficulty, for 'tis not in the Greek Εὐσέβιοι, but οἱ περὶ Εὐσέβιον, the *Euſebians*, which is the Name that St. *Athanaſius* commonly gives to his Perſecutors. St. *Athanaſius* ſeems to ſay, that he was at *Alexandria* when this Trouble happen'd: but 'tis well known, that he was out of the City when *George* came thither, ſince he withdrew before *Eaſter*, and *George* did not thruſt himſelf into thoſe Churches till that time. To which I anſwer, That *Athanaſius* does not ſay, that he was at *Alexandria*, when *George* arriv'd there, but only when *Philagrius* publiſh'd the Edict againſt him. *Laſtly*, 'tis objected, that 'tis ſaid towards the end of this Letter, that they would have a Council aſſembled at *Rome* in the preceeding Year? but the Roman Church, ſay they, was not then in a Condition to have aſſembled in the Year 356, becauſe *Liberius* was then in Exile. *Anſw.* This Objection is eaſily deſtroy'd, for *Liberius* and the other Biſhops of *Italy* had many times deſired the aſſembling of a Council. 1. By their Legates ſent to *Milan* in 354. 2. In 355. before *Liberius* went from *Rome*. And, 3. When he was come to Court. St. *Athanaſius* therefore might ſay truly in 356, that thoſe of *Rome* had deſired a Council the Year before. The Letter to the *Egyptians* was written before *George* arriv'd at *Alexandria*, for there he is mention'd as one ready to be ſent thither, *p.* 290. and he is deſcrib'd as one that was not yet known to the *Egyptians*. There *Cecropi* is mention'd as a Biſhop alive; but he was ſwallowed up by an Earthquake which deſtroy'd *Nicomedia* in 358. There *Liberius* and *Hoſius* are mention'd with Commendation, who fell away in 357. *Baronius* objects Two Things to prove that it was not written till 360. *1ſt.* Becauſe it is ſaid there, that it was now 36. Years ſince the *Arians* were declar'd Hereticks: *2dly* becauſe mention is made in it of a Creed which they would have ſign'd; but we read of none, that there was at this time. In Anſwer, to the *1ſt.* Objection it may be ſaid, that the Figures are wrong, or rather that we muſt count the 36 Years from the *1ſt* Synod held by *Alexander* againſt the *Arians*. 'Tis more eaſy to anſwer the *2d.* by ſaying, That the *Arian* Biſhops might make a Creed when they ſent *George*; beſides that, *Athanaſius* ſays onely that he heard ſay, they had made one, and not that they had done it. Be it as it will, this *1ſt.* Treatiſe againſt the *Arians* is a Letter to the Biſhops of *Egypt*, which has nothing of Affinity with the Subject and Matter of the other Four: The Oration that follows begins as a new Diſcourſe, and St. *Cyril* cites a Paſſage out of the *3d* Book of *Athanaſius* concerning the Trinity, which is found in that which is now call'd the *4th.* and *Theodoret* cites one taken out of the Second, which is now in the *3d.* Treatiſe.

(*u*) *The Book of Synods was compos'd in* 359] This is evident, becauſe he does not finiſh the Hiſtory of the Council of *Ariminum*, concluding with the Nomination of the *1ſt.* Deputies which were ſent to the Emperour; and at the End he adds the Letter of *Conſtantius*, and the generous Anſwer of the Biſhops, which he had learn'd afterwards. He ſpeaks always of that Council as a thing preſent, and with Commendation; and he ſays nothing more of what paſs'd at *Conſtantinople* after the Council of *Seleucia*. This Book is probably that which St. *Jerom* ſays, St. *Athanaſius* had Written againſt *Urſacius* and *Valens*, unleſs we ſhould rather ſay, that it was a Work ſubjoin'd to his Letter to thoſe that lead a Monaſtick Life.

(*x*) *As well as that which is directed to the* Africans.] This is to the Biſhops of the Weſtern *Africa*, and not to thoſe of *Cyrenaick*, as *Baronius* thought, who ſays, that theſe Letters were written under the Pontificate of *Damaſus*.

(*y*) *And the Letter to* Epictetus *was written laſt.*] He obſerves in this Letter, that *Auxentius* and the other *Arians*, were anathematiz'd by the Councils of *France*, *Spain* and *Rome*. St. *Cyril* ſays that it was corrupted, but that which we now have, agrees with that which is related by the Emperour.

St. *Athanaſius.*

Humane Nature to the Word, which is cited by *Theodoret*, under the Name of, *A Book againſt the* Arians, *p.* 595. Two Books of the Incarnation, againſt *Apollinarius*, p. 614, 633. A Treatiſe againſt the Followers of *Sabellius*, p. 650. An Epiſtle to *John* and to *Antiochus*, p. 951. An Epiſtle to *Palladius*, p. 952. An Epiſtle to *Dracontius*, p. 955. An Epiſtle to *Marcellinus*, concerning the Interpretation of the *Pſalms*, p. 959. The Homily of the Sabbath and Circumciſion, *p.* 964. A Treatiſe upon the Words of Jeſus Chriſt, *Whoſoever ſhall be guilty of blaſphemy againſt the Holy Ghoſt, it ſhall not be forgiven him, neither in this World, nor in that which is to come*, p. 970.

In the Second Volume, there are few of his Genuine Works; but here follow thoſe which we own. Two Letters to *Serapion*, concerning the Divinity of the Holy Spirit, *p.* 10. and 16. A ſhort Diſcourſe againſt the *Arians*, p. 22. The Conferences of St. *Athanaſius* with the *Arians*, in the preſence of *Jovian*, from *p.* 27. to *p.* 29. An Epiſtle to *Ammon*, p. 35. A Fragment of one, *p.* 39. A Feſtival Epiſtle, *p.* 38. An Epiſtle to *Ruffinian*, p. 40. A Book of the Abridgment of the Holy Scripture, *p.* 55. All theſe Works, whereof ſome are cited by the Ancients, agree well enough with the Stile of St. *Athanaſius*, and they contain nothing in my Opinion, which gives juſt cauſe to ſuſpect them of Forgery (*z*).

There is not any of the other Works, that bear the Name of St. *Athanaſius*, beſides thoſe which we have already mention'd, that is Genuine, but they are all either manifeſtly Suppoſititious, or very doubtful.

The Treatiſe which has this Title, *That there is but one Jeſus Chriſt*, altho' it be ancient, yet is not written by St. *Athanaſius*. For, Firſt, This Author places *Marcellus* of *Ancyra*, amongſt the Hereticks, whereas St. *Athanaſius* always communicated with him as a Catholick Biſhop, even in the laſt Years of his Life, as appears by the Letters of St. *Baſil*, which complain of St. *Athanaſius* upon this occaſion. Secondly, The Author of this Treatiſe, acknowledges but one only *Hypoſtaſis* in Jeſus Chriſt, whereas St. *Athanaſius* always took this Word, rather to ſignify the Nature, than to denote the Perſon (*aa*).

For this laſt Reaſon we ought alſo to reject the little Treatiſe of the Incarnation againſt *Paulus Samoſatenus*, which is in the Firſt Volume of St. *Athanaſius*, p. 591. becauſe the Author of it owns three *Hypoſtaſes* in the Trinity.

The Refutation of the Hypocriſie of *Meletius*, is rather the Work of *Paulinus* of *Antioch*, or ſome of his Party, than of St. *Athanaſius*, who was neither ſo conceited of the Notion of three *Hypoſtaſes*, nor ſo tranſported with anger againſt *Melctius*, as the Author of this Treatiſe was.

(*z*) *Which gives juſt cauſe to ſuſpect them of Forgery*] Yet there is ſome Doubt of ſome of thoſe Works which are mention'd in this place; but the Conjectures which are alledg'd have little Solidity. Some have doubted of the Letters to *Serapion*, but theſe are written in the Stile of St. *Athanaſius*. The two which are in the 2*d.* Volume, are an Abridgment of the 2*d.* which is in the 1*ſt.* Volume. The Expoſition of Faith which is in *p.* 240. of the 1*ſt.* Volume, is cited by *Facundus*, *B.* XI. *Ch.* 6. The Treatiſe of the Union of the humane Nature is cited by *Theodoret* in his 2*d.* and 3*d.* Dialogue: And ſo it cannot be deny'd, that it is St. *Athanaſius*'s, eſpecially ſince it has his Stile, although the Author of St. *Athanaſius*'s Life affirms the contrary. The 2*d.* *B.* of the Incarnation againſt *Apollinarius* is no ways doubtful, but the 1*ſt.* is call'd in queſtion, which is more obſcure and leſs methodical: Yet *Leontius B.* II. againſt *Eutyches*, cites the 2*d.* under the Name of the 2*d.* Treatiſe of St. *Athanaſius* againſt *Apollinarius*. The Letter to *Marcellinus* about the Interpretation of the *Pſalms*, is in all Probability that which St. *Jerom* and *Caſſiodorus* call a Treatiſe of the Titles of the *Pſalms*, becauſe it contains the Subject and Argument of every *Pſalm*. The Epiſtle to *Serapion* of the Death of *Arius*, is cited by the Ancient Hiſtorians. The Homily of the Sabbath and of Circumciſion is not wholly of St. *Athanaſius*'s Stile, but the Difference is very inconſiderable. Some have doubted of the Tract upon theſe Words, *Whoſoever ſhall ſpeak Blaſphemy againſt the Holy Spirit*; but unjuſtly, for this Tract has not only the Stile of S. *Athanaſius*, but alſo is prov'd to be really his, becauſe *Gobarus* in *Photius Cod.* 232. teſtifies, that St *Athanaſius* had many times cited *Theognoſtus*, who is not found cited but in this Book, and in the Treatiſe of the Judgment of *Denys* of *Alexandria*. And, *Laſtly*, becauſe the Treatiſe which we now diſcourſe of, is cited in the Council of *Lateran*, held under *Martin* the 1*ſt.* in the Year 549 I think we ought not to reject the Conferences of St. *Athanaſius* with the *Arians* before *Jovian*. 'Tis certain that St. *Athanaſius* came to find out this Emperor; and *Philoſtorgius* ſays, that the *Arians* came to accuſe St. *Athanaſius* in his Preſence. Moreover, they are written with great Simplicity, and appear to be very Ancient. *Scultetus* doubts of the Letter to *Ammon*, becauſe it preferrs *Cœlibacy* to Marriage, alledging that St. *Athanaſius* taught the contrary in his Letter to *Dracontius*: But he was miſtaken. The Fragment of the 39*th.* Feſtival Epiſtle ought to be receiv'd as undoubtedly his, after St. *Jerom*'s Teſtimony, who ſays, that St. *Athanaſius* wrote thoſe Letters which bear his Name. I ſay the ſame of the Abridgment of the Holy Scripture, which is upon the ſame Subject with this Feſtival Epiſtle, and has the ſame Opinions of the Canonical Writers. Some doubt of this laſt Treatiſe; 1. becauſe the Author calls *Lucian*, who was a Ring-leader of the *Arians*, a holy Martyr. 2. Becauſes he does not reckon the Book, entituled *Paſtor*, among uſeful Books, as St. *Athanaſius* does in his 39*th.* Letter, and in his Book of the *Nicene Synod*. But 'tis eaſy to anſwer theſe Conjectures. As to the 1*ſt*, That St. *Athanaſius* did not think that *Lucian* was of the ſame Opinion that *Arius* had afterwards, or that knowing he died in the Boſom of the Church, he thought that he ought not to condemn him: Or *Laſtly*, that he cited him as commonly he had been accuſtom'd to cite him. As to the 2*d.* That he ſays nothing of the Truth of the Book entituled *Paſtor*, but neither does he reject it as a wicked Book, and by Conſequence there can nothing be built upon this Conjecture.

(*aa*) *St.* Athanaſius *always took this Word, rather to ſignify the Nature, than to denote the Perſon*] The Council of *Nice* ſeems to have taken the Word *Hypoſtaſis* in this Sence, when it condemns thoſe who ſay, that the Word is another *Hypoſtaſis*, or Subſtance. St. *Athanaſius* ſays often in his 5*th.* Oration, that the Father and the Son are one *Hypoſtaſis* only; and in his Letter to the *Africans*. That the *Hypoſtaſis* is the Subſtance. In ſhort, though the Synod of *Alexandria* was perſuaded that this Difference concern'd not Matters of Faith, yet they approv'd more the Opinion of thoſe who take *Hypoſtaſis* for Nature.

The

The Book of Virginity (*bb*), has nothing of the Stile of St. *Athanaſius*, and it contains ſome Precepts very remote from the Genius and Diſcipline of his time. There is a Difference between him that wrote upon this Subject, who is cited by *Theodoret*, and him whom St. *Jerom* mentions. St. *Athanaſius.*

The Treatiſe of Teſtimonies drawn from the Holy Scriptures, to prove the Eſſential Unity of the Three Perſons of the Holy Trinity, is none of St. *Athanaſius*'s. 1. Becauſe the Author there relates ſome Paſſages of the Queſtions to *Antiochus*, which were written a long time after St. *Athanaſius* as we ſhall ſhew hereafter. 2. The Stile of this Treatiſe is very different from than of St. *Athanaſius*. 3. He uſes childiſh Expreſſions, and gives impertinent Definitions of Angels and Men.

The Homily of the Annunciation, or of the Virgin, is alſo written by a later Author that St. *Athanaſius*. 1. Becauſe he expreſly refutes the Error of *Neſtorius*, and that of the *Monothelites*: and yet neither St. *Cyril*, nor any other Catholick Author, alledges this Book againſt thoſe Hereticks. 2. In explaining the Doctrine of the Church, he uſes ſuch Terms, as were not in uſe till after the *Neſtorians* and *Eutychians* time; as when he ſays, That he acknowledges two Natures in Jeſus Chriſt, *without Confuſion or Mixture, without Change or Diviſion*, Terms which were not us'd till after the Council of *Epheſus*. 3. He deteſts the Error of thoſe that call'd Jeſus Chriſt, a Man-bearing God, an expreſſion which St. *Athanaſius* did not reject, and the Ancients ſometimes made uſe of, and which was not condemn'd till after *Neſtorius* had abus'd it. 4. He gives a ridiculous Etymology of the Greek Word ὑσία, by ſaying, that it comes from ἰσία, which is not a Greek Word.

The Life of St. *Syncletica (cc)*, publiſh'd in Latin, by *Bollandus*, and in Greek, by the Learned *Cotelierius*, in his Firſt Volume of the Monuments of the Greek Church, is ſuſpected of falſhood, becauſe no body mentions it before *Nicephorus*; and in ſome Manuſcripts, 'tis aſcrib'd to a Monk named *Polycarp*; beſides that, it has nothing of the Stile of St. *Athanaſius*.

The Life of St. *Anthony* has better Authority *(dd)*; for St. *Jerom* and St. *Gregory Nazianzen*, ſay poſitively, That St. *Athanaſius* wrote the Hiſtory of the Life of this Father of Monks; but ſtill 'tis doubted, whether that which we now have, be not different from that which was know to theſe Ancients. *Rivet* and other Proteſtant Criticks, being Enemies of all thoſe Books which concern Monkery, boldly reject this Life, as a ſuppoſititious Work: But their Reaſons are not wholly convincing and all the Circumſtances of the Life of St. *Anthony*, related by the Ancients, are to be found in this Book, and therefore I think it very probable that this was St. *Athanaſius*'s, altho' ſomething might be added or chang'd in it, as it often happen'd to Books of this nature.

The Creed which bears the Name of St. *Athanaſius (ee)*, paſs'd a long time without any Contradiction as a Work which was truly this Father's; and yet, now all the World agrees, that 'twas none of his,

(bb) *The Book of Virginity.*] This Book is written in a low Stile, and contains Precepts about the Quality of the childiſh Clothes of Virgins: There are in it Expreſſions unworthy of St. *Athanaſius*, as when he calls a Virgin, the Dancer of Jeſus Chriſt. *Theodoret*, *B.* II. of his Hiſt. *Ch.* 4. cites a Paſſage out of a Book of St. *Athanaſius* addreſs'd to Virgins, which is not to be found in this Treatiſe, which ſhows that this is not the genuine Treatiſe of St. *Athanaſius*.

(cc) *The Life of St.* Syncletica.] 'Tis cited as St. *Athanaſius*'s by *Nicephorus Calliſtus*, and there is a Manuſcript of it which bears his Name; but in another 'tis aſcribed to a Monk named *Polycarp*, which is very likely to be true: For the Stile is unworthy of St. *Athanaſius*. It is full of childiſh Compariſons, which are to be met with almoſt in every Period, and agree much better to a Monk, than to St. *Athanaſius*.

(dd) *The Life of St.* Anthony *has better Authority.*] 'Tis alledg'd againſt this Life, to prove that it is not St. *Athanaſius*'s, that this Saint relates the Death of *Balacius*, after another manner than it is related in this Life: For St. *Athanaſius* ſays, in his Epiſtle to thoſe that lead a Monaſtick Life. That the Letter of St. *Anthony* was written to *Gregory*, who gave it to *Balacius*; whereas in the Life of St. *Anthony*, it is ſaid, that this Letter was addreſs'd to *Balacius* himſelf. 2*dly*, 'Tis reported in the Life of St. *Anthony*, that *Balacius* was killed by *Neſtorius* the Governour of *Egypt*'s Horſe, who accompanied him: Whereas St. *Athanaſius* ſays, that the Horſe upon which *Balacius* rode, did bite him: But theſe Differences are of little Conſequence, and the ſame Author may relate differently ſuch kind of little Circumſtances, either through the Fault of his Memory, or becauſe he is better inform'd at one time than another. The Difference of Stile which is to be met with, between this Letter and the other Works of St. *Athanaſius*, gives us more Trouble: But it may be that he proportion'd his Stile in this Life, both to the Matter, and the Capacity of the Monks for whom he wrote it. This is certain, the Ancients do teſtify, that St. *Athanaſius* wrote the Life of St. *Anthony*, and all that they report of it, is found to agree with what is ſaid in that Book which we now have. See St. *Chryſoſt. Homil.* 8. on *Matth*, St. *Auſtin* in his *Confeſſions*, *Palladius Hiſt. Lauſ. Ch.* 8. *Socrates Lib.* I. *c.* 17. and *Lib.* IV. *c.* 14. All which makes me think, that 'tis not convenient to reject it.

(ee) *The Creed which bears the Name of St.* Athanaſius.] The Reaſons that convince me that this Creed is none of St. *Athanaſius*'s are theſe. 1. Becauſe 'twas not known till the Sixth Century. 2. Becauſe St. *Athanaſius* never would make a Confeſſion of Faith, nor a Creed, being perſuaded he ought to keep to that of *Nice*. 3. Becauſe this Creed rejects ſo plainly the Errors of the *Neſtorians*, *Eutychians*, and *Monothelites*, that 'tis eaſy to perceive, 'twas made ſince thoſe Hereticks, on purpoſe to reject their Errors. 4. The Stile and Terms do plainly ſhow, that this Creed was made by a Latin, and not by a Greek, Author. 5. No Account can be given, upon what Occaſion, at what Time, and for what Reaſon, St. *Athanaſius* ſhould make this Creed. See *Voſſius* in his Book *De Tribus Symbolis*. 6. It appears by the Terms, that 'twas the Work of a Latin Author. 7. 'Tis not found among the ancient Manuſcripts of St. *Athanaſius*. 'Twas made ſince the Council of *Chalcedon*, as the Reaſons we have now given do clearly prove. 'Tis cited in the Council of *Autun*, in the Year 670, and there we read in the Fourth Council of *Toledo*, in 633, ſome Phraſes which ſeem to be taken out of this Creed. But it muſt be confeſs'd, that this laſt Council does not ſay, That they were taken out of the Creed of St. *Athanaſius*, and that there is no certainty, that this Canon of the Council of *Autun*, where mention is made of St. *Athanaſius*'s Creed, is ſo ancient, as we have ſaid, ſince it is not found among the Canons of that Council under *Leodegarius*; but in a Collection of thoſe Canons taken out of the Library of the Monaſtery of St. *Benignus* of *Dijon*. *Hincmar*

St. *Athanaſius.*

but ſome Authors that liv'd a long time after him. 'Tis not certainly known whoſe it is; ſome have attributed it to ſome *French*; others, as Father *Queſnel*, think, that 'tis written by *Vigilius Tapſenſis*, who liv'd towards the End of the Fifth Age of the Church. Howſoever this be, 'tis certain that 'twas compos'd after the Council of *Chalcedon*, becauſe it rejects ſo formally the Errors of the *Neſtorians* and *Eutychians*, that 'tis evident it aims at theſe two Hereſies.

St. *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, in his Book addreſs'd to Queens, and his Defence of the Eighth Anathematiſm, cites a Confeſſion of Faith under the Name of St. *Athanaſius*, about the Incarnation of Jeſus Chriſt, which is ſtill found among the Works of this Father, in the Second Vol. *P.* 30. St. *John Damaſcene*, *B.* III. *Of the Orthodox Faith*, *Ch.* 6. and *Theorianus*, attribute it to St. *Athanaſius*. *Baſil* of *Seleucia*, in the Firſt Act of the Council of *Conſtantinople*, ſays, 'Twas reported that St. *Athanaſius* was the Author of an Expreſſion which is found in this Confeſſion of Faith, *viz.* *That the Word had but one Nature Incarnate.* But *Leontius* in his Book of Sects, denies that St. *Athanaſius* was the Author of this Sentence, and the Catholick Biſhops at a Conference held at *Conſtantinople* againſt the *Severians* in the Year 533, have alſo rejected it, as being falſly attributed to St. *Athanaſius*. And truly the Doctrine and Expreſſions of this Confeſſion of Faith about the Incarnation, do not at all agree with thoſe of St. *Athanaſius* in his Books of the Incarnation; in which he does not only ſay nothing which may favour the Error of the *Eutychians*, but alſo he formally rejects it, and rather favours the contrary Opinion.

The other Works attributed to St. *Athanaſius*, are yet more manifeſtly Suppoſititious, and no body almoſt has acknowledg'd them for Genuine. The Diſpute againſt *Arius* (*ff*) which is in the Firſt Volume, is a Dialogue compos'd under the Names of St. *Athanaſius* and *Arius*, by ſome body that liv'd long after. This is plain, and all the World is agreed in't; but 'tis not known who is the Author of it. Some have attributed it to *Vigilius Tapſenſis*; but for my part, I rather believe that 'tis the Work of a Greek, than a Latin Author, and that it may well be attributed to *Maximus*.

The Letter of *Liberius* to St. *Athanaſius*, and the Anſwer of this Saint to *Liberius* (gg), agree not at all with the Hiſtory of theſe two Biſhops, and have no reſemblance of their Stile.

The Explication of theſe words of Jeſus Chriſt to his Apoſtles, *Go to the Village that is over againſt you, and there ye ſhall find a Colt tied* (*hh*); the Homily upon the Paſſion (*ii*) of Jeſus Chriſt, and that upon the Seed (*kk*), which are found at the End of the Firſt Volume, have neither the Stile nor the Air of St. *Athanaſius*, and contain many things unworthy of him.

and *Abbo*, who liv'd about the Tenth Century; *Radulphus*, *Haimo*, *Hugo*, and ſome other Ancient Frenchmen have cited it as St. *Athanaſius*'s. The Greeks alſo, as *Manuel Calecas*, Lib. 2. have made no ſcruple to aſcribe it to him, *Pitheus* thought that a Frenchman compos'd it, becauſe the French Authors were the firſt that expreſly cited it: and perhaps ſome Frenchman did draw this Creed, partly from the Council of *Toledo*, and put the Name of St. *Athanaſius* to it. Father *Queſnel* is of opinion, that 'twas the Work of *Vigilius Tapſenſis*, and it muſt be confeſs'd, that his Conjectures are very probable; For, 1ſt. This Author has forg'd many Books under the Names of the Fathers, and particularly under the Name of St. *Athanaſius*. 2. In all his Writings he oppoſes the *Neſtorians* and *Eutychians*, and this Creed attributed to St. *Athanaſius*, is directly againſt the Errors of thoſe Hereticks. 3. The ſame *Vigilius* made ſeveral Confeſſions of Faith under the Name of St *Athanaſius*. 4. The Firſt part of the Creed ſeems to be a Recapitulation of the Chapters of *Vigilius Tapſenſis*'s Book againſt *Vurimadus*: and even in the Third Book, the Three firſt Chapters contain theſe Propoſitions, *Deus Pater*, *Deus Filius*, *Deus Spiritus Sanctus*; *Dominus Pater*, *Dominus Filius*, *Dominus Spiritus Sanctus*; *Omnipotens Pater*, *Omnipotens Filius*, *Omnipotens Spiritus Sanctus*, which are word for word in the Creed. Theſe are the Conjectures of Father *Queſnel*, to which one may adhere ſo much the rather, while there is nothing to be had more certain about this Matter. Be it as it will, 'tis certainly the Work of a Latin Author, which has been ſince tranſlated into Greek, which is the reaſon why the Greek Copies differ among themſelves.

(ff) *The Diſpute againſt* Arius.] 'Tis evident that 'tis not a Conference made in the Council, but only a fictitious Dialogue made by ſome body, under the Names of St. *Athanaſius* and an *Arian*, and not of *Arius*; for the Catholick ſays, That his Adverſary is a Monſter come out of the Sect of *Arius*. The Author of this Dialogue is ſo ignorant, that he thinks the Council of *Nice* was held in the Year 310.

(gg) *The Letter of* Liberius *to St.* Athanaſius, *and the Anſwer of this Saint to* Liberius.] Theſe Letters neither agree with St. *Athanaſius*, nor with *Liberius*: The laſt to St. *Athanaſius* is ſo written, as if there were ſome doubt of his being a Catholick: He requires him to Anathematize *Arius* and *Sabellius*, *that I*, ſays he, *may obey your Commands*. The Letter of *Liberius* and the Anſwer of St. *Athanaſius*, are written as if they were Confeſſions of Faith, and they favour the Error of *Neſtorius*. The Stile of theſe two Letters is Childiſh and mean. The Letter attributed to *Liberius*, begins with a *Then*.

(hh) *The Explication of theſe words of Jeſus Chriſt*, Go to the Village that is over againſt you, and there ye ſhall find a Colt tied.] This Homily is a Fragment of ſome Commentary upon the Goſpel. It is not the Stile of St. *Athanaſius*. He explains all the paſſages of Scripture in a myſtical ſence, and draws from thence Allegories, which have more of ſubtilty than ſolidity. It is very different from the Air of St. *Athanaſius*, which is grave and ſerious; and beſides, he generally interprets the Scripture in its natural ſence.

(ii) *The Homily upon the Paſſion.*] This alſo is not written in the Stile of St. *Athanaſius*; for though it be ſomething more Sublime than the former, yet it comes not near the Gravity of this Father's Stile. There are ridiculous things related in it of the Fear of Chriſt. 'Tis ſaid, that he counterfeited the Fear of Death, leſt the Devil ſhould not withdraw, and that when the Devil heard him cry out, *Eli*, *Eli*, he had the boldneſs to attack him: But on the contrary, St. *Athanaſius* in his Fourth Dialogue againſt the *Arians*, does expreſly deny that Jeſus Chriſt counterfeited any Fear, and aſſures us, that as Man he was really afraid. The Author of this Homily diſallows all Oaths, whereas St. *Athanaſius* approves them upon ſeveral occaſions.

(kk) *And that upon the Seed.*] Or rather upon the Action of the Diſciples, who ate the Ears of Corn upon the Sabbath-Day. 'Tis found only in one Manuſcript, and it has nothing excellent, nor is it written in the Stile of St. *Athanaſius*.

The

The Diſcourſe *againſt all Hereſies*, which is the laſt Work of the Firſt Volume of St. *Athanaſius*, is confus'd, and the Stile mean, as is obſerv'd in an Ancient Manuſcript. He oppoſes in a few words all Hereſies, contrary to the Cuſtom of St. *Athanaſius*, who refutes very largely all thoſe he takes in hand. The Oration upon the Aſcenſion of Jeſus Chriſt, is of a Stile more florid than that of St. *Athanaſius* the Phraſes are forc'd and tumid, whereas St. *Athanaſius* writes in a Simple and Natural Stile. The Oration of *Melchiſedeck* cannot be St. *Athanaſius*'s, ſince the Author mentions the Fathers of the Council of *Nice* as dead long before. St. *Athanaſius.*

The Letter of *Jovian* to St. *Athanaſius*, and that of St. *Athanaſius* to *Jovian*, which are in the Second Volume, are much to be ſuſpected. That of St. *Athanaſius* diſcovers the Forgery, becauſe it contains a Confeſſion of Faith different from that of the Council of *Nice*, and 'tis certain that he ſent, no other to this Emperour. The Author of this Letter writes in ſuch terms, as plainly diſcover that he was not St. *Athanaſius*, but rather *Apollinarius*, ſince he acknowledges but one Nature in Jeſus Chriſt; and indeed, *Leontius* teſtifies that *Apollinarius* had inſerted this Doctrine in a Letter to the Emperour *Jovian*. The Book of Definitions, which are pretended to be Collections out of St. *Clement*, and other Holy Fathers, cannot be St. *Athanaſius*'s, ſince the Author cites in it *Gregory Nyſſen*, in the Chapter *of the Act*. Moreover, he ſpeaks of two Natures and one Perſon in Jeſus Chriſt, as if he had written after the Birth of the Hereſies of *Neſtorius* and *Eutyches*. A good part of the Book is taken out of a Book of *Anaſtaſius Sinaita*, entituled, Ὁδηγὸς, a *Guide*; and in ſome Manuſcripts, the Definitions are aſcrib'd to *Maximus*, under whoſe Name Father *Combefis* has Publiſh'd them.

All the Learned agree, that the Seven Dialogues of the Trinity, are not St. *Athanaſius*'s (*ll*); the difference of the Stile, the Terms, and the Doctrine, are convincing Proofs of it; and 'tis plain, that the Author of this Treatiſe liv'd ſince the Council of *Conſtantinople*, at the time when the Diſputes about the Incarnation of Jeſus Chriſt were afoot in the Church. Father *Combefis* has reſtor'd them to *Maximus* (*mm*), upon the Authority of ſome Manuſcripts, and the Teſtimony of the Modern Greeks, who cite them often under the Name of this Author. *Garnerius* a very learned Jeſuit, aſcribes them to *Theodoret*, and has printed them under his Name, in a pretended Supplement to the Works of this Father. But he has nothing to ſupport this Opinion but ſome ſlight Conjectures (*nn*); and he does not ſufficiently refute the Aſſertion of Father *Combefis*.

The following Book, entituled, *A Tragedy*, is falſly attributed to St. *Athanaſius*. *Photius* in *Cod.* 46. ſets down all the Titles of the Queſtions which are handled in this Book, with ſome others that are not found there, and aſcribes them to *Theodoret*. *Garnerius* upon the Credit of *Marius Mercator* attributes them to *Etherius Tyanæus* a Diſciple of *Theodoret*.

The Queſtions to *Antiochus*, and thoſe that follow them, are yet later (*oo*) than thoſe Books of which we have already ſpoken: Theſe were made by ſome Modern Greek, and ſeem to be all written

(ll) *The Seven Dialogues of the Trinity, are not St.* Athanaſius's.] 1. The Author ſpeaks there of an Addition made by the Council of *Conſtantinople* to the *Nicene* Creed. *Annon & vos fidei Nicenæ adjeciſtis?* ſays the Heretick, and the Catholick anſwers, *Sed non ipſi pugnantia.* 2. He explains the Six Epithets given to the Holy Spirit by the Council. 3. He treats there of ſubtile Queſtions about the Trinity, which were not ſtarted in the Time of St. *Athanaſius*. 4. He oppoſes *Eunomius* and *Macedonius*, whom St. *Athanaſius* did never particularly attack. 5. The Author of the Dialogue acknowledges Three *Hypoſtaſes* in Jeſus Chriſt. 6. The Stile is wholly different from that of St. *Athanaſius*. There are cited indeed in the *Lateran* Council under *Martin* the *1ſt. Secret*. 6. Three Teſtimonies of St. *Athanaſius*; and the *3d.* under this Title, *In ſermone Athanaſii qui per modum Interrogationis & Reſponſionis cum Apollinario ſit*; which Title agrees well enough with theſe Dialogues: But what is here related, is no where to be found.

(mm) *Father* Combefis *has reſtor'd them to* Maximus.] In the Greek Manuſcript which *Beza* us'd, 'tis obſerved on the Margin, *This Dialogue is not St.* Athanaſius's, *but ſome ſay 'tis* Maximus's. Two other Manuſcripts of *Rome* and *Venice*, and that of *Du Freſne*, attribute it to *Maximus*. *Gregorius Prōtoſyncellus*, *Veccus*, *Acyndinus*, *Demetrius*, and ſome other modern Greeks, cite it often under the Name of *Maximus*, and ſeldom under that of St. *Athanaſius*. It appears by the Stile and by all the Arguments in that Author, that theſe Seven Dialogues are by one and the ſame Hand; and the Authorities which we have alledg'd, do plainly ſhow that they ought to be attributed to *Maximus*.

(nn) Garnerius *has nothing to ſupport this Opinion but ſome ſlight Conjectures.*] He has no Manuſcripts, nor Citations from the Ancients. All that he ſays to prove it, is, *1ſt.* That *Theodoret* writ againſt the *Arians*, the *Eunomians*, the *Macedonians*, and the *Apollinariſts*, as he teſtifies in many Places of his Works. 2. That the Doctrine, the Expreſſions, and the Reaſons of this Author reſemble thoſe of *Theodoret*, and this Author denies as well as he, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son. Theſe Conjectures are very ſlight, when there are no Manuſcripts for him; for it may ſo happen that Two Authors, writing upon the ſame Principles, may agree very near in theſe Things; beſides the Reſemblance of the Stile is not ſo great as *Garnerius* would have us believe. The Proofs which he brings to ſhow that this Treatiſe is none of *Maximus*'s are not of any greater Weight: He ſays this Book was written before the Creed of *Epheſus*, becauſe there is no Mention in it of the *Neſtorians* and *Eutychians*: That from *Maximus*'s Time the Queſtion was no longer treated of *de Genito & Ingenito*: That there is no Probability, that *Maximus* ſhould diſpute againſt the *Anomæans*, with oppoſing the *Eutychians*, and *Monothelites*. 'Tis eaſie to confute theſe Conjectures, by ſaying, that *Maximus* in theſe Books diſputed againſt the ancient Hereſies, and that he ſufficiently oppos'd thoſe of his own Time in his other Books.

(oo) *The Queſtions to* Antiochus, *and thoſe that follow them, are yet later.*] In theſe Queſtions to *Antiochus*, the Author cites many Writers more modern than St. *Athanaſius*, as *Gregory Nyſſen* in his *8th.* The Author of the Book aſcribed to St. *Denys*, *Ibid.* St. *Epiphanius* Queſtion 3. And many others in other Places. They have nothing of the Stile of St. *Athanaſius*, and the Author in many Places is of a contrary Opinion: in ſhort, in *Athanaſius*'s Time, thoſe kind of Queſtions that were more Curious than uſeful, were not ſuffer'd. The Queſtions that follow about the Explication of ſome Doubts upon Places of Holy Scripture, and the other anonymous Queſtions are by the ſame Author as the preceding, and are only a Collection of Paſſages.

by

St. *Athanaſius.*

by the ſame Author. The Homily of the Vigils of *Eaſter*, has nothing of the Stile of St. *Athanaſius*, but is dry and barren, and full of affected Figures. The Fragments of the Commentary upon the Pſalms, related by *Nicetas* in his *Catena*, are very dubious, and ſo much the more, becauſe we have no account in the Ancients that St. *Athanaſius* ever compos'd a Commentary upon the Pſalms. The ſame muſt be ſaid of the Paſſages taken out of the *Catena* upon *Job*; for there is not much Credit to be given to theſe *Catena's* made by the Modern Greeks. But the Paſſages cited by *Theodoret*, are more valuable, for they are almoſt all found in ſome of the Works of St. *Athanaſius* which we have mention'd, excepting only thoſe which he cites as taken out of a large Diſcourſe of this Father *about Faith*. We muſt alſo acknowledge for Genuine the Fragment of a Treatiſe of St. *Athanaſius* upon theſe words, of Jeſus Chriſt, *My Soul is troubled*, which is recited in the Sixth Council, *Art.* 14. for beſides the Authority of this Council, which cites it as St. *Athanaſius*'s, 'tis eaſie to perceive, that it has the Stile and Air of this Father. 'Tis alſo very probable, that the Paſſages cited by *Gelaſius* and St. *John Damaſcene*, and ſet down at the end of the Second Volume, *P.* 547, and 548, are St. *Athanaſius*'s. The Paſſage of a Letter to *Euphychius* (*pp*), recited in Latin in the Sixth Council, is not ſo certainly his, for it is not written in his Stile, and we read no-where elſe that St. *Athanaſius* ever wrote to *Euphychius*. *Photius* mentions a Commentary of St. *Athanaſius* upon *Eccleſiaſtes*, and the *Canticles*: we have nothing of it at preſent, and I doubt very much, whether it was St. *Athanaſius*'s, ſince *Photius* himſelf confeſſes, that it had not the Stile of his other Works, and that none of the Ancients mention it. The Eleven Books of the Unity of the Godhead in the Trinity, belong to *Vigilius* (*qq*), a Deacon of *Africk*, and afterwards Biſhop of *Tapſa*, as well as the Dialogue, or Conference of *Arius* and St. *Athanaſius*, which follows theſe Eleven Books.

The Exhortation to the Monks, and to the Spouſe of Jeſus Chriſt, which is in the Collection of *Holſtenius*, has nothing of the Stile of St. *Athanaſius*, no more than the Book entituled, *Inſtructions abridg'd for Monks and Chriſtians*, publiſh'd not long ago in Greek and Latin, by *Arnoldus*, and printed at *Paris* by the Widow *Martin*, in the Year 1685. Theſe Books are written in a mean Stile, and contain ſuch Rules and Precepts, as neither agree with the Perſon, nor the Genius of St. *Athanaſius*.

The Letters of St. *Athanaſius* to the Biſhops of *Egypt*, to the Popes *Marcus* and *Felix* (*rr*), and thoſe of theſe Popes to theſe Biſhops, are notoriouſly Falſe and Suppoſititious.

The Relation of the Paſſion of the Image of Jeſus Chriſt in the City of Berytus (*ſſ*), cannot be St. *Atha-*

taken out of St. *Chryſoſtom*, St. *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, St. *Gregory Nyſſen*, St. *Climacus*, St. *Maximus*, which are ſometimes recited under their Names. The Author of theſe Queſtions calls the *Occidentaliſts* by the Name of *Franks*, and ſays that the *Romans* are a Nation of the *Franks*, ἔθνη τῆς Ῥωμαίων γενῶς τῆς Φράγγων τὸ γένος: Which plainly diſcovers that they were compos'd by the Modern *Greeks*, after the Empire of the *Weſt* came to the *Franks*. The modern *Greeks* have made many ſuch Collections, which they have put forth under the Name of ancient and famous Fathers.

(*pp*) *The Paſſage of a Letter to* Eupſychius.] *Theodoret* and the Council of *Chalcedon* cite a Letter of *Atticus* of *Conſtantinople* Succeſſor to St. *Chryſoſtom*, directed *to Euphychius*. St. *Athanaſius* mentions one *Euphychius* Biſhop of *Cappadocia*, *Orat.* 1. againſt *Ar.* But the ſixth Council ſays, that the *Euphychius* mention'd by him was a Prieſt of *Cæſarea*.

(*qq*) *The Eleven Books and the Conference of* Arius *and St* Athanaſius, *belong to* Vigilius Tapſenſis.] It has been obſerv'd long ſince that theſe were the Works of a Latin Author, who wrote long after St. *Athanaſius*. *Sirmondus* firſt diſcover'd that they were written by *Vigilius Tapſenſis*. This he obſerv'd in his Notes upon *Theodolphus* of *Orleans*, where he ſays, that theſe Two Books are found in an ancient Manuſcript, together with the Books of this *African* Biſhop againſt *Neſtorius* and *Eutyches*, in which he teſtifies himſelf that he compos'd theſe Dialogues under the Name of St. *Athanaſius*.

(*rr*) *To the Popes* Marcus *and* Felix.] 1. The Author of this Letter to *Marcus*, uſes the Words of the Epiſtle to *Felix*. 2. The Author of this Letter places the Perſecution againſt St. *Athanaſius* which happen'd in 355, under *Liberius*, Nineteen Years after the Death of Pope *Marcus*. 3. This Letter is compos'd of Paſſages of Authors who liv'd ſince St. *Athanaſius*, as St. *Leo*, *Atticus*, St. *Cyril*, St. *Celeſtine*, &c. 4. He ſays, that there were Eighty Canons of the *Nicene* Council, Forty Greek and Forty Latin, which is a manifeſt Falſhood. 5. He adds, that he reduc'd them to Seventy, that there might be as many Canons as there were Diſciples of Jeſus Chriſt, and Languages in the World, which is the Heighth of Impertinence. 6. The Stile is very different from that of St. *Athanaſius*, and is of a Latin Author. 7. In 336, when this Letter is ſuppos'd to be written, St. *Athanaſius* was in *Gaul*, and conſequently could not write from *Alexandria*. In a Word, the Letter is dated the 1*ſt*. of *December*, and *Marcus* died the ſame Year, in the Beginning of *November*. The ſame Reaſons, prove that the Anſwer could not be written by *Marcus*, for 'tis dated about a Month after his Death. The Letter written to *Felix* has as many Marks of Falſhood. 1. St. *Athanaſius* never communicated with this falſe Pope. 2. It has not the Stile of St. *Athanaſius*, but of a Latin Author. 3. 'Tis compos'd of Paſſages taken out of St. *Innocent*, *Celeſtine*, the Roman Council, and *Adrian*. 4. When *Felix* was choſen, St *Athanaſius* lay conceal'd, and could not then aſſemble a Synod. The Anſwer of *Felix* is compos'd of Paſſages out of the decretal Epiſtles forg'd by *Iſidore*, and of Teſtimonies out of the Fathers; and the Date of the Conſuls is falſe.

(*ſſ*) *The Relation of the Paſſion of the Image of Jeſus Chriſt in the City of* Berytus.] *Sigibert* in his Chronicle, relates this Story at the Year 765, and ſo the Treatiſe which he cites cannot be St. *Athanaſius*'s. I ſhall give a ſhort Account of the Story; and leave the Reader to judge whether it be fabulous or no. 'Tis ſaid, that a Chriſtian having over-againſt his Bed an Image of Jeſus Chriſt which was of his natural Bigneſs, removing out of his Lodging, forgot it in the Lodging where it was, though he knew that Jeſus Chriſt gave it to *Nicodemus*, who left it to *Gamaliel*, and that from *Gamaliel* it paſs'd to St. *James*, and from St. *James* to *Simeon*, and from him to *Zacheus*, and ſo it paſs'd from Hand to Hand till the Deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*: That a Jew having hir'd the Houſe where this Image was, for ſome time did not perceive it: but having invited ſome of his Friends to eat with him, they diſcover'd it, and after that; all the *Jews* aſſembled together to beat it, and one of them having pierc'd it with a Lance, there came forth Blood and Water, which wrought Abundance of Miracles. The Title of this Story ſays, that it happen'd under *Conſtantine* and *Irene*. 'Tis related alſo in the 2*d*. Council of *Nice*, and 'tis ſaid, that it made the Fathers of the Council to weep.

naſius's

nasius's; since the History which is there related, happen'd not, as is pretended, till the Year 765, and moreover, it is full of Fables, and unworthy of St. *Athanasius*. St. *Athanasius.*

The Fragment upon the Incarnation, against the Disciples of *Paulus Samosatenus*, is done by an ancient Author; but we have it not in Greek, and there is no proof that it was St. *Athanasius's*.

The other Fragment of the Sabbath, is an Extract from part of the Homily upon the same Subject, which is in Greek, *Vol.* 1. of St. *Athanasius's* Works.

The Seven Homilies publish'd by *Holstenius*, have nothing of the Stile of St. *Athanasius*, but are written by some late Greek Declaimer. There is nothing in them that is useful or sublime; and they come not near the Noble Simplicity of St. *Athanasius's* Writings, as those who have any relish of such things, are all agreed.

The Four other Discourses publish'd by Father *Combefis*, tho' they are more useful than the former, yet they are not St. *Athanasius's*. The First rejects so expresly the Errors of *Nestorius* and *Eutyches*, that 'tis plain, 'twas compos'd after these Two Hereticks had publish'd their Doctrine.

The Two Last about *Easter* and *Ascension*, are attributed in some Manuscripts to St. *Basil* of *Seleucia*, and 'tis probable that they are all Four written by him. St. *John Damascene*, or the Author of a Discourse upon the Dead, cites a Discourse of St. *Athanasius*, upon the same Subject; but we have none that bears this Title; and 'tis probable that this which is cited by this Author, is suppositious. I say nothing of the Commentary upon the *Psalms*, which in its First Edition, bore the Name of St. *Athanasius*, because now 'tis certainly known, that 'twas written by *Theophylact*.

When we consider the Works of St. *Athanasius*, with respect to the Subject on which they treat, they may be distinguish'd into Four sorts: The First, are Historical, and relate to the History of his own time; the Second sort, are purely Dogmatical; the Third concern Morality; and the Last, are upon the Holy Scriptures. His *Apologies* ought to be rank'd under the First Head. The First *Apology* was written immediately after he was driven out of *Alexandria*, and is address'd to the Emperour *Constantius*. There he refutes the Calumnies which his Enemies had made use of, to render him odious to *Constantius*. And the better to insinuate himself into the Emperour's Favour, he begins his Discourse with saying, That he made his Defence with much assurance before an Emperour, who had been long a Christian, and whose Ancestors had embrac'd the true Religion: That having made use of the Words of St. *Paul*, for his own Defence, he took him for his Intercessor with the Emperour, to whom, no doubt, he would give a favourable Hearing. Then he adds, That 'twas not necessary for him to purge himself from the Accusation relating to Ecclesiastical Matters, which his Enemies had formerly fram'd against him, since as to them he was sufficiently justified by the Testimony of an infinite Number of Bishops, and by the Retraction of *Ursacius* and *Valens*, who had acknowledg'd, that all those Accusations were pure Calumnies invented by them to destroy him; and that tho' these things were not so, yet he ought not to have any regard to an Information made in his absence by his Enemies, which should be of no weight, according to all Laws both Divine and Humane. And therefore without insisting upon those former Accusations in this *Apology*, he refutes those which were made use of since his Return, to blacken his Reputation with the Emperour. First of all, he is accus'd of having spoken ill of this Emperour to his Brother *Constans*. But he takes God to Witness, that he never did it, and says, That it had been a madness in him, to have attempted so bold a thing: That *Constans* would never have suffer'd it: That he had not so great an Interest in him, as to dare say any thing against his Brother: That he never spoke to him, but in the presence of many Persons who were Witnesses of what he said. But to prove the falseness of this Accusation beyond exception, he makes a faithful Relation of all that pass'd in his Voyage to *Italy*; wherein he says, That he parted from *Alexandria*, to put his Person and Reputation under the Protection of the Church of *Rome*; That he assisted at the Assemblies of the Faithful there; That he wrote but twice to *Constans*, while he staid at *Alexandria*: The First time to defend himself against some Letters full of Calumnies, which his Enemies had wrote to him; And the Second time, to send him some Copies of the Holy Scriptures; and that he never went to wait on him but twice, and both times by his own Order. At Last, he says, That the Emperour may judge by the manner of his speaking of his greatest Enemies, whether he was capable of speaking ill of him to his own Brother. The Second Accusation was no less heinous, for they accus'd him of having written a Letter to the Tyrant *Magnentius*, and they said, That they had the Original of his Letter. To which St. *Athanasius* answers, That this Accusation had no appearance of Truth; That he had never seen nor known *Magnentius*; That he never had occasion to write to him; That he had all the reason in the World, to detest him, and to hold no Correspondence with him; That the first Calumny destroy'd this, since 'twas incredible, that one who was so much for the Interest of *Constans*, should be of this Tyrant's Faction, who had revolted from him, and cruelly kill'd him. And as to their pretending to have this Letter, he says, 'Twas not to be wondred at, that they had found out an Impostor, since 'twas very well known, that they had counterfeited the Emperour's Letters. But he prays *Constantius*, to enquire from whence they had this Letter, and who gave it them; and to Summon before him the Secretaries of *Magnentius*, and inform himself, if they had ever receiv'd it: He conjures him to examine this Cause, as if Truth it self were present at his Decision; for, says he, If they had accus'd me before any other Judge, I might have appeal'd to the Emperour; but being accus'd before the Emperour, to whom can I appeal, but to the Father of him who is call'd *the Truth*, that is, *to God?* Then he addresses to him in a lively and elegant Prayer, That he might enlighten the mind of the Emperour, to judge in a Cause which concern'd the whole Church. The third Accusation is concerning his Celebration of the Holy Mysteries in the *Great Church* before it was Consecrated: To which he answers, That he did not Celebrate the Dedication of this Church, which he could not do, without the Order of the Emperour; but he confesses

St. *Athanaſius.*

feſſes, that he did Celebrate there the Divine Myſteries before its Conſecration. He excuſes himſelf upon the account of the great Concourſe of People that came to *Alexandria* on *Eaſter-Day*; and ſays, That the old Churches were ſmall and few in Number, and that the People demanding earneſtly to Aſſemble in the *Great Church*, there to make Prayers for the Safety of the Emperour, he us'd much entreaty, but in vain, that they would delay it, and rather Aſſemble, tho' with ſome inconvenience, in the other Churches; and they would not obey him, but on the contrary, were ready to go out of *Alexandria*, to keep their Aſſembly in the Fields: That this was the reaſon which oblig'd him to Celebrate in the *Great Church* before it was Conſecrated, which he did ſo much the rather, becauſe during the Faſt of *Lent*, many Perſons had been hurt in the preſs of the People. That 'twas not a thing without Example, that he had Celebrated Divine Offices in a Church, before its Dedication. That his Predeceſſor had done the like in the Church of St. *Theonas*, which he had built, and he had ſeen the ſame done at *Aquileia*: That 'twas much more convenient to Celebrate in a place that was intended for the Aſſemblies of the Faithful, tho' it was not yet Conſecrated, than to do it in the Fields, or in thoſe Churches, where the People were in danger of being ſtifled. He obſerves, That tho' there had been no ſuch fear of Danger, yet 'twas more expedient, that all the Faithful ſhould offer up their Prayers together in one and the ſame Place, (tho' 'twas not yet Conſecrated,) than that they ſhould do it apart in ſeveral Places. He was alſo accus'd of diſobeying the Emperour's Orders, when he commanded him to depart from *Alexandria*. To which he anſwers, That he was not diſobedient to his Orders, but that *Montanus* having brought him the Letter in which the Emperour permits him to depart from *Alexandria*, and go for *Italy*, as if he had ask'd leave; he did not think 'twas the Emperour's Intention that he ſhould withdraw, but that his Enemies had inform'd the Emperour, that he deſir'd to retire. That afterwards *Diogenes* came to *Alexandria*, without bringing any Letter or Order from the Emperour, and at his Arrival, 'twas ſufficiently publiſh'd, that he muſt withdraw, but ſtill there was no Order for it to him from the Emperour, either by Word of Mouth, or in Writing: That he always ſaid, He was ready to depart, whenſoever the Emperour ſhould Write to him, or Command him to do ſo; but 'twas agreed not to trouble the Church, till ſuch time as he ſhould receive his Orders: That Twenty Three Days after, *Syrianus*, General of the Army in *Egypt*, entered into the Church with his Souldiers, the People being there at Prayers, on the *Vigil* when we ought to Celebrate Divine Myſteries; that there he committed great Outrages, and oblig'd him to retire into a Deſart; and ſo he was neither Guilty for Flying, nor for Diſobeying the Orders of the Emperour. He ſays, That if he had retir'd ſooner, he had been Guilty both before God and Men, for 'tis a great Crime in a Biſhop, to abandon his Flock, when he is not abſolutely forc'd to do it. He adds, That he intended to go and wait upon the Emperour, and was come out of the Deſart upon this Deſign, and tho' he knew very well the Ill treatment thoſe Biſhops had met with that refus'd to Sign againſt him, and the Violence that had been us'd againſt thoſe of *Alexandria*, who took his part; yet he did not give over his intended Voyage upon that Account, but having ſeen an Order to ſeize him, ſent to the Magiſtrates of *Auxumis*, he apprehended the Rage of his Enemies, and therefore return'd again to hide himſelf in his Solitude.

In the Firſt Apology for his Flying, he juſtifies himſelf againſt the *Arians*, who accus'd him of timorouſneſs: He deſcribes the Deadly Effects of their Fury, and the Miſchiefs they had done to the greateſt Biſhops of the World, *Hoſius*, *Liberius*, *Paul* of *Conſtantinople*, and many others. He ſhows by the Examples of *Jacob*, *Moſes*, *David*, *Elias*, St. *Paul* and *Jeſus Chriſt*; and by the Command of Chriſt in *Matt.* 10. That 'tis lawful to fly from Perſecution, and that 'tis oftentimes of greater Uſe than to expoſe our ſelves to danger: He obſerves, That the Saints who deliver'd themſelves up to their Perſecutors, did it by the Inſpiration of the Holy Ghoſt. He demands of his Adverſaries, where they had learn'd, that 'tis permitted to Perſecute, and not permitted to Fly: He objects to them, that the Devil is the cauſe of Perſecution, and that Jeſus Chriſt has advis'd Flight. At laſt, he complains of the Violence they uſed againſt himſelf, and the Miſchiefs they ſtill do to the Church.

In the Second Apology, he juſtifies himſelf from the former Accuſations made againſt him, by ſetting down the Judgments given in his Favour, in the Councils of *Egypt*, *Rome* and *Sardica*, whoſe Letters he produces at full length. Theſe Monuments are very conſiderable for the Hiſtory of that Time, becauſe there are particular Remarks in them about the Diſcipline of the Church: As, for inſtance, we learn from the Letter of the Synod of *Alexandria*, that the Biſhop of *Alexandria* was choſen by the People, and ordain'd by the Biſhops of the whole Province of *Egypt*; That the Eccleſiaſtical Laws forbid the Tranſlations of Biſhops; That the Myſtery of the Euchariſt was carefully conceal'd from thoſe that were no Chriſtians; That 'twas an Impiety to break a Chalice, and to ſpill the Blood of Jeſus Chriſt; *That the Euchariſt was given to the Laicks in both kinds*; That 'twas Conſecrated on *Sunday*, and that 'twas kept for ſome time; That none but Prieſts lawfully ordain'd could conſecrate and diſtribute it; That the Biſhop had a Throne, or a Seat, that was rais'd higher than other Seats. *Julius* the Biſhop of *Rome*, maintains in his Letter, That he could examine anew in one Synod what had been ordain'd in another, and alledges the Example, rather than the Authority of the Council of *Nice*. He lays claim to this Power, and complains that St. *Athanaſius* was condemn'd without ſending him notice: He blames the *Euſebians* for ſending a Stranger, that liv'd almoſt 60 Leagues off from *Alexandria*, to take Poſſeſſion of the Epiſcopal See of that City. After this, he recites two Letters from the Council of *Sardica*, one addreſs'd to the Church of *Alexandria*, and the other to all the Biſhops of the World, which contain an ample Juſtification of St. *Athanaſius*; and the laſt contains the Subſcriptions of many Biſhops who Subſcribed in this Council afterwards. And after theſe Letters, there follow three Letters of *Conſtantius* to St. *Athanaſius*, commanding him to return; one

Letter

Letter of *Julius* to the Church of *Alexandria*, wherein he congratulates the *Alexandrians* upon the Return of their Bishop; the Letters of Recommendation which *Constantius* gave him to return to *Alexandria*, the Letter of the Synod of *Jerusalem* to the Church of *Alexandria* in favour of St. *Athanasius*, and last of all, the Retractation of *Ursacius* and *Valens* address'd to *Julius*, wherein they declare, That all which was said against *Athanasius* was false, that they acknowledg'd *Arius* for an Heretick, and anathematiz'd his Error; and one Letter from the same Bishops address'd to St. *Athanasius*, wherein they declare, that they are of his Communion. After St. *Athanasius* has thus produc'd these Instruments of his Absolution, being desirous to show that he had done nothing partially, out of favour to himself, goes back again as far as the beginning of the Schism of *Meletius* and the Heresie of *Arius*, and gives an account of all that pass'd upon this occasion until his Exile, reciting the Authentick Acts to justice all that he Asserts: So that for the future, to read the History of that time, one should begin at the Second Part of this Apology, which begins towards the middle of *P.* 777. of the Greek and Latin Edition at *Paris*, and then resume the Beginning of the History, when he shall have finish'd this Second Part. St. *Athanasius.*

He wrote also this History long before with more order, and deduces it higher in his Book which is call'd, *A Letter to those that lead a Monastick Life.* After he has there related all that pass'd about the Cause of *Arianism* till the Council of *Sardica*, he insists upon the Circumstances of the Banishment of Pope *Liberius*. He says, That the *Arians* did not at all spare him, that they had not any respect for the City of *Rome*, the Metropolis of the whole *Roman* Empire, nor for the holy Apostolical See; that by their Instigation, the Emperour had sent a Bishop to *Rome*, to perswade the Bishop there to Condemn St. *Athanasius*. But *Liberius* refusing him, answer'd, That it was against the Canons to condemn a Man that is absent, who had been judg'd worthy of Communion while he was present at *Rome*; That if the Emperour would determine the Controversies of the Church, he should assemble a Free Council, where there was neither Prince, nor Courtier, and where all things might be decided in the Fear of God, and according to the Doctrine of the Apostles; and where every one should follow the Faith of the Council of *Nice*, and from whence those should be excluded that would not profess to follow it; and afterwards the Council might Examine the Matters now in Debate. He adds, That the Bishop having entred into the Church of St. *Peter* to consecrate the Presents that were brought to *Liberius*, as soon as he understood that they were intended to procure his Subscription against St. *Athanasius*, he reproved the *Sacristan* for receiving them, and threw them out of the Church as Sacrilegious Offerings: That when these things were told to the Emperour, he caus'd him to be brought to *Constantinople*, and that the Pope spoke to him more sharply than he had done at *Rome*, whereupon he was sent into Banishment; and there he was forc'd at last to subscribe for fear of Death, after he had resisted for the space of two Years. After this he describes the Fall of *Hosius*; and tells us, that *Constantius* being sollicited by the *Arians*, who would fain engage to their Party a Bishop of so great Authority, exhorted him to Subscribe; and that the Holy Man not only could not endure the Proposal, but perswaded the Emperour to let him alone, and retir'd into his own Country: And that the *Arians* still continuing to sollicit the Emperour, he wrote many Letters, fill'd sometimes with fair Promises, sometimes with Threats, to oblige him to Condemn *Athanasius*. But the Generous Old-man answered him in a Letter which St. *Athanasius* produces, wherein he declares to him that he had suffer'd under the Reign of *Maximian* for the Faith, and that he was still ready to suffer, and to shed his Blood for the defence of Innocence and Truth; he advises him not to hearken to those Easterlings any more than he would do to *Ursacius* and *Valens*. He tells him, That he was Mortal, and that he ought to be afraid of the Day of Judgment; That he ought to meddle no more in Ecclesiastical Matters, than the Bishops should in Temporals. His words are excellent, which are these; [*Remember*, says he, *that you are Mortal, fear the Day of Judgment, keep your self in Purity, that you may appear there amongst the number of the Elect: Do not meddle at all in Ecclesiastical Affairs, and Command us nothing about those Matters; but learn them of us. God has given the Power of the Empire into your hands, and has entrusted with us that which concerns the Church; and as he who Invades your Empire, acts against the Order of God, so take heed that you render not your self Guilty of a very heinous Crime, by assuming to your self a Power in those things which are of Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction. 'Tis written*, Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's; *So then we are not permitted to govern the Empire of the World, and you, Sir, have no Power at all in things that are Sacred.*] After this St. *Athanasius* relates the Violence that was done to *Hosius* to make him Subscribe, and how the Emperour caus'd him to go to *Sirmium*, where he detain'd him till he had communicated with *Ursacius* and *Valens*. The rest of this Letter is a very vehement Declamation, against the Outrages and Persecutions of *Constantius* and the *Arians*; to which is added, a Protestation of the People of *Alexandria*, concerning the Violences that were used against St. *Athanasius*.

The Book of the Synods of *Ariminum* and *Seleucia*, contains not only the History of these two Councils, but also of the Principal Creeds made by the Bishops of *Arius*'s Faction after that which was made by the Council of *Nice*, which he sets down in its full length. From thence he takes occasion to treat of the word, *Consubstantial*, which he maintains against the *Arians*; and yet he acknowledges, that they are not to be treated as Hereticks, who scruple to make use of this word, though they confess the Faith of the Divinity of the Son: He explains in what sence this word was condemn'd in the Council of *Antioch*, held against *Paulus Samosatenus*, and alledges for his sence the Testimony of the two *Dionysii*, who made use of this word.

Besides these Works of St. *Athanasius*, which contain the Deduction of the History of that time, there are some others which concern particular Facts.

St. *Athanaſius.*

The Firſt is the Book of the Definitions of the Council of *Nice*, wherein he defends the Deciſions of this Council, and takes notice of the conſiderable Circumſtances of it. He ſays, That the Biſhops of the Council, who were about 300 in number, deſir'd the *Arians* with great meekneſs, to juſtifie themſelves, but ſcarce had they begun to ſpeak, when all the Biſhops diſapprov'd them; That the Hereticks could not agree among themſelves, but were oblig'd to keep ſilence, and then the Biſhops made the Creed, which was ſign'd by the *Euſebians*; That *Euſebius* of *Cæſarea* in *Palæſtine*, who had refus'd to ſign the day before, approv'd of it next day, and wrote to thoſe of his Church about it. After this, he Diſputes againſt the Impiety of the *Arians*, who had relaps'd into their former Error, and proves that the Son of God was from all Eternity. He Juſtifies the Terms which are us'd by the *Nicene* Council in their Creed, and ſays, The word *Conſubſtantial*, has a very good ſence, and that there is none more proper to expreſs a formal Condemnation of the Error of the *Arians*: And he adds moreover, that this word is not new, ſince *Theognoſtus*, *Denys* of *Alexandria*, *Denys* of *Rome*, and *Origen* have us'd it long before the Council of *Nice*; that this Synod had not eſtabliſh'd any new Doctrine, but confirm'd that which was approv'd by Scripture and Tradition. He obſerves, that in Matters of Faith, its Deciſions did not run in the ſame manner as thoſe that were made about the Celebration of *Eaſter*, when this Phraſe was us'd, *It pleaſes us, we will have it ſo*; for now they only ſay, *This is the Catholick Faith*; Ita credit Catholica Eccleſia.

The Second Book of this Nature, is a Letter to the Biſhops of *Egypt*, which is improperly called, *The Firſt Diſcourſe againſt the* Arians. There he deſcribes the Outrages which the *Arians* committed againſt the Catholicks, and exhorts his Brethren to ſhun their Snares: He warns them by no means to Subſcribe their Confeſſion of Faith, how Catholick ſoever it may appear to them, but to adhere to that of the Council of *Nice*, in which the Impiety of *Arius* was condemn'd. Then he recites the principal Heads of his Error, and refutes them by the Teſtimonies of Holy Scripture. He deſcribes the miſerable End of this Heretick; and concludes with an Exhortation to the Catholicks to maintain the Faith unto Death; repreſenting unto them, that he is not only a Martyr who ſuffers Death for refuſing to offer unto Idols, but alſo he that dies rather than betray the Truth.

The Letter to all the Orthodox Biſhops was written about the ſame Time, and upon the ſame Subject: There he gives an Account of the violent manner of introducing *George* into the Church of *Alexandria*, and deſcribes the Fury of the *Arians*, and the Damage the Church has ſuffer'd by them very particularly.

In the two Letters to *Lucifer*, he deſcribes the Perſecutions which the *Arians* ſet on foot againſt the Catholicks, and repreſents the lamentable State of the Church.

In the Letter to *Serapion* concerning the Death of *Arius*, he relates the Unhappy End of this Heretick, who periſh'd in a Jakes the very Night before he was to be receiv'd into the Church. St. *Athanaſius* ſays, That he learn'd this Story from the Relation of *Macarius*, a Presbyter.

The Letter written by St. *Athanaſius* concerning the Opinion of *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria*, concerning the Trinity, may be numbred amongſt his Hiſtorical Books, becauſe it teaches us a very conſiderable Point of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, which we ſhould not have known if St. *Athanaſius* had not reported it there; namely, That *Denys* of *Alexandria* wrote againſt the *Sabellians* of *Pentapolis*, and that in Diſputing againſt them, he made uſe of ſuch Expreſſions, as would make one believe that he favour'd the contrary Error; That he was accus'd of this in a Synod held at *Rome*; That he wrote a Treatiſe to the Pope, entituled, *A Refutation and Apology*, wherein he defends himſelf and confutes his Adverſaries; and that he taught in this Book a Doctrine perfectly contrary to that of the *Arians*: All which St. *Athanaſius* proves in this Treatiſe, by citing ſeveral Paſſages out of the Book of *Denys* of *Alexandria*.

The Letter of the Council of *Alexandria*, to thoſe of *Antioch*, concerns the State of the Church of *Antioch* after the Death of *Conſtantius*. St. *Athanaſius* and the other Biſhops of this Council, adviſe the Church of *Antioch* to receive the *Arians* who expreſly condemn their Error, to joyn themſelves to *Paulinus* and thoſe of his Party, to admit into their Communion thoſe that held their Aſſemblies in the Old City, that is to ſay, thoſe of *Meletius*'s Party, without requiring any other Profeſſion of Faith, but that of the Council of *Nice*. They give them notice, That there was no Creed made in the true Council of *Sardica*; they adviſe them to have no Diſputes among themſelves about the *Hypoſtaſes*, ſince thoſe who acknowledg'd Three in the Trinity, and thoſe who own'd but One, were both of the ſame Judgment, and only differ'd in the manner of Expreſſion.

St. *Athanaſius* ſpeaks after the ſame manner of the Reception of the *Arians*, in a Letter to *Ruffinian*, where he mentions the Deciſion of this Synod.

In a Letter to the Emperour *Jovian*, St. *Athanaſius* and the other Biſhops of *Egypt*, propoſe to him the *Nicene* Creed as the only true one: They ſay, That this contains the Faith which was maintain'd by many holy Martyrs, who are now with Jeſus Chriſt, that it had never had any Adverſaries, if the Malice of the Hereticks had not endeavour'd to corrupt it; but that *Arius* and his Followers intending to introduce a new Doctrine contrary to the Truth, the Council of *Nice* condemn'd it, and made a Confeſſion of Faith to eſtabliſh the Truth, and extinguiſh the Flame that was kindled by his Partizans: That this Creed was prais'd and ſincerely believ'd in all the Churches of Chriſt, till ſome Biſhops, having a mind to revive the Error of the *Arians*, began to deſpiſe it; and yet they did not openly declare themſelve againſt it, but only in their Explications of it they reflected obliquely upon the *Conſubſtantiality*, and ſpoke Blaſphemies againſt the Holy Spirit. After they have thus explain'd the *Nicene Creed*, they ſet it down, and tell the Emperour, That this is the only Creed to which we muſt adhere.

I ſay

I ſay nothing of the Conferences of the *Arians* and St. *Athanaſius*, becauſe they contain little remarkable.

St. *Athanaſius.*

The Catholick Epiſtle to the Biſhops of *Egypt*, *Arabia*, *Syria*, *Cilicia*, and *Phœnicia*, was written, as well as the preceding Letters, in the Name of the Synod of *Egyptian* Biſhops, in which St. *Athanaſius* preſided. They Exhort the Biſhops to whom they write, to ſeparate themſelves from the *Arians*, to act unanimouſly in the Defence of the Faith, and not to diſſemble the Truth for Fear or Ambition; and to acknowledge the Divinity of the Holy Spirit: and at laſt they propoſe to them as a Badge and Teſt of the true Faith, theſe words, *The Conſubſtantial Trinity.*

The Letter to the *Africans* was written upon the ſame Subject in the Name of St. *Athanaſius*, and 82 *Egyptian* Biſhops; wherein they recommend the Faith of the *Nicene* Council eſtabliſh'd by 318 Biſhops, publiſh'd and receiv'd by all the World, becauſe this Synod had follow'd the Doctrine, and manner of Expreſſion us'd by the Holy Scriptures, and the Fathers.

In the Letter to *John* and *Antiochus* Presbyters, St. *Athanaſius* rejoyces becauſe he underſtood by their Letters written from *Jeruſalem*, that a great number of Brethren were re-united in one and the ſame Communion; he reproves thoſe that would trouble the Church by their Diſputes about words, and wonders that any ſhould dare to reprehend the Doctrine of St. *Baſil*.

In the following Letter to *Palladius*, he commends him for being Orthodox, and approves of his ſtaying with *Innocent*. He rebukes thoſe Monks that would not obey St. *Baſil*, but praiſes this Biſhop, ſaying he was the Glory of the Church, for he contended for the Truth, and taught thoſe that needed Inſtruction, and none could be good Catholicks that had any Diſpute with him. He adds, That he had written to his Monks to obey him as their Father, and that they were to blame for complaining of him. Probably 'twas about the Queſtion of the *Hypoſtaſes*, that the Monks had ſome Diſpute with St. *Baſil*.

After we have ſpoken of his Hiſtorical Works, let us now come to the Dogmatical.

The firſt of theſe, are the two Treatiſes againſt the *Gentiles*, whereof the Second is now entituled, *Of the Incarnation*. In the Firſt of theſe two Books he Oppoſes Idolatry, and Eſtabliſhes the Worſhip of the true God: he diſcovers the ſource of Idolatry, that it comes from the Corruption of Man's Heart, who being created after the Image of God, fell under the guilt of *Adam*'s Sin, and inherited from him an unhappy Inclination to Sin, which the Will does very often follow, though it be free to reſiſt it. From this Principle he concludes, in the firſt place, againſt the Hereticks, That 'tis not neceſſary there ſhould be two Principles, or two Gods, one Good, the Author of Good; and another Evil, the Author of Evil. He refutes this Impious Opinion by Reaſon and Authority, and concludes that Sin is not a Subſtance, but that it entred into the World by the Fall of the Firſt Man. He obſerves that this is the ſource of all Idolatry, that Men being fallen from their firſt Eſtate do no longer raiſe their Heart and Spirit to things Spiritual, but fix them on things Terreſtrial and Senſible. He refutes afterwards the different kinds of Idolatry, and ſhows that we ought not to Worſhip, nor Acknowledge for Divinities, either the Gods of the Poets, or the World, or any part of it. After he has thus overthrown all kinds of Idolatry, he eſtabliſhes the Exiſtence and Worſhip of the true God: He demonſtrates, that God may be known by the Light of Nature, 1. From our ſelves, that's to ſay, by Reflection upon our own Thoughts, that he is neither Corporeal, nor Mortal. 2. From the Beauty of the Univerſe, which diſcovers the Exiſtence of him as the Cauſe of it: Then he ſhows that this God is the Father of Jeſus Chriſt, and that he created all things, and governs them by his Word.

The Second Treatiſe againſt the *Gentiles*, is that which is entituled, *Of the Incarnation of Jeſus Chriſt*; becauſe there he treats of that Myſtery. For explaining the Cauſes of it, he goes back as far as the Beginning of the World, and proves that it was not made by chance, nor fram'd of an Eternal Matter, but that God the Father created it by his Word. After this he ſpeaks of the Fall of Man, who being created after the Image of God, addicted himſelf to things corruptible and periſhing, and ſo became the Cauſe of his own Miſery and Corruption. He ſays that the Fall of Man was the cauſe of the Incarnation of the Word; becauſe God pitying Man, reſolv'd to ſend his Son to Save him, and to give him the means of obtaining that Immortality which he had loſt. Upon this Principle he founds the Neceſſity of the Incarnation of the Word; which he proves, Firſt, Becauſe the Son being the Eſſential Image of his Father, there was none but he that could render Man like to God, as he was before his Fall: 2. Becauſe as the Word is the Reaſon and Wiſdom of his Father, there is none but he can teach Men and undeceive them of their Errors. From the Cauſes of the Incarnation, he paſſes to its Effects, and after he has deſcribed the Graces which the Word has merited for Mankind by his Incarnation, he ſpeaks of his Death; and ſhows, that he was to die as he did, by the Torments of the Croſs, that by his Death he might conquer Death both in himſelf and us. Laſtly, He proves the Reſurrection of Jeſus Chriſt by the wonderful Effects that follow'd his Death, and by the contempt of Death wherewith it inſpir'd his Diſciples. After he has thus explain'd the Doctrine of Chriſtians, he refutes the Jews and Pagans, the former by proving from the Prophets that Jeſus is the Meſſias promis'd in the Old Teſtament; and the latter from the Miracles of Jeſus Chriſt, from the deſtruction of Idolatry, and the Eſtabliſhment of the Doctrine of the Goſpel; which, though contrary to the Luſts and Paſſions of Men, was entertain'd without difficulty, and in a little time by the greateſt part of the World. He concludes theſe Diſcourſes with an Advertiſement to his Friend *Macarius*, to whom they are directed, That he ſhould have recourſe to the Holy Scripture, which is the Fountain from whence theſe things are drawn; to which he adds this Remark, that for the better underſtanding of it, we ſhould lead a Life like to that of the Authors of theſe holy Books.

St. *Athanaſius* wrote but two Treatiſes againſt the *Gentiles*, for his other Dogmatical Treatiſes are either about the Trinity, or the Incarnation. The Four Diſcourſes againſt the *Arians* are the chief of

St. *Athanaſius.*

his Dogmatical Works. In the Firſt, which is call'd the Second, he convicts the Sect of the *Arians* of Hereſie; for which end, he firſt makes uſe of an Argument which he employs againſt all Hereticks, which is the Novelty of their Sect, and the Name which it bears; Then he explains their Doctrine, and proves, that 'tis Impious, full of Blaſphemies, and comes near to that of the *Jews* and *Gentiles*. Laſtly, He refutes their Reaſons, and clears up a great many difficulties which they propoſe againſt the Doctrine of the Church.

In the Second Treatiſe, which is the Third in the common Editions, he explains ſome of the Paſſages which the *Arians* alledge, to prove that the Son is a Creature, and inſiſts chiefly upon that in *Chap.* 8. of the *Proverbs*, *The Lord hath created me in the beginning of his ways*, &c. He ſays towards the end, "That the *Arians* run a hazard of having no true Baptiſm; becauſe, to make this Sacrament valid, 'tis "not ſufficient to pronounce the words, but we muſt alſo have a right underſtanding of them, and "a right Faith. He adds, That if the Baptiſm of other Hereticks who pronounce the ſame words, be "null and void, becauſe they have not a true Faith, 'tis to be thought, that we ought to give the "ſame Judgment of the Baptiſm of the *Arians*, who are become the worſt of all Hereticks. Theſe words of St. *Athanaſius* ſhew, That in his time, thoſe that had been Baptiz'd by Hereticks, were Re-baptiz'd in the Church of *Alexandria*, though they had been Baptiz'd in the Name of the Trinity.

In the Third Diſcourſe, which is reckon'd for the Fourth, he proves, That the Father and the Son have but one and the ſame Subſtance, and one and the ſame Nature, amd that they are one God only, though they be two diſtinct Perſons. Afterwards he ſhows that all that is ſaid of Jeſus Chriſt in the Scriptures, which ſeems unworthy of his Divinity, ſhould be applied to his Humane Nature, becauſe Chriſt being a Perſon compos'd of the Divine and Humane Nature, the Properties of both theſe Natures may be attributed unto him. At laſt, he examines a Queſtion propos'd by the *Arians*, viz. Whether the Father begot his Word voluntarily or neceſſarily: To which he anſwers, That he begot him naturally and not by conſtraint, and ſo in this ſenſe he begot him voluntarily, becauſe he would beget him, though he could not but beget him.

In the laſt Diſcourſe he refutes the *Arians*, proving that the Word is Eternal and Conſubſtantial to the Father, and the *Sabellians*, who deny'd that the Son was a Perſon diſtinct from the Perſon of the Father; and the *Paulianiſts*, who diſtinguiſh'd the Word from the Son of God, and the Paraclete from the Holy Spirit.

The Diſcourſe upon the words of the Goſpel of St. *Matth.* Ch. 11. *My Father has given me all things*, &c. contains a Refutation of that falſe Concluſion which the *Arians* drew from thoſe words, by ſaying, That if the Father had given all things to his Son *in time*, ſo that there was a time when he had not all things, and by conſequence he had not always a Supreme Empire over the Creatures, from whence it would follow, that he was not equal to the Father: To which St. *Athanaſius* anſwers, That this Paſſage does not treat of the Abſolute Power of God over his Creatures, but concerns the Myſtery of the Incarnation. That the Father has given Mankind to Jeſus Chriſt, as a Sick Perſon is left to a Phyſician for his Cure: That Man having ſinn'd, and Death being the Puniſhment of his Sin, the Word became Man, and God gave all Mankind unto him, that he might heal them, and reſtore to them that Life and Light which they had loſt.

In the Letter to *Adelphius*, St. *Athanaſius* proves againſt the *Arians*, that we muſt worſhip *the Word* in the Perſon of Jeſus Chriſt.

In the following Letters to *Maximus*, he ſhows, That Jeſus Chriſt is truly God, and truly Man. The Titles of the Letters to *Serapion*, ſufficiently ſhew what they treat about: *Againſt thoſe that ſay, that the Son and the Holy Spirit are Creatures.* The Treatiſe againſt the *Sabellians*, is a Collection of paſſages out of Holy Scripture, which prove the Trinity of Perſons and the Divinity of the Word. The deſign of the Treatiſe about the Union of the Humane Nature with the Word, is rather to prove the Divinity of the Son of God, than to explain the Incarnation. The Expoſition of Faith, which is in the Firſt Volume, *P.* 240. is an Explication of the *Nicene* Creed, concerning the Unity and the Incarnation. The ſhort Diſcourſe againſt the *Arians*, is a Writing of the ſame Nature. The Letter to *Epictetus*, is the principal Treatiſe of St. *Athanaſius*, concerning the Incarnation of Jeſus Chriſt, where he refutes the Error and the Arguments of thoſe that maintain that the Fleſh of Jeſus Chriſt, was of the ſame Subſtance with his Divinity; That the Divinity was chang'd into the Humanity, or the Humanity into the Divinity; That the Word had adopted a Body without being naturally united to it; That the Body was not aſſum'd in the Womb of the Virgin *Mary*; That the Divinity did ſuffer; or in a word, That the Word was a Perſon different from the Man. In ſhort, he there refutes the foundations of the Error of the *Apollinarians* and *Eutychians*, and the principle of the Error of the *Neſtorians*, by ſhewing, That Jeſus Chriſt is one Perſon compos'd of a Divine and Humane Nature, wherein all the Properties of thoſe two Natures are found. He refutes the ſame Errors in the Books of the Incarnation againſt *Apollinarius*, in which he proves particularly againſt this Heretick, That Jeſus Chriſt took one Humane Nature entire and perfect, That it was not deſtitute of a Soul, nor of Underſtanding and Will.

There are few Moral Treatiſes amongſt the Works of St. *Athanaſius*. The Epiſtle to *Dracontius* is one of the Chief. [This is rather concerning Diſcipline, tho' urg'd with Moral Arguments.] *Dracontius* was a Monk that had been choſen Biſhop: But, either becauſe he was afraid of Perſecution, or elſe becauſe he thought himſelf unworthy to govern a Biſhoprick, he fled and hid himſelf, leſt he ſhould be oblig'd to take care of the People, of whom he had been ordain'd Biſhop. St. *Athanaſius* in this Letter, reproves his Puſillanimity, and exhorts him to return to his Biſhoprick. He repreſents to him, That his Conduct ſcandaliz'd many Perſons; That being ordain'd Biſhop, he was

no

no longer at his own disposal, but ow'd himself to those for whom he was ordain'd; That he was oblig'd to take care of them, and that he should be answerable for the Salvation of those that should perish for want of Instruction; That he should improve the Talent that God had given him, and take Care of the Flock that God had entrusted him with; That if the Fear of Persecution made him flee from a Bishoprick, it was a great weakness in him; but if it was from any dislike of the Episcopal Function, 'twas an injurious Contempt of the Authority and Mystery of Jesus Christ; That he could not excuse himself, by saying, That he had Sworn or Vow'd to the contrary, since *Jeremy* and *Jonas* were oblig'd to do contrary to what they had resolv'd; and besides, That many Monks whom he names, had accepted of a Bishoprick, and that this Profession was no hindrance to their Ordination; That a Bishoprick was so far from being an occasion of Sin, as some would perswade *Dracontius*, that it would be rather a means to Sanctify him by his imitating the Apostles; That this State did not hinder, but he might still observe the Customs of the Cloyster: [*You will be permitted*, says he, *being a Bishop, to fast, or to abstain from Wine: We have known Monks great Eaters, and Bishops great Fasters: We have seen Monks that drink Wine, and Bishops that drink none: Bishops for the most part live in Celebacy*, and we have seen Monks married: In a word, 'tis permitted to every one, in whatsoever State he is, to use such abstinences as he pleases,*] He concludes, with exhorting him to return to his Bishoprick before *Easter*, that his People might not be abandon'd, and oblig'd to Celebrate that Feast without him; and with earnest Entreaties, that he would not hearken to their Counsels, that would hinder his Return: *They would*, says he, *have Priests among themselves, Why then are they unwilling that the People should have Bishops?*

St. *Athanasius.*

* [St. *Athanasius*'s Words are these, *Many Bishops never married, and Monks have been Fathers of Children.* (Πολλοὶ γὰρ Ἐπισκόπων οὐδὲ γεγαμήκασι, μοναχοὶ δὲ πατέρες τέκνων γεγόνασιν, p 958. D. *Vol.* 1.) As these Words are translated, they have quite a different meaning from that which was at first designed by St. *Athanasius*. He makes his Comparison between those that practised, and those that omitted the Austerities there mentioned, in such a manner as shews that he thought them absolutely indifferent; and besides, there is a great difference between *many* and the *most part*.

Yet I should not have taken notice of it, if in his account of St. *Athanasius*'s Doctrine, *Mr. du Pin* had not repeated what he had before observed in this place, and with some Additions; for there he says, *That there were Priests and Bishops married, tho' but few.* Here is a double mistake; for neither does St. *Athanasius* say, that there be *but few* Priests or Bishops married, nor does he speak a word of *Priests*. Monks were not constantly Ordain'd in those days. St. *Anthony*, their great Master, was a Lay-man, and in this very Letter to *Dracontius*, St. *Athanasius*, amongst other Arguments to perswade him to accept the Bishoprick to which he was Canonically Elected, tells him, That if the Monks desire to have *Presbyters* among them, to instruct them in their Duty, they ought not to envy others, who for the same Reason were earnest to have *Dracontius* for their Bishop.]

In the Letter to *Ammon* the Monk, he refutes the Error of some Monks, who condemn'd the use of Marriage; and shews by the Scripture, that 'tis permitted, and that 'tis Impiety to condemn it, tho' Virginity is a more perfect State, and deserves greater Rewards.

The Life of St. *Anthony* may be reckon'd among his Moral Writings, for it contains excellent Instructions for all Monks.

We must also place among the Moral Works of St. *Athanasius* his Homily of *Circumcision and the Sabbath*. There he treats of the Institution of the Sabbath, and thinks that the principal end of its Celebration was not merely to rest, but that it was Instituted to make known the Creator; that the Reason why 'tis abrogated in the New Law, and the Feast of *Sunday* establish'd in its room, is, because the first Day was the end of the first Creation, and the second was the beginning of the New: For the same Reason he believes that Circumcision was appointed on the eighth Day, to be a figure of that Regeneration which is made by Baptism.

Lastly, That I may say something of the Treatises of St. *Athanasius* upon the Holy Scriptures, the Abridgment of the Scriptures, is the most useful of them. There you may see in one view, an Enumeration of all the Canonical Books of the Old Testament according to the Catalogue of the Hebrews, which contains but 22; and he adds those that are not Canonical, but yet are read in the Church to the *Catechumens*, which according to him, are the Books of *Wisdom*, *Ecclesiasticus*, *Esther*, *Judith* and *Tobit*; with this Observation, That some plac'd the Books of *Esther* and *Ruth* amongst those which they esteem'd Canonical. In the Catalogue of the Canonical Books of the New Testament, he places all those which we acknowledge at present. After he has given us these Catalogues, he makes a very faithful Abridgment of what is contain'd in every Book, and gives the Reason, why 'tis call'd by such a Name and Discourses of the Author that wrote it. Afterwards, he gives a Catalogue of those Apocryphal Books which are of little or no use at all. He speaks particularly of the Four Gospels, their Authors, and the places where they were compos'd; he treats in a few Words of the Greek Versions of the Old Testament, and at last gives a Catalogue of some Books cited in Scripture that are lost. The Fragment of the 39th. Festival Letter is upon the same Subject, and it contains also a Catalogue of the Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament, and of those that are useful, tho' they be not Canonical, which he distinguishes from these Apocryphal Books, that have been forg'd by Hereticks; and here he follows the same Catalogue which is in the Abridgment: But, he adds to the number of these Books, that may be read to the Catechumens, *The Doctrine of the Apostles*, and the Book, entituled *Pastor*.

The Book to *Marcellinus* upon the *Psalms* is also of the same Nature. St. *Athanasius*, shows there the Excellency of the Book of *Psalms*, and relates the Subject of many of them, those that are Historical, and those that are Moral. He observes there, That the Book of *Psalms*, referrs to all the Histories of the Old Testament; That it includes all the Prophecies of Jesus Christ; That it expresses

all

St. *Athanaſius.*

all the Opinions which we ought to have, That it contains the Prayers that ſhould be made, and comprizes all the Precepts of Morality: He obſerves, That there are ſome *Pſalms* Hiſtorical, ſome Moral, ſome Prophetical, beſides thoſe that conſiſt of Prayers and Praiſes; all which he diſtinguiſhes, and places in their proper Rank and Order. He ſhews, that the *Pſalms* repreſent to every one of the Faithful, the State of his own Soul, that every one may ſee himſelf there repreſented, and may obſerve from the different Paſſions there expreſs'd, what he feels in his own Heart, and that in whatever State any one is, there he may find Words ſuitable to his preſent Diſpoſition, Rules for his Conduct, and Remedies for his Troubles. Wherefore he divides the *Pſalms* according to the different Matters of which they treat, that every one may make uſe of them according to his Neceſſities, and according to the different States that he falls into. He adds, That thoſe who Sing, ſhould be of a free and quiet Spirit, that the Melody of their Song, may agree with the Harmony of their Spirit. And laſt of all, He would not have any Words of the *Pſalms*, which may appear ſimple, chang'd, under pretence of making them more Elegant.

The Treatiſe upon theſe Words of Jeſus Chriſt, *Whoſoever ſhall ſpeak a word againſt the Holy Spirit, his ſin ſhall not be forgiven him, neither in this World, nor in the other*, is an Explication of this difficult place of Scripture, wherein he firſt obſerves, that *Origen* and *Theognoſtus* thought, That the Sin againſt the Holy Ghoſt, was the Sin of thoſe who after they were baptiz'd loſt the Grace of Baptiſm by their Crimes. But St. *Athanaſius* maintains, That this Explication is not Natural, becauſe thoſe that violate their Vows of Baptiſm, ſin no more againſt the Holy Spirit, than againſt the Father and the Son, in whoſe Name Baptiſm is adminiſtred: And to ſhew that this Opinion of the Ancients, is not defenſible, he obſerves, That theſe Words of Jeſus Chriſt were addreſs'd to the *Phariſees* who were never baptiz'd, and yet ſinned againſt the Holy Spirit, by ſaying, That Jeſus Chriſt caſt out Devils in the Name of *Beelzebub*: He adds, That if this Explication were admitted, it would give up the Cauſe to *Novatus*. He explains the Paſſage of St. *Paul* to the *Hebrews*, where the Apoſtle ſays, *'Tis impoſſible that thoſe who were once baptiz'd ſhould be renew'd again, which does not exclude*, ſays St. *Athanaſius*, *Repentance after Baptiſm, but only a ſecond Baptiſm.* After he has rejected this Explication, he advances a New one of his own; and is of Opinion, That to ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt, is to deny the Divinity of Jeſus Chriſt, by attributing to the Devil, as the *Phariſees* did, his moſt Divine Actions. Thus he explains himſelf, Thoſe, ſays he, who obſerving the Humane Actions of Jeſus Chriſt, conſider'd him as a Man only, were in ſome meaſure excuſable; Thoſe alſo who obſerving his Divine Actions, doubted if he was a Man, were not ſo much to be blam'd: But thoſe who ſeeing his moſt Divine Actions, deny'd his Divinity, by attributing his Actions to the Devil, as the *Phariſees* and the *Arians* do, commit ſo enormous a Crime, that they cannot hope for Pardon. The former ſin againſt the Son of Man, *i.e.* againſt the Humanity of Jeſus Chriſt; and the latter ſin againſt the Spirit, *i.e.* his Divinity. This in ſhort, is the ſum of the Explication that St. *Athanaſius* has given of theſe Words of the Goſpel, whereof he treats, and I leave it to the Judgment of the Reader, if he can find another more probable than this of the Ancients.

We may add likewiſe to thoſe Treatiſes of St. *Athanaſius*, upon the Holy Scripture, the Fragments that are found at the end of his Second Volume, and particularly, that which is taken out of the Sixth Council, upon theſe Words of Jeſus Chriſt, *My Soul is exceeding ſorrowful.*

I ſhall make no Extracts out of thoſe Books which I have rejected, as being none of St. *Athanaſius's*, tho' there be ſome things in them which may be uſeful, becauſe I would make no Confuſion, by mixing the Doctrine of another Author with that of this Saint, and therefore without ſtaying to ſpeak of theſe Books, I proceed to his Character.

His Stile cannot be better deſcrib'd than 'tis already by the Learn'd *Photius*, in *Vol.* 140 of his *Bibliotheque.* " The Diſcourſes of St. *Athanaſius*, ſays he, are clear, ſimple and natural, and yet they have much ſtrength " and gravity: He places the Reaſons which he uſes in a wonderful Light; He ſhews great copiouſneſs of " Invention, and a wonderful eaſineſs of Thought. There is in his Works, a Depth of Logick, I do not mean " of that barren Logick which propoſes Reaſonings and Syllogiſms, without any Ornament, and makes " uſe of Dialectical Terms as School-Boys do, who would make a ſhew of Wit; but of a Logick like that " of the ancient Philoſophers, who propos'd their Idea's and Reaſonings in an excellent manner, accom- " panied with great Ornaments of Eloquence. He makes uſe alſo of Teſtimonies of the Holy Scrip- " ture, and draws from thence convincing Proofs of what he advances. In a word, His Books alone " are ſufficient for the Refutation of *Arianiſm*, and he that ſhould ſay, That St. *Gregory* and St. *Baſil* " drew from this Fountain thoſe great Torrents of Learning which they employ'd againſt this Error, " would not be much miſtaken. The ſame *Photius* ſays alſo in another place, ſpeaking of the Letters and Apologies of this Father, " That they are written with Clearneſs, Elegance and Grandeur; That " he has given a turn at once perſuaſive and agreeable to all that he ſays. This Character appears chiefly in his *Apology* to the Emperour *Conſtantius*, which is a Maſter-piece in its kind, for never any Book had a greater Air of Candor and Simplicity than this, never was any Diſcourſe more Elegant, more beautified with Figures, or more perſuaſive: Here was St. *Athanaſius's* great Excellency in all his Works; they appear ſimple and open, and yet being cloſely conſider'd, one may perceive, that they are compos'd with wonderful Artifice: He obſerves all along an admirable fitneſs of Expreſſion, and always adapts his Stile to the Subject of which he treats, and to the Perſons to whom he ſpeaks. He inſinuates himſelf ſo dextrouſly into the mind by his manner of expreſſing things, that one entertains his Reaſons, and feels himſelf often perſuaded by them, before he is aware. How ſoft ſoever his Diſcourſe appears, it wants nothing of ſharpneſs; for when he attacks his Enemies, he ſpares them not in the leaſt, but on the contrary, uſes the moſt ſmart and emphatical Words that can be found to cover them with Confuſion; and to render them Odious, he makes no ſcruple to load them with the

the reproachful Names which they have deserv'd, and to represent the Crimes they have committed, in the most lively Colours that can be drawn with a Masterly Hand: And yet he does it after such a manner, that it seems rather to proceed from a Zeal for the Truths of Religion, than from any Personal hatred which he bears to the Men themselves. The Conduct of this Saint is less admirable than his manner of Writing. St. *Basil* gives this Character of him in his 48 Letter, address'd to himself. "Who can be found, says he, That has more Prudence than you? Who has a clearer Inspection into "the Affairs of the Church, and who has a greater Facility in executing his Designs? Is there any that "has more Charity and Compassion for his Brethren? Are not you the Bishop in all the World, that "is in most Veneration with those of the *West*. And in the following Letter he has these Words; "The more the Miseries of the Church encrease, the more are we oblig'd, says he, to have recourse "unto you; we have no hopes of any Consolation under our Afflictions but by your means, since you "can do much, both by your Prayers which are very Effectual, and also by the sharpness of your "Wit, whereby you understand at the same time what is most advantageous to the Church. And again in another Letter, "When we consider our Calamities, and the State to which we are reduc'd, we "do almost Despair of Safety; but when we cast our Eyes upon you, we take Courage, and consider "you as a Physician whom God hath given to heal all our Maladies. Who can be a fitter Pilot in this "Tempest, than he who has all his Life time endur'd the like Persecutions for the Faith? And truly, 'Tis hard to say, which of the two is most to be admir'd in St. *Athanasius*, his unmoveable Constancy and Firmness, which he always show'd, or the Prudence that appear'd in his Conduct under all his Persecutions. I say nothing of his Humility, his Charity, Pastoral Vigilance, and his other Vertues, because they don't fall directly within the Compass of that Design which I have propos'd to my self in this Book. St. *Athanasius*.

His Doctrine is very pure, and his Opinions are not only very Orthodox, but his Expressions are very just and exact. He proves the Existence of a God, the Creation of the World, and Providence, in his Books against the *Gentiles*. He establishes the Trinity of Three Divine Persons, and the Unity of the Nature and Substance, almost in all his Works; but he explains this Mystery with much simplicity; for he would not amuse the Reader with Disputes about Words, nor search too profoundly into this Matter. He confesses, That he cannot comprehend it, and he will not employ humane Reasonings to Prove or to explain the Mystery of the Trinity and the Generation of the World: In short, He shuns as much as he can, to enter upon any of those subtile Questions, which have since unprofitably exercis'd the Wit of so many School-Divines. He speaks admirably of the Fall of the first Man, of the Punishments of Sin, of the Necessity and Effects of the Incarnation of the Son of God. He explains this Mystery in such a manner as is equally contrary to all the Errors of the Hereticks of either side; for he teaches against the *Paulianists*, That the Word is united to the Humanity; against the *Valentinians*, That it took a Body like ours in the Womb of the Virgin; against the *Arians* and *Apollinarians*, That it took a Soul and Spirit; against the *Nestorians*, That the Divinity is united in the same Person with the Humanity, so that the Virgin may be called the Mother of God; against the *Eutychians*, That these two Natures subsist in the same Person with their Properties, without Confusion, without Mixture, without Change. He believes, That the Soul is Spiritual and Immortal, and makes no scruple to affirm it as a thing certain, That the Saints are happy and with Jesus Christ. He speaks of the Efficacy of Baptism, and rejects that of the Hereticks: He acknowledges not only in his *Apology*, but also in his *Treatise of the Faith*, cited by *Theodoret*; He acknowledges, I say, in both places, That the Eucharist is the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ *. He praises Virginity, and prefers it to Marriage, tho' he thinks, that 'tis not forbidden. He condemns the Error of the *Novatians*; He acknowledges the Holy Scripture to be the Rule of Faith, and joyns

* [That is to say, St. *Athanasius* calls the *Bread* the *Body*, and the *Wine* the *Blood of Christ*: He had no occasion to Dispute the Question, nor to determine of either side, concerning the *Real Presence*. This is plain from his Second *Apology* to the Emperour *Constantius*, for his Flight, wherein he clears himself from the Crime that was laid to his Charge in the Synod of *Tyre*, That he abetted one *Macarius* a Presbyter in *Mareotis*, who broke the Cup in which the Wine was usually Consecrated: The Council of *Alexandria*, that was call'd to examine the Cause of St. *Athanasius*, in their General Epistle, always call the Cup, Ποτήριον μυστικὸν, *the Mystical Cup*: and speaking of Presbyters, (p 732. *ap.* St. *Athana. Vol.* 1.) say, μόνον ὑμῶν ἔξεστι προσφέρειν τὸ αἷμα τῷ χριστῷ; *it belongs to you alone first to drink of the Blood of Christ*; that is, *to receive before the Congregation*: This determines nothing as to the Nature of the *Presence*; and our Saviour had sufficiently warranted such Expressions by his Discourse in the sixth Chapter of St. *John*.

If St. *Athanasius* had said any thing to declare his Opinion, upon a Question at that time not started in the World, his Arguments could have been consider'd, and his Notions might have then been known: But since all his Writings bend to one scope, from which he hardly ever wanders any occasional Expressions relating to other Disputes, cannot be urg'd any further than as they do in all probability shew what was the Stile of that Age; and it is certain, That the Elements were after Consecration, call'd, the Body and Blood of Christ, at that time; as well, they might, since the Church then believ'd, what our Church likewise professes, That worthy Communicants do Spiritually eat the Body, and drink the Blood of Jesus Christ, when they eat the Bread and drink the Wine in the Lord's Supper. Mr. *Du Pin*, takes a great deal of Pains in his First Volume, to Vindicate the Fathers who liv'd before the Council of *Nice*, from the imputation of *Arianism*: And he observes all along, That before those Questions were professedly Examin'd and Determin'd by the Church, Men did not speak so exactly as they did afterwards: His Observation is certainly right, and it has always been the receiv'd Excuse, whenever the Opinions of these earliest Fathers have been urg'd on behalf of the *Arian* or *Socinian* Doctrines. If therefore this Excuse be just in one Cause, it is equally so in another; and an occasional Expression can no more be urg'd in Favour of *Transubstantiation* than in Favour of *Arianism*, when we otherways know, what was the Opinion of that Age, in which the Question was never put concerning it. There will be no necessity therefore to take notice in every place, where our Author fansies, that the Ancients favour'd his Cause, of the particular Reasons, why they spoke in such a manner, or of the Sence in which their Words are to be understood; since it has been so often prov'd by those who have examin'd all the contested Passages in the Writings of these more Ancient Fathers, that either they favour our Opinions, or that they speak nothing to the purpose of the Dispute that has so long been manag'd between us and the Church of *Rome*] with

St. *Athanaſius.* with it Tradition and the Authority of the Holy Fathers. He obſerves that the Faith is always the ſame, and that it does not change, and that the Councils do nothing but declare what is the Doctrine of the Church. He attributes much to Free-Will, and yet he confeſſes, that ſince the ſin of *Adam* Man is enclin'd to Evil, and fix'd upon ſenſible things. He teaches, That the Soul of Jeſus Chriſt, without diſſolving the Union to his Divinity, deſcended into Hell, to fetch thence the Souls of the Juſt, and alſo of thoſe who had liv'd well under the Law of Nature, who were there in Sorrow waiting for their Deliverance. As to what concerns Diſcipline in his time, one may obſerve in his Works, That the Communion in both kinds was then given to the Laicks; That the Prieſts only Conſecrated; That the Euchariſt was offer'd upon an Altar of Wood; That the Myſteries were hid from the Catechumens and Gentiles; That the Faithful aſſembled in Churches, where they were a long time at Prayers; That there were then a Multitude of Monks that were ſubject to their Biſhop as their Father, and that ſome of them were made Biſhops; That there were alſo Virgins who religiouſly kept their Virginity; That they were not ſhut up, but aſſiſted at the Divine Myſteries in the Church; *That there were Prieſts and Biſhops married, tho' but few*; That Eunuchs could not then be ordain'd; That the Tranſlation of Biſhops was condemn'd; That the People and Clergy choſe them, and other Biſhops ordain'd them; That they muſt be choſen out of thoſe that were born in the place, rather than Strangers; That they had a Reverence for Churches and Sacred Veſſels; That Churches were dedicated with Ceremonies, and that 'twas not permitted to celebrate Divine Myſteries in them before their Dedication, without ſome kind of Neceſſity; That there were Fonts in Churches, and that the Biſhop had a Chair rais'd on high, call'd *the Epiſcopal Throne*; That Oyl and Wine, and Bread for Offerings were kept it the Font; That they had Cœmeteries where they aſſembled in caſe of Neceſſity; That the Churches there were govern'd by Prieſts, who kept there the Aſſemblies of the People; That the Biſhops made their Viſitations in their Dioceſſes; That the Church of *Rome* was conſider'd as the Firſt; That the Church of *Alexandria* had much Authority over all *Egypt*; That they us'd to make the ſign of the Croſs, and believ'd that it drove away Devils; That they receiv'd not the Offerings of the Impious, but only thoſe of the Juſt; That a Biſhop was not allow'd to abdicate his Church; That they Faſted in *Lent*; That they celebrated the Feaſt of *Eaſter* with great Solemnity; That they us'd the Prayers of the Church, and read the Goſpel in the Vulgar tongue, which was underſtood by the People. I ſhall not ſtay to relate the Principles of Morality which are to be found in his Writings, becauſe they are but few, and thoſe few are not handled in their full extent, excepting only what concerns flight from Perſecution, and from a Biſhoprick, and the defence of the Truth.

The Firſt Editions of St. *Athanaſius*'s Works are very imperfect, and the Laſt are confus'd. The moſt Ancient that we have found, is a Latin Edition of ſome Books, which one *Barnabas Celſanus* printed at *Vicenza* in the Year 1482, and which he Dedicated to *Peter Brutus* a Biſhop. This Edition is entituled, *Treatiſes of St.* Athanaſius *againſt the Hereticks*, and it contains the Four Treatiſes againſt the *Arians*, that of the Union of the Humane Nature, together with the Diſpute againſt *Arius*, which was alſo printed in 1500.

This Edition was follow'd by that of *Paris* in 1520, which contains a good part of the Works of St. *Athanaſius* in Latin, tranſlated by different Authors, together with the Commentaries of *Theophylact* upon the Pſalms, which were alſo publiſh'd under the Name of St. *Athanaſius*, by *Chriſtopher Perſona*, who caus'd them to be printed at *Rome* in the Year 1477, [in *fol.* and afterwards in 1496. in *fol.*] and by *Reuchlin* at *Tubing*, in the Year 1515.

Theſe Diſcourſes were reprinted at *Francfort* by *Knobulchus* in 1522, and at *Baſle* by *Froben* in 1527. *Euſtachius Cornecef* Printer at *Cologne*, printed them in 1532, without the Commentary of *Theophylact* upon the Pſalms, and they were alſo printed the ſame Year at *Lyons* by the *Treſchels*.

After theſe, *Epiſcopius* and *Froben* undertook a new Edition of the Works of this Father: They were aſſiſted by *Nannius* Profeſſor at *Louvain*, who made a new Verſion of the moſt part of the Books which bear the Name of St. *Athanaſius*, and compar'd the Greek with three Manuſcripts. They divide the whole into Four Tomes, and place in the laſt ſome Diſcourſes attributed to St. *Athanaſius*, which had not been tranſlated by *Nannius*: This Edition was finiſh'd at *Baſle* in 1558, and reprinted in 1564.

Nivelle added a Fifth Tome, wherein he put the Life of St. *Anthony*, the Five Dialogues of the Trinity publiſh'd by *Beza* at *Baſle* in 1570. This Edition was printed twice at *Paris*, and the Letter to *Ammon*, in the Year 1572, and in the Year 1581.

Hitherto we have ſaid nothing of publiſhing the Greek Text of the Works of St. *Athanaſius*. *Commelinus*, a famous Printer at *Heidelberg*, firſt undertook it, which he happily finiſh'd in the Year 1600; and the ſame Year he publiſh'd in Greek and Latin, over againſt one another, all the Works of St. *Athanaſius* in two Volumes, whereof the Firſt contains thoſe that were tranſlated by *Nannius*, and the Second all that could be found beſides. The Greek Text is revis'd by many Manuſcripts, and printed very exactly. He took care alſo to add at the End, the different Readings collected by *Flecmannus*; but theſe are only in ſome Copies. This Edition, though very large, is very confus'd; for the Books are without any order, without any Obſervations, and many times the Verſion is very faulty.

It was a little while after corrected by *Fronto Ducæus*, and printed at *Paris* without the Greek in 1612, but he has left many Faults.

At laſt in the Year 1627. the Bookſellers of *Paris* made a New Edition Greek and Latin of the Works of St. *Athanaſius*. They follow'd *Commelin*'s for the Greek, and that of 1612, for the Latin; and though they ſay in their Advertiſement that they have exactly revis'd the Greek Text by the Manuſcripts in the Royal Library, and have corrected an infinite number of places in it, yet they have ſtill left a good number of Faults behind. They have added in this Edition the Greek of the Life of

St. *Anthony*

St. *Anthony*, which was publiſh'd before by *Hæſchelius* in 1611, a Homily upon *Eaſter*, publiſh'd by *Plantin* at *Antwerp*, in 1508, the Homilies of *Holſtenius*, and ſome other Fragments: But they have neither chang'd the Order of the Books, nor diſtinguiſh'd the Genuine from the Suppoſititious. St. *Athanaſius.*

What I have now ſaid, ſufficiently diſcovers the Neceſſity that ſome very Skilful Perſon, or rather, ſome Religious Society, ſhould undertake to publiſh a New Edition of the Works of St. *Athanaſius*. And to make it perfect, they muſt compare the Greek Text exactly with Manuſcripts, make a new Verſion of all the Books, diſtinguiſh the Genuine from the Suppoſititious, and make a ſeparate Volume of theſe Laſt, dividing the Firſt, as we have done, into Four Parts: The Firſt ſhould comprehend the Hiſtorical Books; the Second, the Dogmatical: the Third, the Moral; and the Laſt, thoſe upon the Scriptures. In the Hiſtorical, they muſt obſerve the Order and Thread of the Hiſtory; in the Dogmatical, they muſt keep the Order of the Subject Matters; and in thoſe upon the Scripture, they muſt firſt place thoſe that are more general, following very near the Order which we have obſerv'd in our Abridgment. As to the Suppoſititious Books, 'twere good to diſtinguiſh them into three Ranks: The Firſt, ſhould contain the Books of ancient Authors unknown; the Second, thoſe of Modern Authors; and the Third, thoſe whereof the Authors are known unleſs you would rather paſs by the Laſt, and remit the Reader to the Books where they are printed, [with the other Works of thoſe Authors to whom they do of right belong.]

JACOBUS NISIBENUS.

ST. *JAMES*, a Native of *Niſibis*, a City of *Meſopotamia*, which was anciently the Boundary of the Empire between the *Perſians* and *Romans*, having led a very auſtere life in the Deſart, and becoming famous by his Confeſſion under *Maximinus*, and by the great number of Miracles which he wrought, was choſen Biſhop of that City, where he was born: though he did not for that forſake his manner of life, nor work fewer Miracles than before; nay, 'tis ſaid, that he even rais'd up the Dead. He aſſiſted at the Council of *Nice*, where he condemn'd the Hereſie of *Arius*: and *Theodoret* ſays, that being at *Conſtantinople*, when they would oblige *Alexander* Biſhop of that Church to receive *Arius* into Communion, he adviſ'd the Catholicks to have recourſe to God by Faſting and Prayer, and to Pray altogether for the ſpace of Seven Days, that they might agree among themſelves what was beſt to be done. The *Perſians* coming about the Year 338, to Beſiege the City of *Niſibis*, St. *James* upon this occaſion did the Office both of a Governour and a Biſhop; for he not only made fervent Prayers for his People, but encourag'd them by his Exhortations to Re-build a Wall in the room of that which the Beſiegers had beat down; he mounted upon the Walls of the City, and appear'd Miraculouſly cloathed with Purple, as if he had been an Emperour. 'Tis ſaid alſo, That at his Prayer God rain'd an infinite Multitude of Gnats, which ſo annoy'd the Beſiegers, that they were forc'd to retire in diſorder. This Story is related not only by *Theodoret*, who has written the Life of this Saint in his Book entituled, *Philotheus* [which is an Hiſtorical Account of Thirty eminent Aſceticks] and who ſpeaks alſo of this Circumſtance in his *Hiſt. Ch.* 30. of his Second Book; but alſo by *Philoſtorgius*, who cannot be ſuſpected of too much favour to ſo great an Enemy of the *Arians*. *Jacobus Niſibenus.*

St. *Athanaſius* ſpeaks of this Saint, as of a Biſhop who had written for the Church: And if St. *Jerom* has not plac'd him among the number of Eccleſiaſtical Writers, *it is becauſe*, *as* Gennadius *has obſerv'd*, *that this Father underſtood not the Syriack Tongue*, having never read thoſe Syriack Writers, [This, with *Gennadius*'s leave, is ſomething ſtrange: for it is not credible that a Man who lived ſo long in *Paleſtine*, where Syriack was the Mother-Tongue, and who underſtood Hebrew ſo well as St. *Jerom* did, ſhould not underſtand Syriack, which is but a different Dialect.] whom he mentions but in their Verſion; ſo that we muſt not wonder, that he ſays nothing of his Works, becauſe they were never tranſlated into Greek. *Gennadius* has made a Catalogue, wherein he ſays, That the Work of this Author contain'd 26 Books, but he names but 23. The 1ſt. is *concerning Faith*; The 2d. *againſt all Hereſies*; The 3d. *of Charity in general*; The 4th. *of Charity towards our Neighbour*; The 5th. *of Faſting*; The 6th. *of Prayer*; The 7th. *of the Reſurrection*; The 8th. *of the Life after Death*; The 9th. *of Humility*; The 10th. *of Patience*; The 11th. *of Penance*; The 12th. *of Satisfaction*; The 13th. *of Virginity*; The 14th. *of the Life of the Soul*; The 15th. *concerning Circumciſion*; The 16th. *concerning the Benediction of the Grape*, which is the cauſe that the Bunch of Grapes is preſerv'd, which is mention'd by the Prophet *Iſaiah*, Ch. 65; The 17th. *of Jeſus Chriſt, to prove that he is the Son of God and Conſubſtantial to his Father*; The 18th. *of Chaſtity*; The 19th. *againſt the Gentiles*; The 20th. *of the Building of the Tabernacle*; The 21ſt. *of the Converſion of the Gentiles*; The 22d. *of the Empire of the Perſians*; The 23d. *of the Perſecution of the Chriſtians*. *Gennadius*, ſays alſo, That this Father made a *Chronicle*, leſs ſtudied indeed than that of the Greeks, but more bold; for by uſing the words of Scripture, he ſtops the mouth of all thoſe that queſtion the Coming of Jeſus Chriſt upon vain Conjectures. " This holy Man *as* Gennadius *goes on*, died under *Conſtantius*, and was buried by *Conſtan-*
" *tine*'s Order in the City of *Niſibis*, to be a kind of a Defender of it after his Death; but ſome time
" after, *Julian* entring into this City, either becauſe he could not endure the Glory of this Saint, or
" becauſe he would reproach the Memory of *Conſtantine*, commanded, that the Relicks of his holy
" Body ſhould be thrown out of the City; wherefore in a few Months after the Emperour *Jovian*
" was forc'd, to ſave his Empire, to Surrender it to the *Perſians*, under whoſe Dominion it ſtill re-
" mains. [*Theodoret* gives us another Account of the removal of St. *James*'s Body: He ſays, That when *Jovian* Surrendred up *Niſibis* to the *Perſians*, the Inhabitants who left the Town, carried the

Martyr's Bones along with them: His Teſtimony is the more valuable becauſe he lived near the place, and alſo, becauſe, as he tells us himſelf in his *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory*, he took a great deal of pains to collect and write down the Wonderful Things which were related of this Saint.]

MARCELLUS *of* Ancyra.

Marcellus of Ancyra.

MARCELLUS, Biſhop of *Ancyra*, aſſiſted at the Council of *Nice*, where he defended the Faith and oppos'd the *Arians*, as Pope *Julius* affirms, upon the Report of St. *Sylveſter* the Pope. After that Council he wrote a Book againſt *Aſterius* and other Biſhops of the *Arian* Faction, entituled, *Concerning the Submiſſion of Jeſus Chriſt*; wherein he advances many Propoſitions favouring the Error of the *Sabellians*. The *Euſebians* immediately accus'd him of this Hereſie, and it is ſaid, that he promis'd in the Council of *Jeruſalem* to burn his Book; but refuſing to do it when he was at *Conſtantinople*, he was condemn'd and depos'd in a Council held in that City by the *Euſebians* in the Year 336. There is ſome probability that he was reſtor'd again to his See after the Death of *Conſtantine*; but he was driven away at the ſame time that St. *Athanaſius* was forc'd out of *Alexandria*, and oblig'd to fly for Refuge into the Weſt, where he was Abſolv'd in the Councils of *Rome* and *Sardica*. *Socrates* and *Sozomen* ſay, That after this laſt Council, he was reſtor'd to his Biſhoprick as well as St. *Athanaſius*, but that he could not live there in quiet, becauſe *Baſil*, who was Ordain'd in his room in the Year 336, was in Poſſeſſion of his See; and what became of him afterwards is not known. St. *Hilary* and *Sulpitius Severus* affirm, That St. *Athanaſius* having diſcover'd that he favour'd the Error of *Photinus*, depriv'd him of his Communion; and this Biſhop ſeeing himſelf condemn'd by his Judgment, refrain'd from coming to the Church-Gate. But this Relation is not true; for St. *Athanaſius* does always ſpeak of him in his Writings as a Catholick Biſhop, and we underſtand by the Letters which St. *Baſil* wrote to St. *Athanaſius* a little before his Death, that this Father continued always in Communion with him. St. *Jerom* places *Marcellus* of *Ancyra* among the number of Eccleſiaſtical Writers; and ſays that he compos'd many Volumes upon different Subjects, but chiefly againſt the *Arians*. We have nothing of his Works remaining, but ſome Fragments recited by *Euſebius* in the Books which he wrote againſt this Author: Theſe paſſages are very intricate, and favour the Error of the *Sabellians*. Some have accus'd *Euſebius*, that he took for a poſitive Aſſertion what *Marcellus* had only propos'd by way of Doubt or Objection: but the contrary appears ſufficiently from *Euſebius*'s Book, where 'tis plain, that in the greateſt part of the paſſages which he recites, *Marcellus* of *Ancyra* propoſes his true Sentiment, which 'tis very difficult to explain in a Catholick Sence. It appears by theſe Fragments, that *Marcellus* was a Man that talked much, who had little Wit, or Knowledge, or Eloquence, and was altogether void of good Sence. St. *Epiphan. in Hæreſ.* 72. recites a Letter of *Marcellus* of *Ancyra*.

HOSIUS.

Hoſius.

HOSIUS, Biſhop of *Corduba*, a City of *Spain*, did generouſly confeſs the Faith of Chriſt, in the Perſecution of the Emperour *Dioclefian*. The *Donatiſts* affirm, That he was condemn'd for his Crimes by the Biſhops of *Spain*, and was afterwards Abſolv'd by thoſe of *France*: But this is a Notorious Calumny, of which they have no Proof, and which is ſufficiently confuted by the great Reputation that *Hoſius* had all his Life-time; beſides, that his Enemies never charg'd him with any ſuch thing. His Name is found amongſt the Names of thoſe Biſhops that Subſcrib'd to the Canons, which are believ'd to be made in the Council of *Elvira*. He was known to *Conſtantine*, while this Emperour was in the Weſt, and follow'd him into the Eaſt; where he was ſo much eſteem'd by him, that he was choſen to be ſent into *Egypt*, to ſettle the Controverſies that were riſen there about the Hereſie of *Arius*, and the Celebration of *Eaſter*. There he aſſembled a Council, to which the Egyptians have not ſcrupled to give the Name of *Oecumenical*, and us'd his utmoſt endeavours to reduce *Arius* to the Communion of his Biſhop *Alexander*, and to eſtabliſh Peace: But all was in vain, for 'twas neceſſary to have recourſe to a more Powerful Remedy, which was the General Council of *Nice*. There he was choſen Preſident, either becauſe of his Eminent Vertues, and Rare Qualities, or becauſe he had a perfect Knowledge of the Matter which was to be handled in that Council. He preſided alſo at the Council of *Sardica*, and maintain'd for a long time with great Conſtancy the Faith of the *Nicene* Council, and the Innocence of St. *Athanaſius*, under the Reign of *Conſtantius*. This Emperour did in vain ſollicite him with Promiſes and Threatnings, for he anſwer'd and wrote to him with unſhaken Firmneſs; but at laſt, he was ſo far overcome by the Miſeries which he ſuffer'd in Baniſhment, as not only to Communicate with *Urſacius* and *Valens*, in the Year 357, as St. *Athanaſius* confeſſes, but alſo to Subſcribe to the Second Creed of *Sirmium*, which is *Arian*, as St. *Hilary* and *Rhebadius*, who liv'd at the ſame time, do clearly Teſtify. Yet 'tis true, that St. *Athanaſius* who endeavours to excuſe the Fault of his Friend, as much as he can, ſays, That he did not Subſcribe to his Condemnation, and that his Friend at his Death, proteſted by his Laſt Will and Teſtament, againſt what he had done, and expreſly condemn'd the Hereſy of *Arius*. Theſe two Authors, whom we cited before, do not ſpeak at this Rate of him: but on the contrary, St. *Hilary*, ſays, That his Subſcription diſcover'd what he was formerly, *i.e.* an Hypocrite, who had no other Religion, but that of the Court.

But

But it will be better to ſpare his Memory with St. *Athanaſius*, than to blacken it by Declamations without Ground. His Fault indeed was very great, but then his great Age, and the Violence that was us'd towards him, do render him the leſs culpable; and I think we ought to believe upon the Teſtimony of St. *Athanaſius*, that he repented of what he had done before his Death. 'Tis true, that the two *Luciferians* tell us a Story which would prove the contrary if it were certain; but it looks like a Fable. They ſay in their Petition to the Emperour *Valentinian*, that *Hoſius* being return'd into *Spain* with a Declaration of the Emperour, wherein 'twas ordain'd, That all thoſe that would not Communicate with him, ſhould be caſt out of their Sees; One *Gregory*, Biſhop of the Province of *Bætica*, a dull Man, but a zealous Defender of the Faith, refus'd to Communicate with him; and being forcibly carried away to *Corduba* by the Governor's Guards, he continued firm in his Opinion, and boldly reproved *Hoſius*. That *Hoſius* being mov'd with a violent Paſſion, deſired of the Governor to ſend that Biſhop into Baniſhment: But the Governor anſwer'd him, That he muſt firſt be Condemn'd. And that *Hoſius* being ready to pronounce the Sentence of Condemnation againſt him, he appeal'd to the Tribunal of Jeſus Chriſt; and when *Hoſius* was juſt beginning to Pronounce the Sentence, he fell into *Convulſions*, and was caſt down Dead upon the Ground, or at leaſt loſt his Speech. This is what theſe two *Luciferian* Prieſts ſay of *Hoſius*'s End: But beſides that this Relation is refuted by the Poſitive Teſtimony of St. *Athanaſius*, which is much more credible than theirs; it has all over the Air of a Fable feign'd by *Lucifer*'s Party, who pleaſe themſelves, as is uſual for the moſt part with thoſe Devoto's that are too auſtere, with ſuch kind of Tragical Stories that happen for the Puniſhment of ſome Crime. He liv'd almoſt 100 Years, and died in the Year 358. St. *Athanaſius* in his Letter to the *Egyptians*, which is call'd his Firſt Diſcourſe againſt the *Arians*, places *Hoſius* in the number of thoſe who had written againſt the *Arians*, but we have no more of him but that excellent Letter to *Conſtantius*, recited by St. *Athanaſius* in his Letter to thoſe that lived a Monaſtick Life; of which we have made an Extract, when we diſcours'd of the Works of St. *Athanaſius*. *Iſidore* of *Sevil* attributes alſo to *Hoſius* a Letter to his Siſter, in praiſe of Virginity; which was written, as he ſays, in a Stile very Eloquent and Polite; and moreover, he ſays, That he was the Author of a Part of the Canons of the Council of *Sardica*: Some alſo have ſaid that he made the *Nicene* Creed, but without Ground. *Hoſius.*

We may join with *Hoſius*, ſome Authors whereof St. *Athanaſius* makes mention in his Letter to the *Egyptians*, who compos'd very Orthodox Books, which we have not at preſent, and whereof we have not ſo much as the Titles. Theſe Authors are *Maximinus*, of *France*, Biſhop of *Triers*, and his Succeſſor *Paulinus*; *Philogonus*, of *Antioch*; *Cyriacus*, of *Myſia*; *Piſtus* and *Ariſteus*, of *Greece*; *Sylveſter* and *Protogenes*, of *Dacia*; *Leontius* and *Eupſychius*, of *Cappadocia*; *Cæcilian*, of *Africk*; *Euſtorgius*, of *Italy*; *Capito*, of *Sicily*; *Macarius*, of *Jeruſalem*; *Alexander*, of *Conſtantinople*; *Pedaratas*, of *Heraclea*; *Meletius*, *Baſil* and *Longinus*, of *Pontus* and *Armenia*; *Lupus* and *Appianus*, of *Cilicia*. All theſe Biſhops, and many others, compos'd Letters or Books, which were extant in St. *Athanaſius*'s time, but now we know nothing of them.

JULIUS.

JULIUS, was ordain'd Biſhop of *Rome*, in the Year 334, or 335. He call'd a Council at *Rome* in which St. *Athanaſius* was declar'd Innocent: and wrote a Letter to the Biſhops of the *Eaſt*, of which we have given an Extract, when he gave an Account of the Works of St. *Athanaſius*. He ſent his Legates to the Council of *Sardica* and wrote a Letter to thoſe of *Alexandria*, wherein he Congratulates the return of St. *Athanaſius* to them. Theſe two Letters are genuine, and are to be found in the Works of St. *Athanaſius*. The *Eutychians* have attributed to Pope *Julius*, a Letter concerning the Incarnation, addreſs'd to one *Dionyſius*, which *Gennadius* believ'd to be truly his; tho' he obſerves, That tho' it might be uſeful in the time of this Pope, againſt thoſe that admitted Two Perſons in Jeſus Chriſt; yet it prov'd pernicious after the Hereſy of *Eutyches* and *Timotheus*, which it very much favour'd. But this Letter has been rejected by *Hypatius*, in a Conference at *Conſtantinople*, with the *Acephali*; by *Facundus*, *B.* VII. *Ch.* 1. by *Eulogius*, in his Third Diſcourſe; and by *Leontius* of *Conſtantinople*, Book of *Sects*, Ch. 8. who have all affirmed, That 'twas written by *Apollinarius*, and by the *Eutychians*, and falſly attributed to Pope *Julius*. There is another Letter of *Julius*, about the Incarnation, to *Docus*, which is alſo cited in the Council of *Epheſus*, Art. 1. *Facundus* has acknowledg'd it for Genuine; and *Vincentius Lirinenſis*, ſays, that in that Council, The Faith of the Church, was confirm'd by the Teſtimony of Pope *Julius*. *Ephrem* has alſo acknowledg'd it for Genuine, as appears by an Extract out of his Third Book of Laws related by *Photius*. *Anaſtaſius* has cited it in his Collections about the Incarnation, as written by *Acacius*. *Leontius* only has rejected it in his Treatiſe of *Sects*, where he affirms, That 'tis the Work of *Timotheus*, a Diſciple of *Apollinarius*, as was prov'd then by many Copies. He adds, nevertheleſs, That 'tis not at all contrary to the Faith, and that 'tis no great matter whoſe it is. In ſhort, the ſame *Leontius*, affirms, That there were no Writings of *Julius* in his time (which muſt be underſtood with an exception to thoſe that are extant in St. *Athanaſius*,) and that the Seven Epiſtles which bear his Name, were *Apollinarius*'s. And truly, there is no probability, that *Julius* wrote Letters about the Incarnation at a time when there was no Queſtion, but about the Trinity: Beſides, 'tis known, that the *Eutychians*, were wont to attribute the Works of *Apollinarius*, to the Fathers, who had the Reputation of Catholicks, as St. *Athanaſius*, St. *Gregory*, and St. *Cyril*, that ſo they might deceive the People, and engage them unto their Hereſy. *Julius.*

Julius. I ſay nothing of the two Decretal Epiſtles attributed to Pope *Julius*, becauſe they are plainly ſuppoſititious. This Pope died in the Year 352, and was ſucceeded by *Liberius*. The Author of *Damaſus*'s Pontifical, *Uſuardus*, *Ado*, and ſome others, relate, That he was Baniſh'd for the ſpace of Ten Months, till the Death of *Conſtantius*: But this cannot be maintain'd, for *Julius* never ſuffer'd any Perſecution, nor any Baniſhment, for the Defence of St. *Athanaſius*, ſince this Father ſays not one word of it in his Books, who would never have fail'd to charge the *Arians* with the Baniſhment of *Julius*, as well as with that of *Liberius*, and other Biſhops of his Party.

ASTERIUS.

Aſterius. ST. *JEROM* places this *Arian* Philoſopher among the Number of Eccleſiaſtical Writers, not becauſe he wrote a Book againſt the Faith of the Church about the Trinity, but becauſe of his Commentaries upon the Epiſtle to the *Romans*, upon the *Goſpels*, upon the *Pſalms*, and many other Books; which ſhows, That a Heretick may be plac'd amongſt Eccleſiaſtical Authors, when he writes ſuch Learned Books as may be ſerviceable to the Church. St. *Athanaſius* gives a very different Character of this *Aſterius* from that which *Euſebius* had given of him in his Book againſt *Marcellus*. "One *Aſterius*, ſays "he, in his Book of the Two Synods, a Sophiſt of *Cappadocia*, is a Partizan of the *Euſebians*; and "when he could not enter into the Order of the Clergy, becauſe he had Sacrific'd to Idols, during "the Perſecution of *Maximian*, he was adviſ'd to write a Book for the Opinions of *Euſebius*, the Im-"piety of which is equal to that of his Idolatry: For there he compares Jeſus Chriſt to a Locuſt, and "a Worm of the Earth; nay, and ſeems to preferr theſe Inſects before him. He affirms, That the "Word which is in Jeſus Chriſt, is different from the Word which created the World: He runs "through all *Syria*, and enters into all the Churches by the Favour of *Euſebius*'s Recommendation, to "teach others to deny Jeſus Chriſt. He inſolently oppoſes the Truth, and goes into thoſe places which "are appointed only for the Clergy, and there he rehearſes very loudly, his impious Book. Thus St. *Athanaſius* deſcribes the Man and his Work. There are ſome Fragments preſerved in his Writings, which expreſly contain the impious Opinions of the *Arians*: I am only now to tell you, That this *Aſterius*, is different from the Biſhop of *Amaſea*.

THEODORUS.

Theodorus. *THEODORUS*, Biſhop of *Perinthus*, a City of *Thrace*, who was alſo call'd *Heracleus*, was a Biſhop of the *Euſebian* Party. St. *Athanaſius* in his Letter to the Biſhops of *Egypt*, places him among the Number of thoſe that were condemn'd, being Prieſts, and afterwards promoted to Epiſcopal Dignity by the Intrigues of the *Arians*. He aſſiſted at the Council of *Tyre*, and was one of the Deputies that were ſent to *Marcotis*, to Inform againſt St. *Athanaſius*. He aſſiſted alſo at the Council of *Antioch*, and came to that of *Sardica*; and having retir'd from thence with the Biſhops of the *Eaſt*, he was Depos'd and Excommunicated in a Synod of the *Weſtern* Biſhops. St. *Jerom* and *Theodoret*, Teſtify, that he was very Learned, and compos'd in the Reign of the Emperour *Conſtantius*, very Elegant and Clear Commentaries upon the Goſpel of St. *Matthew*, and St. *John*, upon the Epiſtles of St. *Paul*, and the *Pſalms*, in which he endeavours, particularly to explain the Hiſtorical Sence of them. We have in the *Catena* upon St. *Matthew*, publiſh'd by *Corderius*, and printed at *Antwerp*, in the Year 1642, ſome Fragments attributed to this *Theodorus*: But one cannot be certain upon the Credit of this *Catena*, that they are truly his.

TRYPHILIUS.

Tryphilius. *TRYPHILIUS*, Biſhop of a City in the Iſle of *Cyprus*, call'd *Ledra*, was, according to St. *Jerom*, one of the moſt Eloquent Writers of his Age; and was in great Reputation under the Reign of *Conſtantius*. St. *Jerom* had read his Commentary upon the *Canticles*, and ſays, That he wrote many other Books that never came to his Hands.

HELIO

HELIODORUS.

Heliodorus.

GENNADIUS informs us of this Author, in this manner. "*Heliodorus* a Priest, has "written a Book of the nature of Principles, wherein he shews, That there is but one Prin-"ciple only; That there is nothing Eternal, but God; That God is not the Author of Evil; That "all he does, is Good; That he created the Matter which the Malice of Men makes use of to do "Evil: That nothing was created without him, and that he having foreseen that Nature would "become subject to Corruption by Sin, he forewarned Man of this Punishment.

I have read nothing else that concerns this Author. *Gennadius* places him among those Writers that liv'd in the time of *Constantius*.

DONATUS, *and* Vitellius *and* Macrobius *his Disciples.*

Donat. and *Vitell.* and *Macrob.*

ST. JEROM, places among the Number of Ecclesiastical Writers, *Donatus*, Head of the Party of the *Donatists* in *Africa*; which in all probability is to be understood of the Bishop of *Carthage* (*a*). He says, That he wrote many Books concerning his own Sect; and a Book of the Holy Spirit, whose Doctrine was agreeable to that of the *Arians*. St. *Augustin* has wrote a Book against a Letter of this *Donatus* (*b*), and he assures us in his Book of Heresies, That he was an Eloquent Writer. *Gennadius*, mentions two other Authors of the same Party: The First is *Vitellius*, Who wrote, says he, a Book to Defend his Party, upon this Argument, *That the Servants of God are hated of the World.* This Book adds he, contain'd Excellent Doctrine, if he had not treated the Catholicks as Persecutors. He has written also against the Gentiles, and against the Catholicks, who, as he pretends, basely betray'd the Holy Books in the time of Persecution. There are some other Writings of his, which concern the Discipline of the Church. He flourish'd under *Constans*, the Son of *Constantine*.

The Second is *Macrobius*, a *Donatist* Priest, who is mention'd in the Writings of *Optatus* (*c*), who was afterwards sent to *Rome*, to be Bishop there of those of his Party. He wrote before his Separation, a Book directed to Confessors and Virgins; which is a Book of Morality, and contains very useful Instructions, chiefly, to teach one to live in Inviolable Chastity. He flourish'd in *Africa*, among the Catholicks, and at *Rome* among the Donatists.

(a) *Which is to be understood of the Bishop of* Carthage.] There were Two *Donati* of the same Party, as St. *Austin* observes, *B* I. *Retract. ch.* 12. The First was *Donatus* Bishop of *Casæ nigræ*, or *Calamæ*, who never was Bishop of *Carthage*, whatever *Aibaspinæus* says, and the Second *Donatus* was Successor to *Majorinus*, against whom St. *Austin* wrote a Book, call'd *a Discourse against the Epistle of* Donatus; which was written the last by *Donatus*, for he compos'd that Epistle which St. *Austin* refutes; and confirm'd the Faction of the *Donatists* by his Eloquence.

(b) *St.* Augustin *has wrote a Book against a Letter of this* Donatus.] *Lib.* I. *Retract. ch.* 21. *I have written, says he, a Book against the Epistle of* Donatus, *who was Bishop of* Carthage, *next after* Majorinus, *wherein he pretends, that the Baptism of Jesus Christ is not valid out of his own Communion.*

(c) *Who is mention'd in the Writings of* Optatus.] *B.* II. *p.* 37. *Ye say*, says he, speaking to the *Donatists*, *That ye have many of your Party in the City of* Rome; *This is a Branch of your Error, which proceeds from a Lye, and can't come from the Root of Truth: And if it be demanded of* Macrobius, *what See he belongs to, he may say that he belongs to the Chair of St.* Peter, *which perhaps he never saw. How can he enter into the Church where the Sepulchers of St.* Peter *and St.* Paul *are? Did he ever offer to do it?*

St. ANTHONY.

St. *Anthony.*

ST. ANTHONY, who was the First Institutor of a Monastick Life, was born towards the Year 250, in *Egypt*: His Parents who were Christians, and very considerable for their Nobility, took great Care to Educate him in Piety: He was not Instructed in humane Learning, neither had he any Commerce with the World. His Father and Mother dying when he was but Eighteen Years old, left great Riches to him and his Sister: But a little after, he took up a Resolution of forsaking the World entirely; and then he distributed his Inheritance to his Neighbours, Sold his Moveables, and gave the Price of them to the Poor, and so retir'd into a solitary Place towards the Year 270. The first place of his Retreat, was a Cell near his own Village, and after that, he shut himself up in a Sepulchre that was more remote; but at last, he pass'd over the *Nile*, and retir'd into the Ruines of an Old Castle, where he stay'd near 20 Years. But he was forc'd to come fourth from thence towards the Year 305, to govern those that came to put themselves under his Conduct. About this time, the number of those that follow'd him, encreasing daily, several Monasteries were begun to be built in the Desarts, to which St *Anthony* was as a Father. His Charity oblig'd him to go out of his Solitude, during the Persecution of *Maximinus*, and to come to the City of *Alexandria*, that he might assist the Christians which suffer'd for Jesus Christ. But the Persecution was no sooner ended, but he return'd to his Monastery, where he betook himself to his former Exercises, and wrought many Miracles, for Delivering those that were possess'd, and Curing those that were sick. But these Extraordinary Actions drawing after him a great Multitude of Persons, who troubled his Retirement,

he

St. *Anthony.* he withdrew to the remoteſt Part of the Mountains, and there built a Cell, or a little Monaſtery upon Mount *Colzim*, about a Day's Journey from the *Red-Sea*. He liv'd long in this Solitude, out of which he went nevertheleſs from time to time to viſit his former Diſciples, who look'd upon him always as their Father. In a word, After he had acquir'd an Immortal Fame here on Earth, he went to receive the Reward of his Labours in Heaven, in the 19*th.* Year of the Reign of *Conſtantius*, *i.e.* in the Year 356, being the 105*th.* Year of his Age.

Theſe are the principal Circumſtances of the Life of St. *Anthony*, taken out of the Hiſtory of his Life, attributed to St. *Athanaſius*, which one may read if he has a mind to know thoſe things more particularly. But this is not the place to inſiſt upon them, for we conſider him neither as a Monk, nor as a Saint, but only as a Writer. And one may ſay with all the reſpect that is due to him, That in this Capacity, he was much leſs Famous, and leſs known; for as he had not ſtudied at all, ſo he could not undertake to write any Great Books; but the quickneſs of his Wit, might furniſh him with Pieces of leſs Conſequence, ſuch as Letters, Exhortations and Anſwers, ſo that no Writings but of theſe ſorts are attributed to him.

St. *Jerom*, ſays, That he wrote in the Egyptian Tongue, Seven Letters to ſeveral Monaſteries, which come near, ſays he, to the Opinions of the Apoſtles, and their manner of Writing; and theſe have been tranſlated into Greek, but we have nothing of them at preſent, but a Latin Verſion, which is attributed to one *Sarraſius*. The Firſt of theſe Letters is, concerning Vocation; the Second, concerning the Snares of the Devil, and the means of avoiding them; the Third is, concerning the Bleſſings of God towards Mankind; the Fourth, concerning the Incarnation of Jeſus Chriſt; the Fifth, concerning Chriſtian Vigilance; the Sixth, concerning the Knowledge of one's ſelf, and the Neceſſity of the Incarnation; the Seventh and Laſt, is alſo concerning the Knowledge of our ſelves; and he Concludes with an Advertiſement againſt *Arius*, Of theſe Letters, there are Six addreſs'd to the *Arſinoites*, (*i. e.* to the Monks of one of his Monaſteries, which was at *Arſinoe*) tho' St. *Jerom* ſpeaks but of one that was directed to them. Theſe are all written with much Candor; the Thoughts and Expreſſions indeed are ſomething elevated, but the Air is ſimple and without Ornament. There a Man may find a great deal of Piety, and many Excellent Counſels, eſpecially for thoſe Perſons that make profeſſion of a Monaſtick Life. In ſhort, 'Tis obvious to every one that reads them, That the Writer was a much better Chriſtian, than a Scribe, one that underſtood better the Maxims of Chriſtianity, than the Precepts of Eloquence, and was much more fill'd with the Unction of the Holy One, than with Humane Science and Learning.

St. *Athanaſius*, or the Author of the Life of St. *Anthony*, which is attributed to this Father, ſets down a long Exhortation of St. *Anthony* to his Monks, which contains many Inſtructions very uſeful for them, and wholeſome Advices about the Temptations of the Devil. There are alſo found in this Writing, ingenious Anſwers of the ſame Saint to the Philoſophers, and ſome other Perſons, and a Letter to the Emperour.

There is moreover a ſhort Rule attributed to St. *Anthony*, ſet down in the Collection of Rules made by St. *Benedictus Anianenſis* who liv'd towards the Year 820, from the birth of Chriſt, which contains many Moral Precepts, and preſcribes ſome Monaſtical Obſervations. Beſides theſe, *Gerard Voſſius* has given us under the Name of St. *Anthony*, a Sermon, which is a Declamation againſt the Vices and Exceſſes of the Men of the World, at the End of which he Exhorts Men to do Penance, by repreſenting unto them the Judgment of God, and the Pains which the damned ſuffer after the Reſurrection. 'Tis hard to ſay, whether this Diſcourſe be truly St. *Anthony's*, or whether it be only put out under his Name, as a Diſcourſe that would agree exactly to one ſo retir'd from the World as he was. Be that as it will, it has much of the Stile of this Saint's Letters, though more Elegant and Sublime.

Laſtly, There were two Books of Latin Sermons, attributed to St. *Anthony* in the time of *Trithemius*; but now all the Criticks agree, that they are none of his, neither can be, ſince they cite St. *Baſil*, St. *Gregory Nyſſen*, St. *Chryſoſtom*, St. *Nilus* and *Photius*, Authors that liv'd and wrote after St. *Anthony*. The Letters of St. *Anthony* were printed apart, and are ſince inſerted into the *Bibliotheca Patrum*. His Rule is in *Benedictus Anianenſis*'s Code, publiſh'd by *Holſtenius*, from the Copy of a Manuſcript, (which was in the Monaſtery of St. *Maximin*, near *Triers*,) [at *Rome* in 1661.] and re-printed in *Quarto* at *Paris*, by *Billaine* in 1663.

St. PACHOMIUS.

St. *Pachomius.* THough St. *Anthony* was the Inſtitutor of a Monaſtick Life, yet St. *Pachomius* ought to be conſider'd as the Author of a Cœnobitick Life, becauſe he was the firſt that appointed regulated Societies. He was born in *Thebais*, of Gentile Parents, and did for ſome time bear Arms in the War of *Conſtantine* againſt *Maxentius*. When this War was ended, he, who had been always a Chriſtian in his Heart, was baptiz'd, and retir'd with an Hermit nam'd *Palemon*, under whoſe Conduct he led a very auſtere Life. He ſtay'd afterward in *Tabenna*, a Country of *Egypt*, ſituated on the Brink of the *Nile* in the Dioceſs of *Tentyra*, where he Founded a Monaſtery, in obedience, as is believ'd, to the Admonition of an Angel, and in Conformity to a Rule, which he is thought to have received from it. Be this as it will, (for though this Story be related by many Authors, I do not think that any Man is abſolutely oblig'd to believe it:) Be this as it will, I ſay, the Monaſtery which he Founded in *Tabenna*, was fill'd in a very little time, and he was oblig'd to build many more of them; ſo that he peopl'd all the *Upper Thebais* with Monaſteries of his Order. 'Tis reported in the Greek Acts of his Life, publiſh'd

lish'd not long since in the great *Collection of the Lives of the Saints* by *Bollandus* and *Papebrochius*, that he was accus'd at a Synod of *Diospolis*, because he Divin'd the most secret Thoughts of Men; but he was Absolv'd by the same Synod, where were two of his Disciples, after he declar'd that God of his Grace reveal'd to him the most hidden things. He died about the Year 400. We have in the Life of St. *Pachomius* a Rule which is thought to have been given him by the Angels; but there is another also which bears the Name of this holy Abbot, in the Collection of the *Oriental Rules*, in the *Bibliothecæ Patrum*, and at the End of some Editions of *Cassian*, which is much larger, and seems to have been drawn up at different times. It contains many Rules concerning the Habits, the Diet, the Employments and the Discipline of Monks: 'Tis thought to have been translated by St. *Jerom*, and there is at the beginning, a Letter which imitates the Stile of this Father well enough. There are also some Moral Precepts publish'd under his Name by *Gerard Vossius*, printed at *Mentz* in the Year 1604, and in *Benedictus Anianensis*'s Collection, there are Eleven Letters (*a*) of the same Author, written with much Simplicity, which are cited by *Gennadius*; and a Letter of *Theodorus* his Disciple, concerning *Easter*. *Gennadius* calls St. *Pachomius* a Man truly Apostolical in his Discourses and Actions: His Rule is very Judicious, and comes down to all the Particulars necessary for the Government of a Monastery.

St. *Pachomius.*

(a) *Eleven Letters.*] These were written, as *Gennadius* observes, to the Superiours of the Monasteries of his Community, who are design'd by the Letters of the Alphabet; there is One to the Abbot *Hyrus*, One to the Abbot *Cornelius*, One to all the Superiours, to advertise them to come and Celebrate the Feast of *Easter*, at a Monastery call'd in the Egyptian Tongue *Baüm*, and this is cited by St. *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, in a Letter cited by *Bucherius*: There is another to the same persons, giving them notice to meet on the Day of Remission, *i. e.* at the General Chapter, which was held in the Month of *August*, and another to the Brethren, who were gone out of the Monastery to Work.

ORSIESIS.

ORSIESIS was Successor to *Pachomius* after *Petronius*, who govern'd the Monastery of *Tabenna* but a few days. He has written a Spiritual Treatise of the *Doctrine or Institution of Monks*, which he lift when he was a Dying to the Religious of his Monastery. 'Tis an Exhortation that he made to them to Watch over themselves, and to discharge their Duties exactly, and is fill'd with many Passages of Scripture, which he applies to his Subjects very properly. Upon this account 'twas that *Gennadius* said that this Treatise was season'd with Divine Salt, *Divino sale conditus*. 'Twas printed apart by *Gymnicus* at *Cologne* in the Year 1536. and afterwards inserted into the *Bibliothecæ Patrum*. 'Tis found also in *Benedictus Anianensis*'s Code, that was publish'd by *Holstenius*.

Orsiesis.

THEODORUS.

THEODORUS a Presbyter, one of the Principal Disciples of St. *Pachomius*, and his Successor in the Government of the Abby of *Tabenna*, if we believe *Gennadius*, wrote Letters to other Monasteries, which are almost wholly made up of Passages of Scripture: and yet there he often mentions his Master St. *Pachomius*, and proposes his Example and Doctrine for their Instruction. He admonishes also some Religious to continue with Zeal in their Vocation, and exhorts those that were separated from the Society of others to a Re-Union. *Gennadius* says, that there were Three Letters on this Subject, but we have only one Extant, which concerns the Assembly of Monks at *Easter*, and that, as we have already said, is in the Abbot of *Anian*'s Code.

Theodorus.

The MACARII.

THere are several Hermits of this Name, that liv'd much about the same time, and who are easily confounded, if one does not take heed. The First is he that dwelt in the Desart of *Sceta*, and liv'd in the time of St. *Pachomius* and *Orsiesis*, and was *Evagrius*'s Master: He was an Abbot in *Egypt* and his Feast is kept on the 15th. of *January*. He was call'd the *Young Old-man*, παιδαριογέρων, because he had in his Youth the Judgment and Gravity of an Old-man. The Second *Marcarius*, Abbot in *Thebais*, was the Disciple of St. *Pachomius*, and his Feast is kept on the 12th. of *January*. 'Tis commonly believed, That the First of these *Macarii* was the Disciple and Interpreter of St. *Anthony*, mention'd by St. *Jerom* in the Life of *Paul* the Hermit: But *Possinus* the Jesuit maintains with great probability, that the Disciple of St. *Anthony* was different from both these two: and he proves it, because he was one of those two Disciples, who stay'd with St. *Anthony* in his Solitude Fifteen Years, and interr'd him; which cannot be said of the First *Macarius*, who died in 390, after he had been 60 Years a Monk of *Sceta*.

The *Macarii.*

There

The *Macarii.*

There is yet a 4th. *Macarius*, a Monk as well as the other three, but Younger than they, who wrote at *Rome* about the beginning of the 5th. Century, a Treatiſe againſt the Mathematicians. This is he to whom *Ruffinus* addreſs'd his Apology for *Origen*, and of whom St. *Jerom* ſays to *Ruffinus* in his 2d. Apology, *If you had not come from the Eaſt, this able Man had been ſtill among the number of Mathematicians*; And in his 16th. Letter, *He had been Truly* Macarius, *that's to ſay, Bleſſed, if he had not met with ſuch a Maſter.* There are many Books which bear the Name of *Macarius*, and 'tis not known to which of the three they belong. Theſe are, Firſt, Fifty Greek Homilies, tranſlated by *Picus* printed at *Paris* in *Octavo* in the Year 1559, and printed ſince in *Folio* in the Year 1623, with St. *Gregory Thaumaturgus.* There is alſo an Edition in *Octavo*, printed at *Francfort* in 1594. with the Tranſlation of *Zacharias Palthonius*, and they are inſerted into the *Bibliothecæ Patrum.* Secondly, Seven Tracts, publiſh'd in Greek and Latin by the Jeſuit *Poſſinus*, in his Book, entituled, *Theſaurus Aſceticus*, or the *Aſcetical Treaſure*, printed at *Tholouſe* in the Year 1684. Thirdly, A Rule publiſh'd by *Roverius* from a Manuſcript of the Abby of *Becco*, and in the Collection of the Abbot of *Anian*; where there is alſo another Rule written by way of Dialogue between *Serapion*, *Paphnutius*, and the two *Macarii*, which had been before publiſh'd at the End of *Caſſian*, in the *Antwerp* Edition of the Year 1578.

Gennadius aſſures us, That *Macarius* the Egyptian, *i. e.* the Elder, who was a Monk of *Sceta*, wrote only one Letter to the young Monks, wherein he teaches that Man can perfectly ſerve God, when knowing his Nature, he does voluntarily embrace all ſorts of Labour, and reſiſts all that is moſt Charming in this Life, to try the Aids that God has given him; and in ſhort, when by keeping himſelf pure, he arrives to that degree of Continence, that it becomes as it were natural to him. The Subject of this Letter comes near to thoſe Principles which are found in the Tracts and Greek Sermons that bear the Name of *Macarius*; which would make me believe that they were his, if *Gennadius* had not aſſur'd us, that *Macarius* the Egyptian wrote but one Letter only, which he mentions. We muſt therefore ſay, either that *Gennadius* was miſtaken, or that he intended another *Macarius*; or laſtly, That the Author of theſe Works, was that *Macarius*, who was the Diſciple and Interpreter of St. *Anthony*, ſuppoſing with *Poſſinus*, that he was not *Macarius* the Egyptian.

However, The 50 Homilies appear to me to be very Ancient; they are Exhortations to the Religious, and not Sermons to the People. The Firſt contains an Allegorical Explication of the Viſion of the Cherubims related by *Ezekiel*, which he applies to the ſtate of Man's Soul in this Life. The 2d. is of the Kingdom of Darkneſs; that is to ſay, of Sin; from which he maintains, That Man could not be deliver'd but by the Grace of Jeſus Chriſt, and by the Gifts of the Holy Spirit. In the 3d. He recommends to the Brethren to live in Peace, not to condemn one another; to pray continually, and to purifie their outward Man by fighting againſt the Temptations of the Fleſh and the Devil. He ſays in this Homily, That 'tis in our power to reſiſt and fight, but God only can pluck up Sin by the Roots; And that as a Man cannot See without Light, Speak without a Tongue, Hear without Ears, Walk without Feet, Labour without Hands; no more can a Man be Sav'd without Jeſus Chriſt. In the 4th. he ſhows, That in order to Improvement in Vertue, we muſt renounce the World, that we may obtain the Love of the Holy Spirit, which is abſolutely neceſſary for the Sanctification of Mankind. He teaches in this Homily, That Angels and Souls are very thin and ſubtile Bodies, which was an Error very common among the Ancient Monks. In the 5th. he deſcribes the difference between the Life of this World and that of Chriſtians. The 6th. is of Prayer, where he ſays, That it ſhould be made in ſilence, with Peace and Tranquility; That we muſt not throw fourth confuſed Cries, but having God before our Eyes, we muſt pray with Attention, and with a Mind full of holy Thoughts. At the end of this Exhortation, there are two Queſtions and Anſwers touching ſome paſſages concerning the Incarnation of Jeſus Chriſt. The 7th. and 8th. are Queſtions and Anſwers about many Difficulties. All which ſhew, That theſe are not Homilies to the People, but the Exhortations of an Abbot to his Regulars, who had propos'd to him the Difficulties they might meet with, to be reſolv'd in them. There are ſome of theſe Queſtions more curious than ſolid, and the Anſwers are often very Myſtical. Thoſe of the 8th. are about Prayer. In the 9th. he ſhows, That none can deliver himſelf from Temptations, but by fixing his Mind entirely upon God. In the 10th. he ſays That though a Man be improv'd in Vertue, yet he ought to conſider himſelf as one that has done nothing, and then he ought to reach forth after God with greater fervour, leſt he loſe the Holy Spirit by Pride or Lazineſs. The 11th. and 12. contain very obſcure Reflexions concerning the Fall of Mankind, and the Mercies of Jeſus Chriſt; and in the latter part there are Queſtions and Anſwers of very little uſe. In the 13th. he ſays, That ſince the coming of Jeſus Chriſt, God requires of Men greater Holineſs than before. In the 14th. he diſcourſes of the Reward of Chriſtians. The 15th. has no particular Subject. It begins with a Reflexion upon the Obligation that lies upon Chriſtians to honour Jeſus Chriſt with Purity and Faithfulneſs: and after this it contains many Queſtions, whereof the Firſt is concerning the Reſurrection; *viz.* If a Man ſhall riſe with all his Members; and the reſt concerning Concupiſcence, and the Inclination to Sin, that is found in all Men. He is of opinion, That 'tis a kind of Fire kindled in a Man, which inflames, as one may ſay, all his Parts; That a Man may reſiſt it, but that to do it aright, he muſt watch continually over himſelf, and always fight againſt it. He ſays, That thoſe who reſiſt their Paſſions, receive the Holy Spirit, and the Grace which Jeſus Chriſt has merited for them; but they ought to take good heed, that they be not lifted up with Pride, and that they continue in Humility and Contempt of themſelves, as being accountable to Jeſus Chriſt for the Grace they have received; and capable of falling from that State of Holineſs in which they are, unleſs they preſerve themſelves in it, by the vertue of Humility, which he calls the Sign and infallible Mark of a Chriſtian. In the 16th. he ſays, That a Man ought always to live in Fear, becauſe he is always

always expos'd to Temptations; That even thoſe that have not yet received Grace, ought ſo to behave themſelves, as to do Good and forſake Evil by Natural Motives; but thoſe who have receiv'd it, need not ſuch kind of Motives, becauſe this Grace producing Love in their Hearts, makes that become ſweet and pleaſant, which appear'd rough and uneaſie, and makes that appear eaſie which was thought before to be impoſſible. In the 17th. he treats of the Spiritual Unction, and the ſtate of the more Perfect Chriſtians, and makes it appear, that notwithſtanding any Holineſs they have acquir'd, they ought always to fear, becauſe they are always in a Capacity of falling away. In the 18th. he declares the marvellous Effects of the Gifts of the Holy Spirit in the Soul of a Spiritual Man. In the 19th. he explains the degrees through which a Man ought to paſs to acquire Perfection; That he ought firſt to uſe his utmoſt natural endeavours to do good, and then God ſeeing him ſtrive after this manner, gives him the Grace of Prayer, by which means he obtains all Vertues. In the 20th. he ſays, That none but Jeſus Chriſt can cure the Soul that's wounded by the Sin of *Adam*, and therefore we muſt addreſs our ſelves to him by Prayer, that he would give us his Grace. The 21ſt. is of the War that Men are oblig'd to make againſt their Vices and their Paſſions. In the 22d. he deſcribes the terrible difference between the latter End of the Juſt and the Wicked; and ſays, that at the hour of Death the Souls of the Juſt are received by Angels and conducted to the Lord; but thoſe of the Wicked are encompaſs'd by Devils, who draw them down with themſelves to Hell. The 23d. is of the Victory which a Chriſtian ought to gain over his Paſſions. The 24. is of the Neceſſity of the Grace and Influence of the Holy Spirit, to make us capable and worthy of Eternal Life. He continues the ſame Subject in the 25th. wherein, after he has prov'd, that we cannot ſhun all the occaſions of Sin, nor reſiſt all our Paſſions, without the aſſiſtance of the Grace of Jeſus Chriſt, he makes a lively Repreſentation of the ſtate of the Men of this World, and deſcribes the wonderful Effects which the Cœleſtial Fire of the Holy Spirit produces in our Souls. The 26th. contains many Queſtions and Anſwers, concerning the Temptations of the Devil and the Effects of Grace. The Author there teaches, That Man is reſtor'd to his Primitive Dignity by the Holy Spirit; That the Devil cannot tempt us any further than God permits him; That Grace changes the Affections of the Heart; That the Devil knows ſome part of our Thoughts, but there are others unknown to him; That Grace and Charity have no Bounds, and we ought never to ſay that we have arriv'd at the higheſt degree of Perfection; That the Soul goes immediately after Death to that place on which its Love was plac'd during this Life; That the Good which may be done by Natural Strength, can never Save a Man without the Grace of Jeſus Chriſt; That we ought always to attribute to him all the Good we do, and to ſay, If God had not aſſiſted us, we ſhould neither have Faſted, nor Prayed, nor forſaken the World: And that God ſeeing us attribute to him the Actions which may be done by our Natural Powers, has liberally beſtow'd upon us the Spiritual, Heavenly and Divine Gifts of his Grace; That the Actions which are done without Grace, may be Good, but they are not Perfect. In the 27th. after he has firſt conſider'd the Dignity of a Chriſtian, he then Anſwers to many Queſtions about the Effects of Grace: He ſays, That no Man ſhall ever arrive at the top of Perfection in this World; That whatever ſtate they are in, whatever Grace they have, they are always capable of ſinning; That the ſtrongeſt Grace does not hinder the Will from following after Evil, becauſe the Nature of Man, as long as he is in this World, is changeable, and that though God has beſtow'd very ſingular Grace upon Chriſtians, they ought nevertheleſs to work out their own Salvation with Fear and Trembling. In the 28th. he deplores the ſtate of that Soul where Jeſus Chriſt dwells not at all, becauſe of Sin. In the 29th. he ſays, That God gives his Grace after two different manners; That he prevents ſome with it before they have us'd their own endeavours, and beſtows it upon others after they have labour'd a long time; and then he ſhows what reaſon we have to admire the Goodneſs and Wiſdom of the Divine Conduct both towards the one and the other. In the 30th. he ſhows, That if the Holy Spirit does not produce within us the Love of God, we cannot enter into the Kingdom of Heaven. In the 31ſt. he Exhorts Men to Prayer, That they may obtain the change and renovation of their Heart. In the 32d. he ſays, That we cannot certainly know whether we be in a ſtate of Grace as long as we are in this World, becauſe we are always tormented with the Motions of Luſt, but at the Day of Judgment, thoſe who belong to God ſhall be made known. The 33d. is of the Attention and Fervour we ought to have in Prayer. The 34th. is of Eternal Glory. The 35th. is of the ſtate of a Soul which God has deliver'd from Evil Thoughts, which he calls a New Sabbath. The 36th. is of their different degrees of Glory, who ſhall riſe again from the Dead. In the 37th. he proves, That many who have thought themſelves Juſt, were not really ſo; and that thoſe who believ'd themſelves to be arriv'd at the higheſt degree of Perfection, have oftentimes faln into Sin. I paſs over the 38th. becauſe that is entire among the little Tracts of *Mark* the Hermit. In the 39th. he ſays, Tis to no purpoſe to read the Scripture, if we do not make improvement by it. In the 40th. he proves, That there is a concatenation of Vertues one with another, and that there is the ſame in Vices: He anſwers alſo three Queſtions, and in his Anſwers, he ſays, That there are different degrees of Damnation, and that greater Sinners ſhall be more puniſh'd, than thoſe that have not committed ſo great Crimes; That the quiet ſtate of ſome Souls does not hinder them from exerciſing Charity; That Grace and an Inclination to Sin may be found together in one and the ſame Soul at the ſame time. In the 41ſt. he deſcribes the Improvements of Grace in a Soul, and makes it appear, that none can preſerve this Diſpoſition of growing in Grace without Humility. In the 42d. he ſays, That nothing but the Actions of Men can be hurtful or uſeful unto them. In the 43d. he ſpeaks of the different Improvements of thoſe that ſtrive againſt Sin, but 'tis ſo obſcure, that hardly any thing can be underſtood in it. The 44th. is of the Change that Jeſus Chriſt wrought in us, and the manner how he heals our Souls: He continues the ſame Subject in the following Homily, and explains by many Com-

The *Macarii.*

 pariſons,

The *Macarii.*

pariſons, the Union of the Soul with God. In the 46th. he ſays, That a ſick Soul may have recourſe to a Phyſician, to pray and requeſt his help, and when the Heavenly Phyſician comes to its aſſiſtance, he joyns himſelf to it, to lighten and conduct it, and make it his Spouſe. The 47th. contains many Allegorical Explications of the Law of *Moſes*, which he applies to the different ſtates of the Soul. In the 48th. he ſays, That thoſe who have a true Faith of Heavenly things, ought not to have their Affections fix'd on things of this Earth; and that thoſe who retire from the World, ought not to be ſollicitous or anxious about the things thereof: In ſhort, he would not have the Monks make uſe of any Medicines to help them in their Diſeaſes, but to put their whole Truſt in Jeſus Chriſt. In the 49th. he ſhows, That 'tis not enough to have abandon'd the World, but we muſt alſo ardently ſeek after Eternal Happineſs. In the 50th. and laſt, he obſerves, That God was the Cauſe of all the Miracles which the Saints wrought, and from this Remark he draws a Moral Reflection, that we cannot command the Devil, but by the Aſſiſtance of God and the Power of the Holy Spirit. He adds, That he that conſiders his Infirmity, his Weakneſs and Wounds, and does not withal conſider the Aids of the Holy Spirit which ſtrengthens him, is an Indiſcreet Man: And on the contrary, He that ſo much thinks upon the Divine Aids as to forget his own Weakneſs, and ſo fanſies that he can never fall, does miſerably deceive himſelf. After this manner does this Author always reconcile theſe two Fundamental Doctrines of Grace and Free-Will, that we ought always ſo to labour, as if the whole depended upon our own Endeavours, and yet to acknowledge that we can do nothing without God. And if Men had always contented themſelves with this Simplicity without nicer Philoſophical Enquiries, How many Queſtions had been ended without Noiſe! How many Differences compos'd! What Diſputes had been Aboliſh'd! What Arguments Superſeded! How many Books had been ſtifled! But to return to our Author; there are beſides Seven Spiritual Treatiſes of his, which have been publiſh'd in Greek and Latin by *Poſſinus*: The 1ſt. is concerning *Watching over our Heart*; The 2d. *Of Perfection of Mind*; The 3d. *Of Prayer*; The 4th. *Of Patience and Diſcretion*; The 5th. *Of the Elevation of the Mind*; The 6th. *Of Charity*; The 7th. *Of the Freedom of Spirit*; and ſome *Apophthegms of the Fathers*. 'Tis plain, That the Author of the 50 Homilies is the Author of theſe Treatiſes; for there is the ſame Genius in them both. He has the ſame Notions, and the ſame Stile. He Diſcourſes after the ſame manner of Grace and Free-Will, and he maintains in theſe Seven Treatiſes, as well as the Author of the Homilies, That Angels and Souls are Bodies. But 'tis not ſo certain that theſe are the Works of *Macarius* the Diſciple of St. *Anthony*; and I think 'tis more probable, that they were made by a later Monk. Whoever was the Author, his Stile is Simple, and one may ſee that he was a Good Hermit, who ſpeaks from his Heart without Affectation and ornament, and oftentimes even without Order. He allegorizes all, and expreſſes a great many myſtical Thoughts which are very hardly intelligible, and for the moſt part makes uſe of Compariſons which are not juſt and fit. In a word, Some things have eſcap'd him, which cannot altogether be reconcil'd to good ſence; ſo difficult a thing it is in Spiritual Matters not to wander ſometimes!

The Rules which bear the Name of *Macarius*, are of another Author; Thoſe that are found under the Name of *Macarius* only, in *Benedictus Anianenſis*'s Code, are attributed to *Macarius* of *Alexandria*, i. e. the Abbot of *Nitria*, Diſciple of St. *Pachomius*, and Maſter of *Evagrius*. There is a certain paſſage in them which ſeems to be taken out of St. *Jerom*'s Letter to *Ruſticus*, which makes me think, either that this was added, or that St. *Jerom* imitated St. *Macarius*. However this Rule is ancient, and is cited by the Author of the Life of St. *Philibert*, who ſays, That this Saint read the Rules of St. *Macarius*, St. *Benedict* and St. *Columbanus*. The other Rule which is found in the ſame Code, compos'd by the two *Macarii*, St. *Serapion*, and St. *Paphnutius*, is made in the Form of a Dialogue, and probably is nothing elſe, but ſome Conferences of theirs, which ſome Monks had gathered together; as the two Rules which follow in the ſame Code, are a Collection of the Speeches of 34 Abbots. There is alſo found a Rule in the ſame Code which bears the Name of the Abbot *Iſaiah*, which is proper for Hermits, and eſpecially younger Regulars. 'Tis full of Moral Precepts, and therefore had the Title of, *The Precepts and Advices of the Abbot* Iſaiah. This Abbot is probably he whom *Ruffinus* and *Palladius* mention and call *the Abbot of* Syria. There are alſo under the Name of the ſame *Iſaiah*, ſome *Remarks upon a Religious Life*, publiſh'd by *Poſſinus*. At the ſame time there liv'd one *Mark*, a Hermit, who dwelt in the Deſart of the *Cells*, and liv'd almoſt an Hundred Years, to whom ſome Books are attributed, which probably belong to another *Mark* who liv'd long after.

I ſhall ſay nothing at preſent of the Diſcourſes, the Anſwers, and Admonitions of the other Hermits of this time, becauſe they may be ſeen in *Ruffinus*, *Palladius*, and other Authors who have written their Lives.

SERAPION *Biſhop of* Thmuis.

Serapion Biſhop of *Thmuis.*

WE muſt not confound this *Serapion*, whom we now write of, with the famous *Serapion* Abbot in the Territory of *Arſinoe*, though he was a Monk and Abbot as well as the other; but this *Serapion* was Ordain'd towards the Year 340 Biſhop of *Thmuis* a City of *Egypt*, in the Province of *Sceta*, by St. *Athanaſius*, at we find in his Epiſtle to *Dracontius*. St. *Jerom* ſays, That this Biſhop deſerv'd the Name of a Scholar becauſe of his Eloquence; That he was St. *Anthony*'s Friend, and had the honour to be a Confeſſor under *Conſtantius*, that is to ſay, to ſuffer for the Defence of the Faith of the Council of *Nice*, and the Innocence of St. *Athanaſius*. 'Tis probable, that 'tis he, whoſe Name is read among the Subſcriptions of the Letter from the Council of *Sardica*: 'Tis he alſo who

who wrote to St. *Athanasius* about the Death of *Arius*, as we learn by the Answer of this Father, which is directed to him. St. *Jerom*, says, That he wrote a Book against the *Manichees*, a Treatise of the Titles of the *Psalms*, and many very useful Letters: We have no more extant, but his Treatise against the *Manichees*, publish'd by *Canisius*, wherein he proves, That Vice or Evil is not a Substance, and that our Nature is not Evil of it self: Which he proves chiefly, because many very wicked Persons do afterwards become very pious and vertuous. This is the Subject of this little Treatise. The Arguments in it are very Solid, but the Stile is very Simple and without Art.

Serapion Bishop of *Thmuis.*

EUSEBIUS EMISENUS.

THIS *EUSEBIUS*, was of *Edessa*, a City of *Mesopotamia*, of a considerable Family. He had learn'd from his Infancy the Holy Scriptures according to the Custom of his Country, and then he Studied the Greek and Humane Learning, and came to *Palestine* to perfect himself in the Knowledge of the Scripture; he was the Disciple of *Eusebius* of *Cæsarea*, and of *Patrophilus* of *Scythopolis*. The *Eusebians* would have chosen him Bishop of *Antioch*, after the Deposition of *Eustathius*; and afterwards would have plac'd him in the See of *Alexandria*, in the room of St. *Athanasius*, but he would not accept of these contested Bishopricks. He was afterwards Ordain'd Bishop of *Emesa*, near Mount *Libanus*, but the People made so great Resistance against him, that he was forc'd to retire to *Laodicea*, where he was well receiv'd by *George*, Bishop of that Church, who re-establish'd him in *Emesa*. He was very dear to *Constantius*, who carried him with him, to the *Persian* War. He died in the Year 359, when his Successor, *Paul* of *Emesa*, assisted at the Council of *Seleucia*, as we learn from St. *Epiphanius*. He is plac'd in some Martyrologies, among the Number of Saints. St. *Jerom* gives this Account of the Writings of this Bishop: "*Eusebius*, Bishop of *Emesa*, "who was well skill'd in Rhetorick, and had the Air of an Orator, wrote an infinite Number of "Books; he applied himself Chiefly, to give the Historical Sence of Scripture; and therefore those "who would learn to Preach, read his Books with great Attention. His principal Pieces were against the *Jews*, against the *Gentiles*, against the *Novatians*, Two Books of Commentaries upon the Epistle to the *Galatians*, and many short Homilies upon the Gospels. *Theodoret*, has preserv'd in his Third Dialogue, Two Fragments to prove, That the Divinity of Jesus Christ did not suffer, which are taken out of some of those Books that we have already spoken of; and there are in the Greek *Catena's* upon the Scriptures, several Fragments which are attributed to *Eusebius* of *Emesa*. The Homilies which we have at present under his Name, are none of his, tho' they are cited under his Name in the *Eleventh Century*, by *Guitmondus*, and in the *Twelfth*, by *Gratian*, but they were all written by some Latin Authors, much later than *Eusebius* of *Emesa* (*a*); some of them by St. *Eucherius*, others by *Faustus Rhedonensis*, and *Cæsarius* of *Arles*, and many other French-men. *Petrus Diaconus*, Library-keeper of *Mount-Cassin*, attributes these Homilies upon the Gospels, and upon the Feasts of the several Seasons, and of the Saints of the Year, to *Bruno*, Bishop of *Signi*; and this is confirm'd by the Catalogues in the Manuscripts of the *Vatican*, and *Mount-Cassin*, where these Homilies are attributed to the same Author. They were Publish'd by *Gagneus*, and Printed apart, and also in the Fifth Volume of the *Bibliotheca Patrum* at *Cologne*.

Eusebius Emisenus.

(a) *But they were all written by some Latin Authors, much later than* Eusebius *of* Emesa.] The Stile is of a Latin Author that understood no Greek: And it appears by the Homilies of St. *Blandina*, *Epiphodius*, *Alexander* of St. *Genest*, that the Author was a *Frenchman*. There is a Sermon of St. *Maximus* the Second Abbot of *Lerins*, which mentions also St. *Honoratus* Abbot of *Lerins*. And afterwards Bishop of *Arles*, who liv'd long after the Death of *Eusebius* of *Emesa*. There is also a Sermon of the Rogation-days instituted by St. *Mamertus*. The Author calls himself the Disciple of St. *Maximus* Abbot of *Lerins*, which makes me believe that these Sermons belong to St. *Eucherius* of *Lyons*, under whose Name they have been printed. The Author of the Homilies about *Easter* opposes the Heretick *Pelagius*, and cites St. *Gregory the Great*.

BASIL *of* Ancyra.

BASIL, was ordain'd Bishop of *Ancyra*, in the Year 336, by the Bishops of *Eusebius*'s Party, in the room of *Marcellus*, whom they had already Deposed: He was Excommunicated, and his Ordination declar'd void in the Council of *Sardica*, but yet he continued still in the Possession of his See: He Disputed against *Photinus* in the Council of *Sirmium*, in the Year 351, and there confounded that Heretick. He was one of the greatest Enemies to the *Arians* or *Anomœans*, that is to say, to those that openly defended the Opinion of *Arius*, and maintain'd, that the Word was not at all like to the Father: But he was look'd upon, as the Head of that Party, which was afterwards call'd *Semi-Arians*, who refusing to acknowledge, That the Son was Consubstantial with the Father; affirm'd, that he was like him in all things, and even in Substance. *Basil* maintain'd this Opinion stoutly, and caus'd it to be Establish'd by the Authority of a Council, which was held at *Ancyra*, in the Year 358. He defended it at *Seleucia* and *Constantinople*, against the Intrigues of the *Eudoxians* and *Acacians*, who Depos'd him in the Year 360, after they had charg'd him with many Crimes. St. *Jerom*, informs us, That *Basil* of *Ancyra*, wrote a Book against *Marcellus* his Predecessor, a Trea-

Basil of *Ancyra.*

Baſil of Ancyra.

tiſe of Virginity, and ſome other little Pieces. We have nothing of his extant, but his Conduct and Actions, diſcover him to have been a Man of Wit, Eloquent, and well skill'd in Theology. Tho' he is ſaid to be the Head of that Party, who were call'd *Semi-Arians*, yet 'tis not certain that he was a Heretick; on the contrary, St. *Baſil* ſpeaks of him as a Catholick Biſhop, and St. *Athanaſius*, confeſſes in his Book of Synods, That *Baſil* of *Ancyra*, and thoſe of his Party, did not differ from them that profeſs'd the Conſubſtantiality, but only in words; and therefore St. *Hilary* and *Philaſtrius*, call the Biſhops of the Council of *Sirmium*, that was held againſt *Photinus*, whereof *Baſil* of *Ancyra* was the Chief, Orthodox and Holy Biſhops.

LIBERIUS.

Liberius.

LIBERIUS Succeeded Pope *Julius* in the See of *Rome*, in the Year 352. He proteſts in one of his Letters, That 'twas much againſt his Will, that he was promoted to this Dignity. In the Fragments of St. *Hilary*, there is a Letter attributed to this Pope, which was written to the Biſhops of the *Eaſt*, ſoon after his Elevation to the Pontificate, wherein he acquaints them, That he had ſent to St. *Athanaſius*, three Prieſts of the Church of *Rome*, *Luke*, *Paul* and *Ælianus*, to cite him to *Rome*, that Judgment might be given about his Cauſe, according to the Diſcipline of the Church; That he had alſo directed another Letter to him, wherein he acquaints him, That in Caſe he did not come to *Rome*, He would declare him Excommunicated from the *Roman* Church. He adds, That theſe Prieſts being return'd, and having inform'd him that *Athanaſius* refus'd to come, he had follow'd the Judgment that the *Eaſtern* Biſhops gave againſt him; That he would Communicate with them, and all the Biſhops of the Catholick Church; That on the contrary, *Athanaſius* was faln from his Communion, as well as from that of the *Roman* Church, and from all Correſpondence with it by Letters.

This is the Subſtance of this Letter attributed to *Liberius*, which would not be much for his Advantage, if it were really his: But I think, 'tis very probable, that he never wrote any ſuch thing, and that this Epiſtle was forg'd by him that made the Collection of the Fragments of St. *Hilary*. For Firſt, Is it any ways Credible, that *Liberius* ſhould Excommunicate St. *Athanaſius*, without any Cauſe, and without any Regard to the Judgment of his Predeceſſor, or to that of the Council of *Sardica*?

Secondly, The Author of this Letter ſays, That the *Eaſtern* Biſhops had wrote to *Julius* againſt St. *Athanaſius*, without mentioning the Judgment which this Pope gave in his Favour.

Thirdly, St. *Athanaſius* never complains that *Liberius* had Excommunicated him before he was Baniſh'd; but on the contrary, he ſuppoſes, That he was always for him, till he Subſcrib'd in the place of his Baniſhment.

Fourthly, The Words of St. *Hilary* which follow this Letter, have no connexion with the Contents of it, and plainly ſhow, That he refers to a quite different Letter: The Words are theſe; [*Is not this a very Holy Letter? What does it contain in it that proceeds not from a Spirit full of the Fear of God? But* Potamius *and* Epictetus, *deſiring to condemn the Biſhop of* Rome, *as is ſaid in the Synod of* Ariminum, *would not obey him; and tho'* Fortunatianus *ſent this Letter to many Biſhops, he loſt his Labour.*] Now is it credible, That St. *Hilary* ſhould ſo commend a Letter that contain'd the Condemnation of St. *Athanaſius*? What he adds, does yet more clearly prove what we have ſaid, and confirm our Opinion. [*They would rather prejudice their own Intereſts, and hazard all, than refuſe Communion to St.* Athanaſius, *or reflect upon the Authority of the Council of* Sardica, *which had abſolv'd him. The Egyptians wrote to* Liberius, *that he ſhould maintain Communion with St.* Athanaſius, *as they had formerly written to* Julius, *to deſire him, that he would reſtore him to it.*] Theſe words plainly diſcover, that *Liberius* had not Excommunicated St. *Athanaſius*, ſince the *Egyptians* do not deſire him, as they had formerly done *Julius*, to reſtore him to Communion, but only to maintain Communion with him. *Qualis ad Julium pridem de reddenda exulanti Communione, talis nunc, ut de ſubjectis intelligitur, datæ ſunt de tuenda.*

Fifthly, *Liberius* himſelf is a Witneſs, That he never Excommunicated St. *Athanaſius*. For in his Letter to *Lucifer*, where he gives an Account of what happen'd about the Cauſe of this Saint, at the beginning of his Pontificate, he ſays, That the Biſhops of the *Eaſt* had written Letters againſt him, that he had not ſuppreſs'd them, as he was accus'd, but had read them in Council, and yet gave no Credit to them: *Queis fidem & ſententiam non commodavimus noſtram:* [*Which we did neither believe nor approve,*] becauſe he at the ſame time receiv'd Letters from 75 Biſhops of *Egypt*, in behalf of St. *Athanaſius*. Does not this plainly ſhew, That the Letter which we now ſpeak of, was none of *Liberius*'s, ſince it ſuppoſes, that he believ'd the Letter from thoſe of the *Eaſt*, and Excommunicated St. *Athanaſius*.

Sixthly, If *Liberius* had Excommunicated St. *Athanaſius* at the beginning of his Pontificate, would not the Officers of *Conſtantius* have alledg'd this as a Reaſon to make him Subſcribe to his Condemnation? And how could he have maintain'd ſo ſtoutly as he did, That the Church of *Rome* had always held him Innocent?

Seventhly, Tho' *Liberius* ſhould have conceal'd or ſuppreſs'd this Letter, while he was of St. *Athanaſius*'s Party; yet would he not have produc'd it immediately after he had Sign'd againſt him? For then he could have no Intereſt to conceal it, but on the contrary, was oblig'd to publiſh it: And yet

even

even then he confesses, that he was always of St. *Athanasius*'s side. [*Because* Julius *my Predecessor of happy Memory, receiv'd St.* Athanasius *into his Communion, I was afraid lest I should have pass'd for a Prevaricator, if I should have condemned him; but as soon as I understood that you had justly condemn'd him, I follow'd your Judgment.*] Does not this plainly shew, that *Liberius* did not Condemn St. *Athanasius* at the Beginning of his Pontificate, but that on the contrary, he did always Protect him, upon the Authority of his Predecessor? *Liberius.*

Lastly, There are some Expressions in this Letter, that were not us'd till after *Liberius*'s time.

From all which, I conclude it to be false, that *Liberius* did write this Letter, or Excommunicate St. *Athanasius*. On the contrary, immediately after he was exalted to the Pontificate, he wrote to him a Letter of Communion. The Bishops of the *East* wrote to him against this Saint, and those of *Egypt* for him. He read their Letters in a Synod, where 'twas decreed that Communion must be continued with St. *Athanasius*, as it had always been in the *West*. This happened towards the End of the Year 352, or at the Beginning of 353, before the defeat of *Magnentius*. After the Death of this Tyrant, *Constantius* conven'd a Council at *Arles*. *Liberius* sent thither *Vincentius* of *Capua*, in his Name, together with *Marcellus* a Bishop in *Campania*, and gave them Order to entreat the Emperour, That he would call a Council at *Aquileia*. These Bishops were so far from being stedfast, that they suffer'd themselves to be impos'd upon, and Subscrib'd to the Condemnation of St. *Athanasius*, together with all the other Bishops of the Council, excepting only *Paulinus* the Bishop of *Triers*: *Liberius* understanding this, sent *Lucifer Calaritanus*, with *Pancratius* a Priest, and *Hilary* a Deacon, to carry a Letter to the Emperour *Constantius*, wherein after he had given an Account of what we have already said concerning every thing that had been done since the Beginning of his Pontificate, in the Cause of St. *Athanasius*, he prays him to Order the Examination of this Affair in a Free Council, upon Condition that they should begin with Confirming the *Nicene* Creed. He gave to the same Deputies a Letter of Recommendation, address'd to *Eusebius Vercellensis*, and indeed, he wrote two other Letters to him, one of Recommendation, and another of Thanks. About the same time, He wrote also to *Hosius*, and to other Bishops concerning the Lapse of *Vincentius* of *Capua*. Immediately after the Council of *Milan*, held in the Year 355, which was not more favourable to St. *Athanasius*, than that of *Arles* had been before, *Liberius* wrote an Elegant Letter to *Eusebius Vercellensis*, *Denys* and *Lucifer* then in Banishment, wherein he praises them for their Constancy, and testifies to them, That he was ready to suffer the same Persecution for the same Cause. He says, He knew not whether he should be griev'd for their Absence, or rejoyce for their Glory; which he observes to be greater than that of former Martyrs, because these suffer'd only the Torments of their Pagan Persecutors, but they endur'd the Injuries of their false Brethren. He prays them to assist him with their Prayers, That God would give him Grace to bear with Patience and Constancy, the Tryals that he was threaten'd with. And indeed, a little after, *Constantius* perceiving that there was none almost left but *Liberius*, who justified the Innocence of this Saint, and desiring to confirm his Condemnation by the Authority of the Bishop of *Rome*, sent an Eunuch thither, who urg'd him to Subscribe to the Condemnation of St. *Athanasius* to no purpose; for all the Answer he could get from him, was, That he should call a Free Council in some place, that was distant from the Court, where there should be neither Guards nor Officers; That this Council should begin with making a Profession of the Faith, as it had been explain'd in the Council of *Nice*; That it should drive away all the *Arians*, and anathematize their Error, and then afterwards should examine the Cause of St. *Athanasius*. The Emperour having receiv'd this Answer, sent an Order to the Governour of *Rome*, to surprize *Liberius*, and send him to Court, which Order was executed. And when he was in the Emperour's presence, he spoke to him with no less Constancy, than he had done at *Rome* to his Eunuch. We have his Answers in *Theodoret* in *B.* II. of his *Hist. Ch.* 16. wherein he discovers an unconceivable Firmness of Mind, in refusing to Subscribe to the Condemnation of St. *Athanasius*. *Constantius* objected to him, That he had been condemn'd by all the World; and, says he, *You are the only Bishop in the World, that justifies an impious Disturber of the Peace*; to which he answer'd with great Constancy, *Tho' I were alone, yet the Cause of Faith is nevertheless Good, for at another time there were found but three young Men that disobey'd the Orders of the King.* After this, he pray'd him, That he would call a Synod, but withal, desir'd, That before they should proceed to examine St. *Athanasius*'s Cause, He would make all the Bishops Subscribe the *Nicene* Creed. *Constantius* being enrag'd against St. *Athanasius*, as supposing him the cause of that Enmity, which his Brother *Constans* had against him; *Liberius*, as to this, answer'd him wisely, *You ought not, Sir, to make use of Bishops to revenge your Quarrels; for the hands of Ecclesiasticks, ought not to be employ'd, but only to Bless and to Sanctify.* At last, *Constantius* threatning him with Banishment; *I have already*, says he, *bid adieu to my Brethren at* Rome, *for the Ecclesiastical Laws are to be preferr'd before my Living there.* Three Days time were given him to consider of it, and because he did not change his Opinion in that time, he was Banish'd two Days after to *Berœa*, a City of *Thrace*. The Emperour, the Empress, and the Eunuch *Eusebius*, offer'd him Money to bear the Expence of his Journey, but he refus'd it, and went away chearfully to the place of his Banishment. The Clergy of *Rome*, having lost their Head, took an Oath to chuse no body in the Room of *Liberius*, as long as he was alive: But *Constantius*, by the management of *Epictetus*, Bishop of *Centumcellæ* in *Italy*, procur'd one *Felix* a Deacon, to be ordain'd Bishop, who was himself also one of those that had sworn not to chuse a Bishop in the Room of *Liberius*. St. *Jerom*, says, That *Acacius* had a hand in this Ordination. St. *Jerom* and *Socrates* accuse this *Felix* of Arianism; but *Theodoret* and *Ruffinus*, say, That he was not an *Arian* in Doctrine, but only communicated with that Party. However, all the Ancients agree, That this

Ordination

Liberius. Ordination was not lawful (*a*); and ſome late Authors are very much to be blam'd for putting this Man in the Catalogue of Popes, and yet they have far leſs Reaſon to place him among the Holy Martyrs in very many Martyrologies (*b*).

But *Liberius*, who had given proof of ſo great Conſtancy in time of Peace, could not long endure the tedioufneſs of Baniſhment; for before he had been two Years in it, he ſuffer'd himſelf to be over-perſwaded by *Demophilus* Biſhop of that City, to which he was baniſh'd, and did not only Subſcribe the Condemnation of St. *Athanaſius*; but he alſo conſented to an Heretical Confeſſion of Faith (*c*);

(a) *However, all the Ancients agree, That this Ordination was not lawful.*] St *Athanaſius*, in his Epiſtle to thoſe that lead a Monaſtick Life; ſays, that he was ordain'd in the Palace without the Conſent of the People, or the Election of the Clergy, by *Epictetus*, in the Preſence of Three Eunuchs, and Three Biſhops, who were rather Spies than Biſhops; that the People would not permit him to enter into the Church, and withdrew themſelves from his Communion. St. *Jerom* ſays that he was an Antipope. *Optatus* and St. *Auſtin* in the *Catalogue of Popes*, makes no mention of *Felix*, but place *Damaſus* immediately after *Liberius*. And certainly *Liberius* being a lawful Biſhop, another could not be ordain'd in his Room. And whereas 'tis ſuppos'd, that after his Lapſe he fell from his Biſhop-rick. This can never make the Ordination of *Felix* valid which was null from the Beginning; Beſides *Liberius* was not depos'd after his Fall, but on the contrary was always acknowledg'd as a lawful Biſhop, and continued in the Poſſeſſion of his See with the Conſent of all the Biſhops of the Catholick Church.

(b) *They have far leſs Reaſon to place him among the holy Martyrs in very many Martyrologies.*] His Feſtival is kept on *Auguſt* 4th. *Mombritius* was the firſt that publiſh'd his Life, and after him *Baluſius* put forth a more correct Edition of it. There was a Diſpute about the Saintſhip of *Felix*, among the Correctors of the Roman Martyrology in the Time of *Gregory*; and 'tis ſaid, there was then found an old Inſcription in the Church of St. *Coſmus* and St. *Damian*, expreſs'd in theſe words: *The Body of St.* Felix *Pope and Martyr, by whom* Conſtantius *was Condemn'd.* But the Life of this *Felix* and theſe Monuments are apochryphal: For, firſt, they ſuppoſe that *Conſtantius* put him to Death; But 'tis evident by the Teſtimony of *Marcellinus* the Presbyter, that *Felix* ſurviv'd *Conſtantius*. 2. How could it poſſibly be, that neither St. *Athanaſius*, nor *Hilary*, nor *Lucifer*, &c. nor any other of the Ancients ſhould ever ſpeak one word either of the Condemnation of *Conſtantius* by *Felix*, or the Martyrdom of this Pope? 3. The Acts of *Mombritius* relate, that *Conſtantius* was condemned for being twice baptiz'd by *Euſebius* of *Nicomedia*: But 'tis manifeſt from the Teſtimonies of St. *Hilary* and *Lucifer*, that *Conſtantius* was a Catechumen, and was not baptiz'd till about the latter end of his Life by *Euzoius* as St. *Athanaſius* relates in the Book of Synods. The Authority of theſe Martyrologies is of little worth, as well as that of *Anaſtaſius* the Library-keeper. The Inſcription found in the Church of St. *Coſmus*, and St. *Damian* is an Argument of little weight.

(c) *Conſented to an Heretical Confeſſion of Faith.*] *Baronius* and many others maintain, that he ſubſcrib'd only the firſt Creed of *Sirmium* which was not heretical: But if this had been ſo, St. *Hilary* who approv'd this Creed, had never call'd that which was ſign'd by *Liberius, the Perfidiouſneſs of the* Arians, and anathematiz'd *Liberius* ſo often upon the Account of his Subſcription. St. *Jerom* ſays alſo, that *Liberius* was forc'd to ſign Hereſy, and all the Ancients ſpeak of the Fall of *Liberius*, as the Approbation of the Hereſy of the *Arians*, which made *Faber*, *Blondel* and *Petavius* think that *Liberius* ſubſcrib'd the Second Creed of *Sirmium*. But this Opinion has its Difficulties, for St. *Hilary* ſays, that the Creed ſign'd by *Liberius* was compos'd by 22 Biſhops, which were for the moſt part Eaſtern; and that the Second Creed was made by *Potamius* and the Weſtern Biſhops. *Baſil* is reckon'd among thoſe that approv'd the Firſt, and condemn'd the Second Creed of *Sirmium* as ſoon as it appear'd. In ſhort, *Liberius* return'd not from his Exile, till after the Council of *Ancyra*; in which, the Eaſtern Biſhops had already thrown out the Second Creed of *Sirmium*. What Probability is there then, that they ſhould offer it to him to ſign? To anſwer theſe Difficulties and clear up this Matter, we muſt obſerve, that *Demophilus* caus'd *Liberius* to ſign or approve a Creed while he was in Exile, different from that which he ſign'd after his Return to *Sirmium*; that the Creed which *Demophilus* preſented to him, was made at *Sirmium* by many Biſhops, *quæ*, ſays *Liberius* in his Letter, *Sirmium à pluribus Fratribus, & Coepiſcopis noſtris tranſlata & ſuſcepta eſt*: Words which can be underſtood of none but the Second Creed of *Sirmium*, which begins thus; *Cum nonnulla putaretur eſſe de fide diſceptatio, diligenter omnia apud Sirmium tractata ſunt & diſcuſſa, præſentibus ſanctiſſimis Epiſcopis*: And therefore we muſt ſay, that the Creed which *Liberius* approv'd in his Exile was the Second of *Sirmium*: For *Demophilus* was an *Arian*, and of the Party of *Urſacius* and *Valens*, who maintain'd the Second Creed of *Sirmium*. 'Twas for this Reaſon that *Eudoxus* and *Aëtius* ſpread a Report that *Liberius* was of their Opinion, and *Liberius* himſelf wrote to *Urſacius* and *Valens*, that he was of their Judgment; but being afterwards call'd to *Sirmium*, where he found *Baſil* of *Ancyra*, *Eleuſius*, and the other *Semi-Arian* Biſhops, who a little before had condemn'd the *Arians* in the Council of *Ancyra*, he and thoſe other Biſhops ſign'd a Book, which contain'd the Creeds of *Antioch*, the Firſt of *Sirmium*, and thoſe other Creeds that aſſerted the Son to be like unto the Father, and were oblig'd to condemn thoſe that ſaid he was unlike to him. See *Sozomen B.* IV. *ch.* 15. of his *Hiſt.* Nevertheleſs it may be objected, That the Second Creed of *Sirmium* was not made by *Baſil* and the other Eaſtern Biſhops; but that which was preſented to *Liberius* by *Demophilus*, was made by theſe Biſhops as we are aſſured by the Fragments of *Hilary*. To this, I know of no other Anſwer but by ſaying, that the Names of theſe Biſhops were added by the Author who made theſe Extracts out of St. *Hilary*, who has put in the Margin, *Inquirendum, i. e. we muſt enquire if theſe were the Biſhops*: Which plainly diſcovers, that he was not certain of it, but might ſet down thoſe Names at a venture. This is what I thought my ſelf oblig'd to ſay of this Queſtion, which is very difficult and famous, though of no great uſe: [Though it is of no great Importance for us to know who preciſely were the Biſhops that drew up the Second *Sirmian* Creed; yet it is of great Moment to know whether that or the Creed of the Firſt Council of *Sirmium* were ſign'd by Pope *Liberius*: Our Author, who knew the thing was too groſs to be quite omitted, ſhuffles it off at laſt as if it had been a critical Queſtion, only ſtarted at firſt to employ the learned: But when the ableſt Advocates of the Church of *Rome* have confeſſed, that an *Arian* Creed was deliberately ſign'd by one of its Biſhops, they muſt alſo own that this deſtroys Infallibility effectually: And St. *Hilary*'s Carriage, who declaimed againſt *Liberius*'s Apoſtacy with all the Warmth that he uſually employ'd upon ſuch Occaſions, ſhews how the Orthodox Biſhops of that Age, thought a Biſhop of *Rome* might be treated, when guilty of a Crime which they thought equal to that of denying the Faith in the Times of Paganiſm.]

whether

whether it was the First or Second Confession of *Sirmium*, is disputed among the Learned. Whichsoever 'twas, he did certainly write one Letter of Communion to the Bishops of the *East*, wherein having declar'd St. *Athanasius* to be cast out of his Communion, and acknowledg'd his Approbation of that Confession of Faith which *Demophilus* presented unto him, he desires them to use their Interest and Prayers with the Emperour, to obtain his Deliverance from Banishment, and restauration to that Church which God had entrusted him with. He wrote also at the same time two Letters, which contain'd for the most part the same things, one to *Ursacius* and *Valens*, and the other to *Vincentius* of *Capua*; which are preserved amongst the Fragments of St. *Hilary*. *Liberius.*

After these Letters *Liberius* quickly obtain'd his Desires; for the Emperour being satisfied, sent immediately for him to come to *Sirmium*, where he found Deputies of Bishops from the *East* and from the *West*. There was held a kind of a Council, which made a Collection of all the Creeds that had been approv'd by the *Semi-Arians*, wherein the Son was declar'd like unto the Father in Substance. These Creeds *Liberius* was oblig'd to sign, and then was sent back to *Rome*, with a Letter from the Synod directed to *Felix*, importing that *Liberius* and he should govern the Church of *Rome* as Co-partners. But *Liberius* was no sooner return'd thither, but *Felix* was forc'd to depart, and when afterwards he endeavour'd to return by Force, he was driven away with disgrace.

Now *Liberius* seeing himself in peaceable Possession of his See, as he had Subscrib'd against his will to the Condemnation of St. *Athanasius*, and the Creeds of the *Arians*, so he quickly repented of what he had done, made Profession of the *Nicene* Creed, and reconcil'd himself to St. *Athanasius*. He wrote one Letter to all the Bishops in the World in the Year 362, wherein he would have all those Bishops pardon'd, who through surprize, had approv'd of the Error of the *Arians*; but he absolutely Anathematizes the Heads of their Party, and those that would not return from their Error. This Letter is set down in the Fragments of St. *Hilary*. At last the *Semi-Arians* seeing themselves over-power'd by the *Anomœans*, who had more Interest in the Emperour *Valens*, had recourse to *Liberius*, and sent to him, in the Year 366, *Eustathius* of *Sebaste*, together with *Sylvanus* and *Theophilus* Bishops of *Cilicia*, who presented him with Letters from the Council of *Lampsacus*: *Liberius* at first would not receive them, because, he said, they were of *Arius*'s Faction; but they perswaded him that they would retract that Error, and profess that the Son is perfectly like his Father, and of the same Substance; yea, they made Profession of the *Nicene* Creed it self, approv'd the word *Consubstantial*, and condemn'd the Creeds of *Ariminum* and *Seleucia*. *Liberius* having exacted of them these Declarations, wrote into the East in their favour; and he died within a little time after in the Year 366 (*d*). The History which we have now given of *Liberius*, informs us of the number of Letters that were written by this Pope, as well as the time, the occasion and subject of every one of them: And therefore it will be sufficient here to give a Catalogue of them, and to mark out those that are falsly attributed to him; and in doing of it, we shall follow the Order that is observ'd in the two Volumes of the last Edition of the Councils.

The 1st. is that which was written to *Hosius* upon the Lapse of *Vincentius* of *Capua*, publish'd by *Baronius*, and taken from a Manuscript in the *Vatican*. This appears to me to be Genuine, and agrees with the History of that time.

The 2d. is a Letter to *Constantius*, at the end of *Lucifer*'s Works, and in the Fragments of St. *Hilary*.

The three following to *Eusebius Vercellensis*, are taken out of the Acts of this Bishop, and appear to me to be Ancient.

The 6th. to the Confessors in Exile, is in the Fragments of St. *Hilary*, and in the Acts of which we have spoken already.

The 7th. which was written to the Eastern Bishops after he had sign'd against St. *Athanasius*, is taken out of the Fragments of St. *Hilary*, and is very Genuine.

The 8th. is that which is supposed to have been written to those in the East, immediately after his Advancement to the Pontificate, wherein he declares St. *Athanasius* Excommunicated: But we have shown that 'tis very doubtful, though it is in the Fragments of St. *Hilary*.

The 9th. written to *Ursacius*, to *Valens*, and *Germinius*, and the 10th. to *Vincentius* of *Capua*, from the place of his Banishment, after he had sign'd, are Genuine, and taken out of the Fragments of St. *Hilary*.

The 11th. written to the Bishops of *Italy* after the Council of *Ariminum*, is unquestionable, and is preserv'd in the same place.

The 12th. which is a Confession of Faith address'd to St. *Athanasius* is Supposititious, as we have already prov'd when we discours'd of the Works of that Father, among which it occurs.

The 13th. which is suppos'd to be that which *Eustathius* and the other Deputy-Bishops from the *East*, obtain'd of *Liberius*, and presented to the Synod of *Tyana*, agrees very well with the History of that time.

The 14. and 15th. ought to be rank'd among those Letters that are forg'd by *Isidore*, and are rejected by all the Criticks.

The three Decrees attributed to this Pope, have not any respect to the Discipline of his time, nor have they any Authority.

The Conference (*e*) which he had with *Constantius* and *Epictetus*, is preserv'd by *Theodoret*. *B.* II. of his *Hist. Ch.* 6. and was by him drawn out of the Ancient Acts written in *Liberius*'s time.

The Stile of *Liberius* is Simple and without Ornament, but strong and clear. His Conduct unblameable, if he had not suffer'd himself to be overcome by the Love which he had for the City of *Rome*, and his Church: But he made amends for that Fault by the Constancy which he show'd after his Return.

(d) *He died in the Year* 366.] St. *Jerom* and *Marcellinus* say so in their Chronicles.

(e) *The Conference.*] 'Twas rather an Examination which *Liberius* under-went in the Emperor's Council

St. HILARY.

St. *Hilary.* St. *HILARY* was born in the City of *Poictiers* (*a*), whereof he was afterwards Biſhop. He was bred up in the Heathen Religion, and applied himſelf in his Youth to the Study of Profane Learning: He was Married, and had one Daughter nam'd *Apra* (*b*). The Reflections which he made upon the Falſhood of the Gentile Doctrines, did by little and little conduct him to ſome Imperfect Knowledge of the Truth, which he compleated by Reading the Holy Scriptures, as he himſelf tells us, at the Beginning of his Books concerning the Trinity. After he was perfectly inſtructed in the Chriſtian Religion. He was Baptized, and probably his Wife and Daughter were converted with him. He liv'd ſeveral Years after his Baptiſm, before he was made Biſhop (*c*), but we know not any one particular Circumſtance of his Life during all that time. He was ordain'd Biſhop of *Poictiers* ſome years before his Baniſhment; and immediately after he was promoted to that Dignity, he labour'd with all his might to ſave the Flock which Jeſus Chriſt had entruſted him with, by Preaching the Truths of the Goſpel. Afterwards, when he ſaw that the *Arian* Hereſie began to ſpread in *France*, he wrote Twelve Books of the Trinity againſt it (*d*), which he finiſh'd about the time that he was threatned with Baniſhment. He was ſent by Order of the Emperour *Conſtantius* into Baniſhment, becauſe he had defended St. *Athanaſius* in the Council of *Beziers*, againſt *Saturninus* Biſhop of *Arles*, and againſt *Urſacius* and *Valens*, who had been a little before Excommunicated by the Biſhops of *France*; for being come to this Council, which was Aſſembled by the intriguing of *Saturninus*, he deſir'd that Matters of Faith ſhould be handled before all other things, and offer'd to convict *Saturninus*, *Urſacius* and *Valens*, of Hereſie; but they were ſo far from accepting this Propoſition, that they condemn'd St. *Hilary*, and wrote a Letter againſt him to the Emperour, who was then at *Milan*; whereupon he ſent immediately an Order to Baniſh St. *Hilary* and *Rhodanius* Biſhop of *Thoulouſe*. Nevertheleſs, there was no Biſhops Ordain'd in their room; and ſo the Church of *Poictiers* enjoy'd Peace, and St. *Hilary* continued ſtill to Govern it, and to Adminiſter the Sacraments there by his Prieſts. The ordinary place of his Baniſhment was *Phrygia* (*e*); where he wrote his Treatiſe of Synods, which he dedicated to the Biſhops of *France*, to inform them of the Opinions of the Eaſtern Biſhops about the Trinity, and to inſtruct them how they ſhould behave themſelves in theſe two Synods, the expectation whereof held all the Church in Suſpence. This Treatiſe was compos'd by St. *Hilary* after the Council of *Ancyra*, held in the Year 358, whoſe Canons he there explains, and before the Councils of *Ariminum* and *Seleucia*, that's to ſay, towards the Beginning of the Year 359. Sometime after he was ſent to the Council of *Seleucia* by the Lieutenant of the *Præfectus Prætorio*, and by

(a) *Was born in the City of* Poictiers] St. *Jerom* in his Preface to *B.* II. of his Commentaries upon the Epiſtle to the *Galatians*, ſays, that St. *Hilary* was a *Gaul* born at *Poictiers*: *Fortunatus* ſays alſo, that he was of that City. *Pictavis reſidens qua ſanctus Hilarius olim Natus in Urbe Pater.* The Names of his Parents are not known; for we muſt not acquieſce in what *Bollandus* writes, that the Tomb of his Father and Mother were found in a Village of *Poictou*, where his Father was nam'd *Francarius*: But there is ſome probability that he was of a good Family. We need not now diſtinguiſh this *Hilarius* from ſeveral others of that Name, of whom we ſhall ſpeak afterwards.

(b) *Apra*] The Author of the Life of this Saint which is attributed to *Fortunatus*, is the only ancient Witneſs that we have of this Circumſtance; who does alſo obſerve, that St. *Hilary* having left his Daughter and Wife at *Poictiers* when he was baniſh'd, had a Revelation in the Place of his Baniſhment, that a rich and potent young Man courted his Daughter to marry her, but that he by his Prayers hindred her from taking any other Spouſe but Jeſus Chriſt, and that he wrote a Letter to her which this Author recites. The ſame Author adds at the end of *B.* I. of the Life of St. *Hilary*, that returning from his Baniſhment, and finding that his Daughter deſir'd to marry, he prayed God to take her out of the World; that his Prayer was heard, for his Daughter died, and her Mother ſurviv'd her but a very little time. This is reported by the Author of this Life, who liv'd ſoon after King *Cloüis*, towards the Year 580, and who appears to be different from *Venantius Fortunatus*. St. *Gregory* of *Tours* cites this Life without naming the Author of it; and ſo we muſt not wholly reject what he ſays, nor yet altogether build upon it.

(c) *He liv'd ſeveral Years after his Baptiſm, before he was made Biſhop.*] In his Book of Synods, he ſays, that he was baptiz'd a long while before his Baniſhment, and but a little while before it he was made Biſhop: *Regeneratus pridem, & in Epiſcopatu aliquantiſper manens.*

(d) *He wrote his Twelve Books of the Trinity againſt it.*] Some have thought that they were written in his Baniſhment; but the Preface alone, which is the Beginning of the Firſt Book, diſcovers that theſe Books were written before that time: For after he has there deſcribed his Converſion he obſerves that ſoon after his Ordination the *Arian* Hereſy was ſpread in *France*, and that immediately he took Pen in hand to confute their Impious Doctrines. What he ſays in the Tenth Book, does alſo prove that he was not baniſh'd, but only threatned with Baniſhment when he wrote it, *Sed licet*, ſays he, *nunc à multis coarcervantibus ſibi ſecundum deſideria ſua Magiſtros ſana doctrina exulet*, (which is plainly meant of the Baniſhment of *Paulinus* of *Triers*, *Euſebius* of *Verceilles*, and *Lucifer Calaritanus* baniſh'd after the Council of *Milan*) *non tamen à Sanctis quibuſq; Prædicationis Veritas exulabit. Loquemur enim exules per hos libros, & Sermo Dei qui vinciri non poteſt, liber excurret*, &c. Where he ſpeaks of his Baniſhment as a thing that was future and had not yet come to paſs, but which was quickly to follow after the Baniſhment of *Paulinus* and others: From whence it appears that this Tenth Book was written between the Council of *Milan* and that of *Beziers*.

(e) *The ordinary Place of his Baniſhment was* Phrygia] St. *Jerom* in his Catalogue, and *Sulpitius Severus B.* II. of his *Hiſt.* do teſtify this, as well as the Author of the Life of St. *Hilary*. *Theodoret B.* III. *ch* 4. ſays, That *Hilary*, *Euſebius* and *Lucifer* were in *Thebaïs*, when *Julian* permitted the exil'd Biſhops to return to their Sees. This is true of the Two laſt, but not of the Firſt, for he was then in *France*. St. *Hilary* himſelf ſays, in his Book of Synods, that he was in the Provinces of *Aſia*.

the

the Governour of *Phrygia*. Being arriv'd at that City, he was kindly receiv'd, and gain'd the good opinion and affection of every Body. Firſt of all, he was requir'd to give an account of the Faith of the Biſhops of *France*, becauſe of the falſe Reports that the *Arians* had ſpread Abroad againſt them, which render'd them ſuſpected of *Sabellianiſm*, and charg'd with believing that there was but one Perſon only in the God-head. But St. *Hilary* having declar'd his Faith which agreed with the *Nicene* Creed, gave an authentick Teſtimony of the Purity of the Faith of the Weſtern Biſhops; and ſo having remov'd the Jealouſies they might have of his Doctrine, he was admitted to the Communion and Society of the other Biſhops, and took his Place among thoſe that were to vote in the Council. He aſſiſted there at the Beginning; but ſeeing that the greater part of the Biſhops were *Arians*, they would not ſuffer him to ſtay there any longer. Yet he continued ſtill at *Seleucia* till the End of the Council, and follow'd the Deputies of the Council to the Emperour's Court, to receive the Orders that ſhould be given him: But when he ſaw that the true Faith was in extreme Danger, the Biſhops of the Weſt being over-reach'd, and thoſe of the Eaſt over-power'd, he deſir'd Audience of the Emperour in Three Petitions, (if we may believe *Sulpitius Severus*) which he publickly preſented, That he might have leave to Diſpute for the Faith againſt his Adverſaries. St. *Jerom* mentions but one Petition, and indeed, of the three Papers which St. *Hilary* preſented to *Conſtantius*, there is none but the Third wherein he deſires Audience. This he preſented towards the End of the Year 359, and the Second Paper alſo about the ſame time. The *Arians* ſeeing themſelves attack'd by ſo powerful an Enemy, procur'd him to be ſent back into *France*, yet without releaſing him wholly from his Baniſhment. As he return'd, he paſs'd through *Italy*, and entered *France* in the Year 360. 'Twas in his Journey, or a little after his Return, that he addreſs'd his Third Diſcourſe to *Conſtantius*, which is commonly plac'd Firſt. St. *Jerom*, ſays, That he wrote it after the Death of this Emperour: But it appears by the Diſcourſe it ſelf, that it was compos'd Five Years after St. *Hilary* withdrew from the Communion of *Saturninus*; and after the Baniſhment of *Lucifer*, *Euſebius* and *Paulinus*, which diſcovers that it was in 360, and ſo before the Death of *Conſtantius*, and yet 'tis probable, that it was not publiſh'd in the *Eaſt*, till after the Death of this Emperour, which made St. *Jerom* believe, that it was not written till that time. 'Twas about the ſame time, that he compos'd his Treatiſe againſt *Urſacius* and *Valens*, which contain'd the Hiſtory of the Council of *Ariminum* and of *Seleucia*; from whence part of thoſe Fragments are taken, which have been publiſh'd by themſelves. The whole Book conſiſts of Two Parts; The Firſt is taken out of a Book of St. *Hilary*, which he wrote during the time of Perſecution, and before the Death of *Conſtantius* as the Preface ſufficiently diſcovers. This Firſt Part begins at *P.* 430. and ends at 466. of the *Paris* Edition in the Year 1652, and it contains the Tranſactions that happen'd to the end of the Councils of *Ariminum* and *Seleucia*. The Second Part taken out of another Book, begins at *P.* 466, and contains what paſs'd afterwards. When the Catholick Biſhops afterwards recover'd their Liberty under *Julian* the Apoſtate, St. *Hilary* aſſembled many Councils in *France* for the Re-eſtabliſhment of the Ancient Faith, and the Condemnation of the Synods of *Ariminum* and *Seleucia*. In them he procur'd the Condemnation of *Saturninus* Biſhop of *Arles*, who oppos'd this Deſign, as well as *Paternus* Biſhop of *Perigueux*. As to the other Biſhops who acknowledg'd their Fault, they were pardon'd; *and all the World muſt own, ſays* Sulpitius Severus, *that our* France *was oblig'd to St.* Hilary *alone for its happy Deliverance from Hereſie*. He extended alſo his care as far as *Italy*, if we believe *Ruffinus*, and took a great deal of pains to re-eſtabliſh the Faith there, by viſiting the Churches, and cauſing them to reject the Errors of the Hereticks. *Euſebius* of *Vercellæ* found that St. *Hilary* had prevented him in this Employment, and *Ruffinus* makes no ſcruple to ſay, That St. *Hilary* labour'd with more Diligence and Succeſs than he, [*becauſe he was of a ſweet and mild diſpoſition, and withal of great Learning, and every way qualified for perſwading*: Niſi quod Hilarius, viz. natura lenis, placidus, ſimulq; eruditus, & ad perſuadendum commodiſſimus, rem diligentius & aptius procurabat.] An excellent Remark, which may ſerve for an Inſtruction to thoſe who are employ'd in the Converſion of Hereticks: The ſame Hiſtorian adds, [*That St.* Hilary *compos'd Books concerning the Faith, which were nobly written, wherein he clearly diſcovers the Artifices and Tricks which the Hereticks us'd to deceive the too Credulous and ſimple Catholicks.*] Laſtly, *Ruffinus* relates in his Book concerning the Corruption of *Origen's* Works, That St. *Hilary* having wrote a Book to chaſtiſe thoſe that had ſign'd the Creed of *Ariminum*, his Book was ſo corrupted by the Hereticks, though he knew nothing of it, that he was accus'd in a Synod of being an Heretick, and forc'd to depart from it as an Excommunicate Perſon. But I do not think we ought to take this Relation for certain, becauſe 'tis no ways probable that the Faith of St. *Hilary* about the Trinity, could be ſuſpected by the Weſtern Biſhops. In the Year 364, an occaſion offer'd it ſelf (*f*), wherein St. *Hilary* ſhew'd his Zeal for the Truth. The Emperour *Valentinian* being come to *Milan*, publiſh'd an Edict, wherein he oblig'd all the Catholicks to acknowledge *Auxentius* for their Biſhop. St. *Hilary* being perſwaded that this Biſhop was in his Judgment an *Arian*, preſented a Petition to the Emperour, wherein he declar'd, that *Auxentius* was a Blaſphemer, whoſe opinions were contrary to thoſe of the Prince and other Catholicks. The Emperour being mov'd by ſo ſharp an Accuſation, appointed a Conference, in the Preſence of the Treaſurer, and the great Mr. of the Palace, between St. *Hilary* accompanied with Ten Biſhops, and *Auxentius*,

St. *Hilary*.

(f) *In the Year* 364, *an occaſion offer'd it ſelf.*] *Baronius* places this Conference in 369, which is a groſs miſtake, ſince according to the Teſtimony of all the Ancients, St. *Hilary* was dead before. Beſides the Letter of *Auxentius* which was written after this Conference, bears not the Name of *Gratian*, who was declar'd Emperour in 367, but only the Names of *Valens* and *Valentinian*. It appears by *Ammianus Marcellinus*, *B.* XXVI. that *Valentinian* came to *Milan* about the end of the Year 364, and went away ſoon after: And therefore this Conference muſt have been held in this Year.

St. *Hilary.* *Auxentius* at this Conference, after he had endeavour'd to elude the Diſpute, was oblig'd, under pain of loſing his See, to profeſs, That Jeſus Chriſt was truly God, and of the ſame Subſtance, and the ſame Divinity as the Father. The Emperour thinking this Profeſſion ſincere, embrac'd his Communion, and St. *Hilary*, becauſe he ſtill continued to proclaim *Auxentius* a Heretick, who mock'd God and Men, was driven out of *Milan* as a Diſturber of the Peace of the Church. Being thus diſabled to ſpeak any more *Viva voce* againſt *Auxentius*, he wrote a Tract againſt this Biſhop the next Year. In the Year 366 he Collected the Commentaries of all the Tranſactions, that had happen'd after the Council of *Ariminum*, as may be ſeen in the Second Part of the Fragments which is taken out of this Work, were you will find the Letters written in 366.

At laſt, after he had endur'd ſo much Labour and Trouble for the Defence of the Faith, he finiſh'd his courſe in the Year 367 (g).

Beſides the Works of St. *Hilary* which we have already mention'd, becauſe they have a reſpect to the Hiſtory of his Life, he has alſo written other Books, ſome whereof are come to our hands.

He wrote a little Tract againſt *Dioſcorus* the Phyſician, and *Salluſtius* the Prefect, *wherein he has particularly ſhown*, ſays St. *Jerom*, in his Epiſtle to *Magnus*, *how far his Learning and Eloquence could reach*. This Book is not extant, yet 'tis very probable that 'twas written in Defence of the Chriſtian Religion againſt Paganiſm.

He wrote ſeveral Commentaries upon the Scriptures, which are almoſt wholly taken out of *Origen*, whoſe Commentaries he caus'd *Heliodorus* to explain to him, if we believe St. *Jerom*: But it muſt be confeſs'd, that he follow'd more the Sence than the Letter of *Origen*'s Commentaries, and that he added many things of his own, as the ſame St. *Jerom* has alſo obſerv'd. We have his Commentaries upon St. *Matthew*, we have alſo more of his Commentaries upon the *Pſalms* than St. *Jerom* had ſeen; for this Father mentions only the Commentaries upon the 1ſt. and 2d. *Pſalms*, upon the 51ſt. and thoſe that follow untill the 62d, and upon the 118th. and thoſe that follow unto the laſt; and we have beſides theſe Commentaries, the Commentaries upon the 14th. and 15th. *Pſalms*, and upon the 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, *Pſalms*, which bear the Name of St. *Hilary*, and are written in his Stile. But we have none of his Commentaries upon *Job*, which are cited by St. *Jerom*, whereof St. *Auſtin* relates a Paſſage in his 2d. Book againſt *Julian*, to prove Original Sin.

There was alſo attributed to him in St. *Jerom*'s Time, a Commentary upon the Canticles, but this Father ſays, that he had never ſeen it.

St. *Jerom* mentions alſo a Collection of Hymns, compos'd by St. *Hilary*; a Book Entituled *Myſteries*; and many Letters.

I place not the Letter and Hymn to his Daughter *Apra*, in the Number of St. *Hilary*'s Works, becauſe I doubt not but theſe pieces were the Work of him that wrote his Life, which are not at all like this Father's way of Writing: Some have attributed to him the Hymn *Pange Lingua*, and that of St. *John* the Baptiſt, *Ut queant laxis*; but without any Ground: The Books of the Unity of the Eſſence of the Father and the Son, were Rhapſodies taken out of the Genuine Works of St. *Hilary*. St. *Jerom* in his Apology to *Pammachius*, ſpeaks of a Book of St. *Hilary* addreſs'd to *Fortunatus*, which was concerning the Number *Seven*. Some have confounded this Treatiſe with St. *Cyprian*'s Books *of Exhortation to Martyrdom*, being addreſs'd to a Perſon of the ſame Name. But that which St. *Jerom* attributes to St. *Hilary*, muſt be different from thoſe of St. *Cyprian*; and therefore if there be no Miſtake in this place of St. *Jerom*, we muſt ſay, that St. *Hilary* wrote a Treatiſe addreſs'd to his Friend *Fortunatus*, concerning the myſterious Significations of the Number *Seven*. And this Work may very well be one of thoſe Treatiſes of *Myſteries*, which St. *Jerom* mentions in his Catalogue of Eccleſiaſtical Writers.

The Twelve Books of the Trinity, compos'd by St. *Hilary* in Imitation of *Quintilian*'s Books, as St. *Jerom* has obſerv'd, are an excellent Work, which contains the Explication and the Proofs of this Myſtery. He has there eſtabliſh'd the Faith of the Church in a demonſtrative Manner: he has clearly detected the Errors of the Hereticks, refuted them ſolidly and anſwered all their Objections: So that this is the largeſt and moſt methodical Work of any, that we have in all Antiquity upon this Subject.

The Firſt Book is a Preface to the Whole, wherein he deſcribes very pleaſantly after what manner a Man arrives at Happineſs, and the Knowledge of the Truth; and then gives an Account of the Subject of the Eleven following Books. He begins with obſerving, that Happineſs does not conſiſt in Abundance, nor in Repoſe, as common People imagine, nor yet in the bare Knowledge of the Firſt Principles of Good and Evil, as many wiſe Men among the *Pagans* thought, but in the Knowledge of the true God. He adds, that Man having an ardent Deſire after this Knowledge, meets with ſome Perſons that give him low and mean Idea's, unworthy of the Divinity. Some would perſuade him that there are many Gods of different Sexes: Others take the Repreſentations of Men, of Beaſts, and Birds, for Divinities: Others acknowledge no God at all; and ſome, in ſhort, confeſs, That there is a God, but deny that he has any Knowledge, or takes any Care of things here below. But the Reaſon of a Man diſcovers theſe Notions to be falſe, and ſo by the Light of Nature, he comes to know, That there can be but one God Almighty, Eternal and Infinite, who is in all places

(g) *He finiſh'd his Courſe in the Year* 367.] St. *Jerom* places his Death in this Year. *Sulpitius Severus* ſays, that he died Six Years after his Return into *Gaul*, and *Gregory* of *Tours B.* I. of his *Hiſt. ch.* 3. ſays, that his Death happen'd in the Fourth Year of *Valentinian*. Theſe Two Dates fall out juſt in the ſame Year; for the one reckons ſix Years after the end of the Year 360, which reaches to the Beginning of 367, and the 4th. Year of *Valentinian*'s Reign begun in the Month of *February* the ſame Year.

who

who Knows all things, and Orders all things; and afterwards by reading the Books of *Moses* and the Prophets, where he found these Truths explain'd, he was fully convinc'd of them, and studied with the greatest Application of mind to know this Sovereign Being, who is the Fountain of all kind of Beauty and Perfection. Neither did he stop here, but upon further Enquiry, he came to understand, That 'twas unworthy of God to suppose that Man to whom he had given so much Knowledge, should be annihilated for ever; for if this were true, to what purpose would his Knowledge serve, since Death would one Day deprive him of all Understanding? But than as on the one side, Reason discovers it to be fit, that Man should be Immortal; so on the other side, the Sense of his present Weakness, and the Apprehension of Death, which he sees is unavoidable, fill him with anxious Fears. In this State, he has recourse to the Gospel, which perfects all the Knowledge he had before, and resolves all the Doubts that yet remain with him. There he learns, That there is an Eternal Word, the Son of God, who was made Man, and came into the World to communicate to it the Fulness of Grace and Truth. This gives him hopes infinitely above all that he could have before, for now he presently perceives the Excellency and Greatness of these Gifts, by understanding, That since the Son of God was made Man, nothing can hinder, but Men may become the Sons of God; and so when a Man joyfully receives this Doctrine, he perfects the Knowledge he had of the Divinity, by the Knowledge of the Humanity of Jesus Christ. He renews his Spirit by Faith; He acknowledges the Providence of one God over him, and begins to be fully persuaded, that he who created him, will not annihilate him. In short, he understands, That Faith is the only infallible means of coming to the Knowledge of the Truth; That it rejects unprofitable Questions, and resolves the captious Difficulties of humane Philosophy; That it judges not of the Conduct of God according to the Thoughts of Men, nor of that of Jesus Christ, according to the Maxims of this World; That 'twas by his Faith, (whereof the Law was only a Shadow and Type,) that Jesus Christ having rais'd our Minds to that which is most Sublime and Divine, prescrib'd to us, instead of the Circumcision of the Flesh, the Circumcision of the Spirit, which consists in the Reformation of our Lives, and the Renovation of our Hearts: That as we die to Sin in Baptism, that we may live a Spiritual and Immortal Life, so Jesus Christ died for us, that we might rise again together with him; and so the Death of him who is Immortal, procur'd Immortality to us Mortals. Now when once the Soul is fully possess'd with these Thoughts she rests satisfied with this Hope, without fearing Death, or being wearied of Life: For she considers Death as the beginning of Eternal Life, and looks upon this present Life, as the means of obtaining a happy Immortality. St. *Hilary*.

These are the Steps by which St. *Hilary* guides the minds of Men to the Knowledge of Happiness and Truth, after he himself had arriv'd at it by the same Methods: For he does not deliver these things as curious and profound Discourses which he had meditated in his Study, but as the History of his own Thoughts which by degrees carried him on to a perfect Conversion. Then he declares, That afterwards being Ordain'd Bishop, as his Office oblig'd him to take Care of the Salvation of others, he preach'd the Truths of the Gospel; And at last, That the Heresy of the *Arians*, who would judge of the Almighty Power of God, by the weak Light of their own Reason, had oblig'd him to undertake the Defence of the Truth, and the Refutation of their Errors. After he has in a few words Explain'd the Faith of the Church, he admonishes the Reader, above all things, when he thinks of God, to devest his Mind of the meanness of humane Opinions, and to judge of God according to the Light of Faith, and agreeable to the Testimony of God himself. "For, says he, the chief Qualification re-
"quir'd in a Reader, is, That he be willing to take the Sence of an Author from what he reads, and
"not give that Sence wherewith he himself is prepossess'd. He must take the meaning of the Author,
"and not give him one of his own: He ought not to endeavour to find in the Passages which he reads,
"that which he presum'd, ought to be found there before he read them; wherefore in Discoursing
"of God, he ought at least to be persuaded, that he knew himself, and so to Embrace with Reve-
"rence, that Doctrine which he teaches us. He only can give an Account worthy of himself, because
"he is not known but from himself, and by himself. But if it happens, says St. *Hilary*, That some
"Comparison, from humane Affairs be us'd in Discoursing of these Mysteries, we must not believe
"that they are Just, or have a perfect Resemblance to them." After this Excellent Advertisement, St. *Hilary* gives an Account of the Subject of his Eleven Books of the Trinity, and finishes this First Book, with an Invocation of the Divine Assistance.

In the Second Book, He explains the Catholick Doctrine concerning the Three Divine Persons. He says, He should have permitted Christians to keep themselves to the Words of the Gospel, without diving further into the Mystery of the Trinity, if the Hereticks had not oblig'd them to explain it more clearly. "The Errors and Blasphemies of the Hereticks, says he, oblige us to do those things
"which are forbidden us, to search into those Mysteries which are Incomprehensible, to speak those
"things that are Ineffable, and to explain that which we are not permitted to examine: And instead
"of performing with a sincere Faith (which were otherwise sufficient) that which is commanded us, *i.e.*
"Worshipping the Father and the Son, and being fill'd with the Holy Spirit, we are obliged to em-
"ploy our weak Reasonings to explain those things which are Incomprehensible; being constrain'd, if
"a Man may so say, by the fault of others, to commit this one our selves, lest we fall into the Error
"of those who have dar'd to give an heretical Sence to the Words of Scripture; for that which makes
"the Heresy, says he, is not the Scripture, but the manner of Expounding it; 'tis the Interpretation
"that makes the Crime, and not the Words." After this, he gives an Account of the Errors of the *Sabellians*, the *Ebionites* and *Arians*, to which he opposes the Faith of the Church. He says, That the Father who is the First Person of the Trinity, is the Fountain and First Principle of all Things, being Eternal and Infinite; and that the Word, who is the Second Person of the Trinity, is the Son

St *Hilary.* begotten from all Eternity of the Father. He confeſſes, That this Generation is Incomprehenſible, and reproves thoſe that endeavour to explain it. He asks them, If they can comprehend how they came into this World; How they receiv'd their Feeling, Life, Perception, Taſte, Sight, Underſtanding, and the other Senſes; How they can Communicate them to others. [*Tell me,* ſays he, *O Man, if thou canſt comprehend how all this is done, and if thou canſt not comprehend it, with what Face doſt thou demand an Explication of the Generation of the Son of God? Thou that art ſo ignorant of what paſſes in thy ſelf, Wilt thou be ſo inſolent as to complain for not knowing what paſſes in God?*] And ſo, without inſiſting on the Explication of the Eternal Generation of the Word by humane Reaſon, he proves it by Holy Scripture, and confirms the Catholick Faith of the Divinity of the Word againſt all Hereſies. He ſpeaks occaſionally of the Temporal Generation of the Son of God, that is to ſay, of the Myſtery of the Incarnation. At laſt, He treats of the Holy Spirit, who is the Third Perſon of the Trinity and maintains, That he is a Divine Perſon, diſtinct from the Father and the Son: He obſerves, That tho' the Name of Spirit be given ſometimes in Scripture to the Father and the Son, yet in moſt places, it ſignifies a Perſon diſtinct from them both. He Diſcourſes of the Effects and Gifts of the Holy Spirit; and ſays, That he Intercedes for us; That he Enlightens our Underſtandings, and warms our Hearts; That he is the Author of all Grace, and of all heavenly Gifts; That he will be with us till the End of the World; That he is our Comforter here while we live in Expectation of a future Life, the earneſt of our future Hopes, the Light of our Minds, and the Warmth of our Souls. From whence he concludes, That we muſt beg this Holy Spirit, to enable us to do Good, and to perſevere in the Faith, and keeping the Commands of God.

In the Third Book, He proves the Divinity of the Son of God, by the Words of the Goſpel of St. *John, I am in my Father, and my Father is in me.* He obſerves alſo, "That the Generation of the "Word is incomprehenſible, as well as the moſt part of the Miracles of Jeſus Chriſt; That Humane "Reaſon cannot give an Account of it; and, That Jeſus Chriſt was made Man, to Preach this Eternal "Power to Men, and to make known his Father unto them; That in this Sence, we muſt under- "ſtand his deſire to be Glorified, that he might glorify his Father, *viz.* That the Glory which the "Humanity of Jeſus Chriſt receiv'd and made appear unto Men, diſcover'd the Dignity and Power "of his Father." He obſerves alſo, That the Birth of Jeſus Chriſt, His Reſurrection, His Entring into the Room where the Diſciples were, unſeen, through the Doors, and the other Miracles of Jeſus Chriſt, are no leſs above Reaſon, than his Eternal Generation. From whence he concludes, "That "the Nature and Operations of God, are above the Reaſon, Perception, and Underſtanding of Men; "That we muſt acknowledge in theſe things, the folly of Worldly Wiſdom, and the Vanity of Hu- "mane Knowledge, and Embrace that Heavenly Prudence, and Divine Wiſdom, that ſeems to be "folly to the World.

In the Fourth Book, He deſcribes the Errors of the Hereticks concerning the Conſubſtantiality of the Word; He oppoſes to them the Faith of the Church; Anſwers the Paſſages which they alledge, and endeavours to prove the Divinity of the Word, by many Paſſages taken out of the Old Teſtament.

He continues the ſame Subject in the Fifth Book, where he thinks, That 'twas the Word which appear'd to *Abraham*, to *Jacob*, to *Moſes* and the other Patriarchs, who is call'd an Angel, becauſe of his Miniſtery, and not becauſe of his Nature.

In the Sixth Book, he proves, That Jeſus Chriſt is the Son of God, By the Teſtimony of his Father; By his own Declaration; By the Preaching of the Apoſtles; By the Confeſſion of the Faithful; By the Acknowledgment of the Devils and Jews, and by the Belief of the Gentiles. We muſt obſerve here, That in citing a Paſſage of the Epiſtle to the *Romans*, he appeals to the Greek Text, as to the Original.

In the Seventh, He ſhews that the Son of God, is truly God. There he obſerves, That the Hereticks uſe very great Addreſs and Subtilty to Maintain their corrupt Opinions which they falſly pretend to have from Religion; That they deceive the Simple by their Expreſſions, which are Catholick in appearance; that they accommodate themſelves to the Wiſdom of this World, That they corrupt the true Sence of Scripture-Expreſſions, by the Explications which they add, as it were to give an Account of what they ſay. He adds, That 'tis this which renders the Matter of the Trinity, a difficult Subject to treat on: [*For if on the one ſide,* ſays he, *I declare that there is but one God,* Sabellius, *will think, that I eſpouſe his Opinion: If I ſay, That the Son is God, the modern Hereticks will accuſe me of admitting Two Gods: If I affirm, That the Son is born of the Virgin,* Ebion *and* Photinus *will make uſe of this Truth, to Eſtabliſh their Impiety. But,* ſays he, *the Doctrine of the Church confounds all theſe Errors. The Power of Truth is ſo great, that even its Enemies explain it; that the more 'tis oppos'd, the more force it gains; and certainly, the Church was never more Triumphant, than when it was moſt vigorouſly attack'd: It was never more Famous, than when it was reproach'd: It was never more Powerful, than when it ſeem'd to be abandon'd. She wiſhes, That all Men would continue in her Boſom, and She is never more troubled, than when She is oblig'd to throw any one out, and deliver him up to the Devil. But when the Hereticks go out from Her, or when She caſts them out, as She loſes on one ſide the occaſion of giving them Salvation, ſo She gains this Advantage on the other, of diſcovering the Happineſs of thoſe who continue inviolably fix'd in Her Communion.* And a few Lines after, he adds, *All Hereſies attack the Church, and while they attack the Church, they overcome one another. But the Victory is gain'd to the Church and not to them; for they all Quarrel about thoſe Errors, which are all equally rejected by the Church.* Sabellius, *for Inſtance, does unanſwerably confute the Error of* Arius; Arius *confounds the Error of* Photinus, *and ſo of the reſt: but in vain do they mutually Conquer one another, for they are always*

always overcome in ſome Article or other, and the Church alone remains victorious over all Errors, by profeſſing that Jeſus Chriſt is the true God, Son of the true God, born before all Ages, and afterwards begotten of Mary.] Laſtly, he proves that he is God, becauſe the Name of God is given him in the New Teſtament, and from what is there ſaid of his Birth, his Nature, his Power and his Actions. St. Hilary.

In the Eighth Book he ſhows the eſſential Unity of the Father and the Son, and refutes the Interpretations of the Hereticks, by explaining the Paſſages which they alledged, to prove that the Unity of the Father and the Son is an Unity of Will and Judgment, and not of Eſſence and Nature. At the Beginning of this Book he obſerves, " That 'tis not ſufficient for a Biſhop to live a Good Life, " but he muſt alſo teach Sound Doctrine; that as his Life muſt be Innocent, ſo his Preaching muſt be " Learn'd: for if he be Pious without being Learned, he will not be ſerviceable to others; and if he " be Learned without being Holy, his Doctrine will want Authority: From whence he concludes, " That the Holineſs of a Biſhop ſhould ſhine more brightly by his Learning, and his Doctrine ſhould " be recommended by the Holineſs of his Life, *Ut & vita ejus ornetur docendo, & doctrina vivendo.* There is in this Book an excellent Paſſage for the real Preſence of Jeſus Chriſt in the Euchariſt, where he ſays, *That by this Sacrament we truly receive the Fleſh and Blood of Jeſus Chriſt, who remains corporeally in us.*

In the Ninth Book he anſwers the great Objections of the *Arians* founded upon Five Paſſages of Scripture, whereof he explains the true ſence. And Firſt of all, he ſhews, That they abuſe the Paſſages which they alledge by perverting them from their Natural Sence; That they do not explain them by their Connexion with what follows, and what goes before; That they attribute to the Divinity of Jeſus Chriſt, that which ſhould only be attributed to his Humanity. Upon this occaſion he diſcourſes of the Union of the two Natures in Jeſus Chriſt, and explains how by virtue of this Union, thoſe things are attributed to God which agree only to the Humane Nature, and thoſe to Man which belong to the Divinity. Afterwards he explains the Paſſages which the *Arians* continually object to the Catholicks, one by one: The Firſt, which is taken out of the Tenth Chapter of St. *Mark*, is the Anſwer which Jeſus Chriſt made to the Rich young Man, who call'd him Good Maſter, *Why calleſt thou me Good*, ſays he, *there is none Good but God*; from whence the *Arians* concluded, That Jeſus Chriſt was not truly God. St. *Hilary* anſwers, That he does not particularly reprove the Young Man, for calling him Good, but becauſe he gives him this Title, as if it agreed to him in the Capacity of a Doctor of the Law. *The Young Man*, ſays he, *not knowing that he was the Meſſias, who came to ſave the loſt Sheep of the Houſe of* Iſrael, *ask'd him as a Doctor of the Law, and gave him the Title which the Doctors take to themſelves. Jeſus Chriſt reproves this Notion, and to explain to him in what ſence he ſhould be called Good, he tells him, None is Good but God; ſhowing by this, That he was ſo far from rejecting the title of Good, as it agreed to God, that he accepted of it in that ſence. And therefore his Anſwer is one Proof of his Divinity, which ought to be underſtood in this ſence, Why call you me good, if you believe not that I am God? There is none Good but God; which ſuppoſes that he himſelf was God.* St. *Hilary* confirms this Anſwer by many places of Scripture, where Jeſus Chriſt gives himſelf the Title of *Good*, and of *Maſter*; from whence it appears that the Title was not here refus'd upon its own Account. Upon this occaſion he Anſwers the Objection of the *Arians*, who ſay, That Jeſus Chriſt call'd his Father the only God; and ſhows that the Father is the only God, becauſe the Divinity of the Father is the ſame with that of the Son, which Truth he proves by many Paſſages of Scripture.

The Second Paſſage objected by the *Arians* is taken out of the Goſpel of St. *John*, Chap. 17. *This is life Eternal to know thee the only true God, and Jeſus Chriſt whom thou haſt ſent*; from whence the *Arians* concluded, That Jeſus Chriſt was not the true God, but one ſent from the true God. St *Hilary* anſwers, "That this Paſſage does not exclude the Eſſential Unity of the Father and the Son, ſince " in this and other places, Jeſus Chriſt affirms, That he came forth from God; That he is with God; " That he had overcome the World; That he ſhould be honour'd as the Father; That he had recei- " ved the Power of giving Eternal Life; That all things which are the Father's are his. He adds, That in the ſame Place Jeſus Chriſt prays the Father to glorify him with the Glory that he had with him from all Eternity; which evidently proves the Unity of the Eſſence of the Father and the Son: Moreover the words alledg'd in the Objection, prove nothing contrary to the Faith of the Church, which acknowledges that the Father is the only true God, though Jeſus Chriſt is alſo God, becauſe the Father and the Son are not two Gods, but one God only.

The Third Objection is taken from *Ch.* 5th. of the ſame Goſpel of St. *John*. *The Son can do nothing of himſelf, he doth only what he ſeeth his Father do.* St. *Hilary* ſhows that this Paſſage eſtabliſhes the Divinity of Jeſus Chriſt, and is very far from deſtroying it, becauſe it proves the Unity and Equality of the Father and the Son.

The Fourth Paſſage is the grand Objection of the *Arians* founded upon thoſe words of Jeſus Chriſt in St. *John*, Chap. 14. *My Father is greater than I.* St. *Hilary* ſays, That the Father is greater than the Son, conſider'd as Man and as Mediator. The laſt Objection is taken from thoſe words of Jeſus Chriſt in St. *Mark*, Chap. 13. *No Man knoweth the Day of Judgment, nor yet the Angels, nor the Son, but the Father only:* From whence the *Arians* concluded, That the Knowledge of the Father being more extenſive than that of the Son, his Nature muſt be more excellent. St. *Hilary* having in anſwer to this Objection, proved by many Reaſons, that Jeſus Chriſt could not be Ignorant of the Day of Judgment, and having demonſtrated this Truth, he adds, That what Chriſt ſays in this place, that the Son knew not the Day of Judgment, ought not to be underſtood literally, as if he were really ignorant of it; but in this ſence, that he did not know it, not ſo as to tell it unto Men. Wherefore being ask'd about the ſame Matter after his Reſurrection, he does not ſay, That he was ignorant of it;

but

but he reproves his Apoſtles with that heat, which teſtified his Knowledge of it, by ſaying unto them, St. *Hilary*. *'Tis not for you to know the times and the ſeaſons which my Father has reſerv'd in his own Power.* He adds alſo, that it may be ſaid in another ſence, That the Son of Man was ignorant of the Day of Judgment, becauſe he knew it not as he was Man, but as he was God: For, ſays he, as we may ſay, That the Son of God was ſubject to Fear, to Sadneſs, and to Sleep: becauſe the Humanity of Jeſus Chriſt was ſubject to theſe Infirmities; So we may ſay, That he was ignorant of the Day of Judgment, becauſe he knew it not as he was Man, but upon the account of his Divinity.

In the Tenth Book he Anſwers the Objections which the *Arians* draw from thoſe Paſſages of Scripture which prove that Jeſus Chriſt was ſubject to Fear, to Sorrow and Pain. And here he maintains, That Jeſus Chriſt had not truly any Fear or Pain, but only the Repreſentation of thoſe Paſſions within him: In which, if his Judgment is not different from that of the Church, yet it muſt be confeſs'd, that the manner of expreſſing it is very harſh. He had anſwer'd the *Arians* better, if he had ſaid, That the Fear, the Sorrow and Pain of Jeſus Chriſt did belong to his Humane Nature, and not to his Divinity. He acknowledges in this Book, That all Men are conceiv'd in Sin, and that none but Jeſus Chriſt ought to be excepted from this General Law. He ſays, That the Soul is not communicated to Children by the Parents. He obſerves, That what is ſaid in the Goſpel of St. *Luke* concerning the Bloody Sweat of Jeſus Chriſt, and of the Angel that appear'd unto him, is not to be found in many Greek and Latin Copies of this Goſpel.

In the Eleventh Book, he Anſwers ſome Paſſages of the Goſpels and of St. *Paul* concerning Jeſus Chriſt's being riſen from the Dead, and becoming Glorious, which are alledg'd by the *Arians* to prove that the Son is not equal to the Father: But St. *Hilary* ſhows, That thoſe Paſſages do much rather prove the Divinity of Jeſus Chriſt, than deſtroy it.

In the laſt Book, St. *Hilary* explains that Paſſage of the Proverbs, *God created me in the Beginning of his Ways*, &c. He demonſtrates that the Word of God was not properly created, but begotten of God from all Eternity; which he proves by many Paſſages of Scripture. He expounds this Paſſage of the Proverbs of the Incarnation of Jeſus Chriſt. He adds ſome Proofs of the Divinity of the Holy Spirit, and Ends with a Prayer to God, wherein he begs Grace to preſerve in his Heart that Faith whereof he made Profeſſion at his Baptiſm, that he may always worſhip the Father and the Son, and receive the Holy Spirit which proceeds from the Father by the Son.

His Book of Synods is Addreſs'd to the Biſhops of *France* and *Britain*. He commends them for the Conſtancy which they had ſhown in refuſing Communion to *Saturninus*, and for the Zeal wherewith they maintain'd the Faith of the Church, by condemning the Impieties of the *Arians* ſo ſharply: After this, he ſets himſelf to explain the Creeds made by the Eaſtern Biſhops after the Council of *Nice*. He declares, That if there were any Error in ſome of thoſe Creeds, it ought not to be attributed to him, ſince he only relates what others had ſaid; and if they were found agreeable to the Doctrine of the Apoſtles, the Praiſe of it ought not to be given to him but to the Original Authors: He leaves it to the Judgment of the Biſhops, to whom his Book is written, whether they be Heretical or Catholick. Then he intimates to them, what Obligation lay upon him to inſtruct them in the Opinions of the Eaſtern Biſhops, that they might Join with the right Side in thoſe Councils which were ſhortly to be held at *Ariminum* and *Ancyra*. But before he comes to ſpeak of thoſe Creeds which are ſuſpected, he relates and explains that of the Council of *Ancyra*, which was made in oppoſition to the Second Creed of *Sirmium*, afterwards he relates the Creeds made by the Eaſtern Biſhops after the Council of *Nice*, at *Antioch*, *Sardica*, and the Firſt Creed at *Sirmium*. He ſhows, That thoſe Creeds are Catholick, and endeavours to excuſe the Oriental Biſhops for making ſo many, by alledging the Multitude and Obſtinacy of the *Arians* that were in the Eaſt. He ſays, That in thoſe Provinces to which he was Baniſh'd, there was only *Eleuſius*, and a ſmall number of Biſhops with him, that acknowledg'd the Divinity of the Word. He Congratulates the Weſtern Biſhops for maintaining the Apoſtolical Faith, engrav'd by the Holy Spirit in their Hearts, who were ignorant of the Creeds written by the hands of Men. After this, he explains in a lively and clear manner his own Doctrine and that of the Weſtern Biſhops concerning the Myſtery of the Trinity, and ſecures it againſt the falſe Explications of the Hereticks. He gives the true ſence of the word *Conſubſtantial*, which he juſtifies againſt thoſe that directly oppoſe it, or that think fit it ſhould be ſuppreſs'd. He Exhorts the Eaſtern Biſhops with much Eloquence to uſe this term, and to receive the Confeſſion of Faith made by the Council of *Nice*. He concludes with conjuring his Brethren in much Humility, to Pardon the Freedom he had taken to inform them of theſe things, and adviſe them what they ought to do. He Exhorts them to preſerve with inviolable Fidelity, the Doctrines of Piety and Religion which were written upon their Hearts, and Requeſts them to remember his Baniſhment in their Prayers.

The Third Diſcourſe addreſs'd to the Emperor *Conſtantius*, which ſhould be the Firſt as we have obſerv'd already, is a Petition preſented to this Emperor, wherein he remonſtrates, that he was a Catholick Biſhop of *France*, baniſh'd by the Intrigues of his Enemies, who had falſly accus'd him to his Majeſty. He prays the Emperour that he would grant him Audience in the Preſence of *Saturninus*, who was the chief Cauſe of his Sufferings, that he might have Opportunity to juſtify himſelf from thoſe Accuſations that were form'd againſt him: and he makes no ſcruple to declare, that if his Adverſary could ſhow that he had done any one thing unworthy, either of the Holineſs of a Biſhop, or the Piety of a Chriſtian, he would not only quit all Claim to his Favour for continuing to him his Biſhoprick, but on the contrary, he would be willing to ſpend his Old Age in a State of Penance among the Laity. But ſo far as this Petition concern'd only his own Perſon, he went further and proteſted, that he would never ſpeak more of it unleſs the Emperour commanded him; yet

yet ſtill he deſir'd with great Boldneſs and Earneſtneſs, an Audience about the Cauſe of the Faith, which was common to him with all other Catholicks. And to this purpoſe, he repreſents to the Emperor the Confuſion of ſo many Creeds. "When once they begun, ſays he, to make new Con- "feſſions of Faith, the Faith became the Creed of the Times rather than of the Goſpel: *Facta eſt "Fides temporum potius quam Evangeliorum.* Every Year new Creeds were made, and Men did not "keep to that Simplicity of Faith which they profeſs'd at their Baptiſm: And O what Miſeries en- "ſued! For preſently, there were as many Creeds as might pleaſe each particular Party; and no- "thing elſe has been minded ſince the Council of *Nice*, but this making of Creeds. New Creeds "have been made every Year and every Month, they have been chang'd, they have been anathema- "tiz'd, and then re-eſtabliſh'd; and ſo by enquiring too much into the Faith, there is none left; it "has always continued uncertain, and there was never any Certainty of the Truth." After he has deſcribed this Confuſion very ſmartly, he remonſtrates to the Emperour, that the only way to ſave himſelf from this Shipwrack, was to acquieſce in the Faith of the Goſpel, whereof he made Profeſſion at his Baptiſm. Then he prays the Emperour, that he would give him Audience in the Preſence of the Council, which was to meet at *Conſtantinople*; and promiſes that for explaining and proving the Faith of the Church, he would only make uſe of the Words of Jeſus Chriſt. He confeſſes, that all the Hereticks boaſt of preaching the Goſpel, but, ſays he, they do not underſtand it; *For they alledge Scripture without knowing the meaning of it, and make uſe of Orthodox Terms without having the True Faith.* He preſſes the Emperour to grant him this Audience for the good of the whole Church; and promiſes him, that being to ſpeak publickly to him of a Queſtion ſo famous in the Preſence of a Council divided upon this Subject, he would ſay nothing but what ſhould tend to the Honour of the Emperour, the Preſervation of the Faith, and the peaceable Union of the *Eaſt* and the *Weſt*. And to aſſure him of this Promiſe, he gives him this Sign of it, by confining himſelf wholly to the Terms of the Goſpel, in declaring his Doctrine at preſent. With this Declaration he concludes this Paper, which ſome have thought Imperfect, but without any Ground. St. *Hilary.*

The Second Book of St. *Hilary* to *Conſtantius*, is alſo a kind of Petition, wherein he prays him, To put an End to the Perſecutions and Vexations wherewith the *Arians* exercis'd the Church; To forbid the Secular Judges to meddle in Affairs of Religion; To leave his Subjects to their Liberty, whether they will be *Arians*, or no; To permit them to continue united to the Catholick Biſhops, and ſeparated from the *Arian* Biſhops; and in ſhort, To ſuffer all the baniſh'd Biſhops to return to their Sees. After this, He compares the Perſecution of the *Arians* againſt the Catholicks, with that of the Pagans againſt the Chriſtians: He ſhows how Cruel it was, and how far diſtant from the Spirit of the Church and of Jeſus Chriſt. *The Biſhops*, ſays he, *are put in Priſon; The People are oblig'd to ſerve as their Guard; The holy Bodies of the Virgins of Jeſus Chriſt, are expos'd to the View of all the World, to abuſe them; Men are compell'd, I do not ſay to be Chriſtians, but to become* Arians; *The Name and Authority of the Emperour is abus'd; He is impos'd upon by Surprize; Judges are deſir'd of him for approving theſe Injuſtices; and in ſhort, The People are forc'd to conſent unto them.* After this, He deſcribes particularly, the Violence that was us'd to *Paulinus* of *Triers*, to *Dionyſius* of *Milan*, to *Euſebius* of *Vercellæ*, and many others. This Book is imperfect.

Theſe Diſcourſes of St. *Hilary*, are written with great Moderation, as to what concerns the Emperour, whoſe Conduct he excuſes; but he has not us'd the ſame Moderation in the laſt, which is commonly plac'd before the other Two. There he ſpeaks with ſo fervent a Zeal, that he might deſerve to be accus'd of too violent a Paſſion, if it were not otherwiſe certain that he was acted only from a principle of Love to the Truth*. He begins with theſe Words which are all Sparks of Fire: *'Tis time to Speak, ſince the time to be Silent is paſt; we muſt wait upon Jeſus Chriſt, ſince Anti-Chriſt Governs: Let the true Paſtors cry aloud, ſince the Hirelings are fled: Let us die for the Sheep, ſince the Thieves are entered, and the Lion full of Rage, goes about the Sheep-fold.* After he has exhorted the Paſtors in theſe Words, and many others of the ſame Nature, to Defend the Truths of the Goſpel with Courage and Boldneſs, He gives an Account of the Conduct which he had obſerv'd ſince his Baniſhment. He ſays, That he kept Silence in Modeſty, hoping that things would change for the better, but there being now no further place for hope, he found himſelf oblig'd to ſpeak: He declares, That he wiſhes he had rather been in the time of *Decius* or *Nero*, than in that wherein he liv'd; That neither Tortures, nor the Fire, nor the Croſs, could have made him afraid, but he would boldly have maintain'd the Combate againſt his declared Enemies, and ſuffer'd with Conſtancy in this publick Perſecution. *But now*, adds he, *we oppoſe a Perſecutor that deceives us with falſe appearances, an Enemy that puts on a Friendly Countenance to us*; Conſtantius, *the Anti-chriſt, who Perſecutes the Church under a mask of deſigning its advancement. He profeſſes*, ſays he, *to be a Chriſtian, that he may deny Jeſus Chriſt; He procures Union, to hinder Peace; He ſtifles Hereſies, to ruine Chriſtianity; He honours the Biſhops, that he may make them loſe the Title of the Miniſters of Jeſus Chriſt; He builds up Churches, that he may deſtroy the Faith. Let him not imagine*, adds he, *that I Charge him falſly; That I Reproach him: The Miniſters of Jeſus Chriſt, ought to ſpeak the Truth: If what I have propos'd be a Calumny, I am willing to paſs for an infamous Perſon; but if it be true and publickly known, I uſe the freedom of an Apoſtle, in reproving it after a long Silence.* After this, He Juſtifies his calling *Conſtantius*, Anti-chriſt, by giving a horrible Repreſentation of the Perſecution that he

*[The beſt Excuſe that can be made for St. *Hilary*, is, That *Oppreſſion may make a Wiſe Man mad*; and St. *Athanaſius* needs it as much as he; for in his Letter *to all thoſe that lead a Monaſtick Life*; he ſhews as great Marks of Rage and Anger againſt *Conſtantius*, as St. *Hilary* does here; and yet St. *Gregory Nazianzen*, a Man that was never ſuſpected of *Arianiſm*, has ſaid very great Things of that Prince, when he ſet him againſt *Julian* the Apoſtate.]

St. *Hilary.* he raiſed. He adds, That it was neither through Indiſcretion, nor Raſhneſs, nor Anger, that he ſpoke ſo of him, but that his Reaſon, his Conſtancy, and his Faith oblig'd him to ſay theſe things. *Yes*, ſays he, *addreſſing himſelf to* Conſtantius, *I tell you what I ſhould have told* Nero, *what* Diocleſian *and* Maximian *ſhould have heard from my Mouth: You fight againſt God; You uſe Cruelties to the Church? You Perſecute the Saints; You hate thoſe that Preach Jeſus Chriſt; You utterly aboliſh Religion: In a word, You are a Tyrant; I ſpeak not with reference to the Things of this World, but with reference to the Things of God. This is what is common to you with the Pagan Emperours. Let us now come to that which is peculiar to your ſelf. You feign your ſelf to be a Chriſtian, and you are the Enemy of Jeſus Chriſt; You are become Anti-chriſt, and have begun his Work: You intrude into the Office of procuring New Creeds to be made, and you live like a Pagan; You teach things Profane, and are ignorant of Piety and Religion; You give Biſhopricks to thoſe of your own Faction, and take them away from the good Biſhops, that you may beſtow them upon the Bad. You put the Biſhops in Priſon; You keep your Armies in the Field to terrify the Church; You aſſemble Councils to eſtabliſh Impiety in them, and you compel the Weſtern Biſhops to renounce the Faith, that they may embrace Error. You ſhut them up in a City to weaken them by Famine, to kill them with the Rigour of the Winter, and to corrupt them by your Diſſimulation: You foment the Diſſentions of the Eaſt by your Artifices.* He adds alſo many other Accuſations of the ſame Nature; and to compleat all, he ſays, *That the Church never ſuffer'd ſo much, under* Nero, *under* Decius, *and* Maximianus, *as it has done under* Conſtantius, *who is more cruel than all thoſe Tyrants, becauſe the former gave Martyrs to the Church, who overcame Devils, whereas* Conſtantius *makes an Infinite number of Prevaricators, who cannot ſo much as comfort themſelves by ſaying, that they were overcome by the violence of their Torments.* I ſhould never have done, if I ſhould relate all that St. *Hilary* ſays in this place of the Perſecution of *Conſtantius*. He charges him particularly, with the Baniſhment of *Paulinus* and *Liberius*, and the Troubles wherewith he exercis'd the Church of *Tholouſe*; and concludes with ſaying, That all thoſe things that he had accus'd him of, were publick and certain; and therefore he had Juſt Cauſe to call him Anti-chriſt. He ſhows afterwards, the Impiety of thoſe Biſhops that Aſſiſted at the Council of *Seleucia*, who maintain'd, that the Father was not like in Subſtance to the Son, and condemn'd the Words, *Conſubſtantial*, and *like in Subſtance*. He anſwers, what *Conſtantius* alledges, as the Reaſon of condemning theſe Terms, That we muſt not make uſe of any but Scripture Expreſſions. He anſwers, I ſay, That theſe Terms agree with the Doctrine of the Goſpel; That *Conſtantius*, and thoſe of his Party, are alſo forc'd to make uſe of ſuch Terms as are not to be found in Scripture; and in ſhort, That the Scripture makes uſe of Terms more Emphatical, ſince it eſtabliſhes the Equality and Unity of the Father and the Son. He blames *Conſtantius* for the variety and contrariety of thoſe Creeds that were made after that of the Council of *Nice*. He explains the Faith of the Church concerning the Majeſty of God, and proves by many Examples, That we are not to wonder, if the Eternal Generation of the Son is Incomprehenſible. This Book is alſo imperfect.

The Book of Fragments, is a Collection of many Pieces taken out of two Books of St. *Hilary*, and likewiſe of ſome Paſſages out of his other Works. 'Tis not known who is the Author of this Abridgment, nor when he liv'd. The Paſſages that are cited in it, are certainly St. *Hilary*'s, and for the moſt part, the Pieces that are collected in it are ancient; but he does not obſerve any Order in this Collection.

He begins with a Fragment of St. *Hilary*'s Preface, wherein after he had ſpoken of the Excellency of Faith, Hope and Charity, he declares, "That he had undertaken to publiſh a Work of great Importance and vaſt Extent, but very Intricate, becauſe of the Diabolical Cheats of the Hereticks, and "wherein he muſt uſe great Cunning, becauſe of their Knaveries; againſt which alſo, there were "many Prejudices, by reaſon of the Diſſimulation and fear of many: That this Book would ſeem "ſtrange, even to thoſe of the Country where he was, tho' there the things themſelves were done "which he treated of: That what he was to deliver, had come to paſs ſome years ago, but the Silence which he had hitherto kept, made all theſe things ſtill ſeem New; That the Peace had almoſt "made him forget the Memory of them, but that not long before theſe things had been renew'd "again by the impious Malice of ſome notable Seducers." After this, He deſcribes the State of the Affairs of the Church under *Conſtantius*; He complains, That he had Baniſh'd thoſe Biſhops that would not condemn St. *Athanaſius*, and that he interpos'd his Authority in Eccleſiaſtical Deciſions. At laſt, he ſays, That he had treated in his Work, of Faith in God, of the Hope of Eternity, and the Defence of the Truth; and he exhorts all Chriſtians to inform themſelves of thoſe things which he there recites, that ſo every one may be ſatisfied in his own Judgment, without following the Opinions of others blindly.

After his Preface, follow the Letters of the Council of *Sardica*, to all the Churches, and in particular to *Julius* Biſhop of *Rome*, together with the Subſcriptions of ſome Biſhops, and the Names of the Hereticks that were condemned.

The Author of theſe Fragments, has join'd to theſe two Letters, a Fragment of St. *Hilary* for St. *Athanaſius*; at the End, the Recantation of *Urſacius* and *Valens*, is mention'd: Their Letters to *Julius* and St. *Athanaſius*, are at the bottom of this Fragment. The Paſſage which immediately follows, has reference to the Condemnation of *Photinus*; and that of *Marcellus* of *Ancyra*, which he conſented to; but the End of that Paſſage concerns the Council of *Nice*, whoſe Creed he recites and explains.

The

The First Letter of *Liberius* here produc'd, is suppositious, as the Passage which follows, plainly discovers, and as we have already shown when we treated of the Works of this Pope: The Second, is Genuine, which is directed to the Bishops of *Italy*, concerning the Restitution of the Bishops who had approv'd the *Arian* Creeds. The Letter of the Bishops of *Illyricum*, concerning the Condemnation of the Creed of *Ariminum*, is one of the most Excellent Monuments of that time. The Letters of *Ursacius* and *Valens*, *to Germinius*, and his Answer, are put here out of their proper place, being written in the Year 366. We have already spoken of Pope *Liberius*'s Letters that are set down: After which, there follows a Letter of the Eastern Bishops, to the Council of *Ariminum*, with some Reflections of St. *Hilary*, which are very much corrupted. After this Fragment, the Author of this Collection has added this Note: *Here endeth the Book taken out of the Historical Work of St.* Hilary: And yet he adds afterwards many Pieces which are probably taken out of the same Book. St. *Hilary.*

The 1st. is a Letter from a Council of the Bishops of *France*, held at *Paris*, against the Creed made at *Ariminum*.

The 2d. is a Letter of *Eusebius* of *Vercellæ*, written to *Gregory*, a Bishop in *Spain*, wherein he commends him for oppoſing *Hosius*, and preserving the Faith.

The 3d. is a Letter, or rather a Confession of Faith, by *Germinius* the *Arian* Bishop, against those of his own Party, who had Sign'd the Creed of *Ariminum*.

The 4th. is a Letter written by the Eastern Bishops in the Name of the Council of *Sardica*, against the Bishops of the West: This Letter should have been plac'd before those others which we have already spoken of.

The 5th. is a Letter of the Bishops of the Council of *Ariminum* to the Emperour *Constantius*, before they had Sign'd the Creed which was presented to them by the *Arians*. There follows after it a short Reflection concerning the Stile of St. *Hilary*.

The 6th. is the Approbation which the Legates of the Council of *Ariminum*, gave to the Creed made by the *Arians* at *Nice*, a City of *Thracia*.

The 7th. is a Letter written to the Emperour *Constantius*, by the Bishops of *Ariminum*; after they had approv'd the Confession of Faith made at *Nice*, which was presented to them by the *Arians*.

The 8th. is a large Letter of *Liberius* to *Constantius*, in Favour of St. *Athanasius*. This is mis-plac'd as well in respect of time, as of the Matter it self.

The 9th, is a Letter of *Constantius*, to the Council of *Ariminum*.

The 10th. is the Decree of this Council before they had surrendred up themselves to the Emperour's Pleasure.

The 11th, is the Condemnation of *Ursacius* and *Valens*, in this Council. Here end the Monuments taken out of the Works of St. *Hilary*, to which there is subjoin'd in some Copies, the Creed of the *Nicene* Council, the Creeds of *Ariminum*, and that which is attributed to St. *Athanasius*. These are the Pieces contain'd in the Fragments of St. *Hilary*, which might be read with more Pleasure and Profit, if they were dispos'd according to the Order of time which I have set down in the Notes (*b*).

The Book against *Auxentius*, Bishop of *Milan*, is a *Manifesto* against this Bishop, and against those that maintain him. Who, because they cover'd themselves chiefly under the Cloak of procuring Peace and Unity, St. *Hilary* says, That we can have no other true Peace, but that of Jesus Christ and the Gospel; and that this Peace cannot take place in a time when the Ministers of the Church are become Anti-Christs, by opposing the Doctrine of Jesus Christ and the Gospel, while they pretend to preach

(b) *According to the Order of Time which I have set down in the Notes.*] These pieces are:

Pages of the Paris-*Edition* 1652.		*The Year of Christ.*
Pag. 447	The *Nicene* Creed in the Year	325
433	The Letter of the Council of *Sardica* to all the Bishops.	
	A Letter of the same Council to *Julius*.	347
465	The Letter of the Bishops of the *East*, written from *Philippopolis* upon their Departure from *Sardica*.	
443	The Letters of *Ursacius* and *Valens* to *Liberius* and St. *Athanasius*.	349
484	The Letter of *Liberius* to *Constantius* about the Cause of St. *Athanasius*.	
450	The Suppositious Letter of *Liberius* to the Bishops of the *East*.	352
	A Letter of *Liberius* before his Banishment.	
456	To *Eusebius*, *Dionysius* and *Lucifer*.	
457	To *Vincentius* of *Capua*.	354
463	A Letter of *Eusebius* of *Vercellæ*, to *Gregory* a Bishop of *Spain* upon occasion of the Fall of *Hosius*.	357
	The Letters of *Liberius*, written in his Banishment after his Subscription.	358
457	To the Bishops of the *East*.	
458	To *Ursacius* and *Valens*.	
459	Letters which concern the Council of *Ariminum*.	358
487	A Letter of the Emperor to the Council.	
488	The Catholick Determination.	
Ibid.	The Condemnation of *Ursacius*, of *Valens* and *Germinius*.	
481	The Answer of the Council to the Emperor before he had subscrib'd.	
459	The Profession of Faith, of the Bishops of the *East* that was given in to the Legates of the Council.	359
482	The Acts of the Subscription of the Legates.	
483	A Letter to the Emperor after their Subscription.	
465	A Letter of *Germinius* after the Council of *Ariminum*.	360
462	A Letter of the Council of *Paris*.	
451	A Letter of *Liberius* to the Bishops of *Italy*.	362
452	A Letter of the Bishops of *Italy* to the Bishops of *Illyricum*.	
Ibid.	A Letter of *Ursacius* and *Valens* to *Germinius*.	366
453	The Answer of *Germinius* to their Letter.	

St. *Hilary.* it. He complains, That they make uſe of Temporal Power, to maintain a Falſe Doctrine. He endeavours to prove, that *Auxentius*, foſters Heretical Opinions; he recites the Conference that he had with him, and exhorts the Catholicks to take heed of Anti-chriſt, and to ſeparate themſelves from *Auxentius*. After this Book, follows a Letter of *Auxentius* to the Emperour, wherein he endeavours to purge himſelf from the Hereſy of *Arius*, yet without approving the Term *Conſubſtantial*, or rejecting the Creed of *Ariminum*.

The Commentaries of St. *Hilary* upon St. *Matthew*, are very excellent; for there he had made many very uſeful Hiſtorical and Moral Obſervations. The Chief of them are theſe following.

In the 1ſt. Canon, he endeavours to reconcile the two Genealogies of Jeſus Chriſt, by ſaying, That St. *Matthew* deſcribes the Royal Race of Jeſus Chriſt, by *Solomon*; and St. *Luke*, the Sacerdotal Race, by *Nathan*. He maintains, That the Virgin was of the ſame Tribe, and the ſame Family with *Joſeph*; and that ſhe continued a Virgin after her Child-bearing, and that the Perſons who are call'd in Scripture, the Brethren of Jeſus Chriſt, were indeed, the Children of *Joſeph*, that he had by a former Wife. He ſays, That the Wiſe-men acknowledg'd the Royal Power of Jeſus Chriſt, by preſenting him with Gold, his Divinity by offering him Incenſe, and his Humanity by giving him Myrrh. He obſerves, That *Rachel* who mourn'd for her Children, is a Figure of the Church, which having been a long time barren, became afterwards fruitful. He ſays, That the Innocents were made partakers of Eternal Life by the Martyrdom which they ſuffer'd.

In the 2d. Canon, he ſays, That Jeſus Chriſt did not cauſe St. *John* to Baptize him for the Purification of his Sins, ſince he was without Sin, but that Water might Sanctify us by Jeſus Chriſt. Then he ſpeaks of the Effects of Baptiſm. *After Baptiſm*, ſays he, *the Holy Spirit deſcends upon the baptiz'd, he fills them with a Cæleſtial Unction, and makes them the adopted Children of God.*

In the 3d. Canon, he explains the Temptations of Jeſus Chriſt, and ſpeaks of his Faſt for Forty Days. He ſays, That the Devil was ignorant of the Incarnation.

In the 4th. he explains the Beatitudes: He ſays, That none but the perfect Man who is wholly purified from his Sins, ſhall enjoy the Viſion of God. He obſerves, That Adultery is the only cauſe for which married Perſons can be Divorc'd. He condemns Oaths, Revenge and Vanity.

In the 5th. he ſends the Reader to a Book of St. *Cyprian*, for the Explication of the Lord's Prayer: He alſo mentions *Tertullian*; but he ſays of this laſt Author, That his following Errors depriv'd his Firſt Books of that Authority, which he could otherwiſe have allow'd them. He occaſionally ſays, That the Soul is Corporeal.

In the 6th. Canon, he particularly recommends Good Works, without which, all other things are unprofitable to Salvation.

In the 7th. he explains allegorically the Cure of the Leper, and of St. *Peter*'s Mother-in-Law; underſtanding thoſe places of the Curing of Sinners. He compares the Church to a Ship toſt with a Tempeſt; and towards the latter End, he obſerves, That we ought not to mention the Names of Dead Infidels, in the Commemorations of the Saints.

In the 8th. he Diſcourſes particularly of the Fall of humane Nature by the Sin of the firſt Man, and of the Reparation of Mankind by Jeſus Chriſt.

In the 10th. he adviſes Catholicks not to enter into the Churches of *Hereticks*. He obſerves, That nothing in the Eccleſiaſtical Miniſtry, ought to be ſold for Money, and that the Eccleſiaſtical State, ought not to be ambitious of obtaining Temporal Authority. He ſays, That at the End of the World, the Jews that ſhall be then alive, ſhall believe in Jeſus Chriſt, and be ſaved. He aſſures us, That Man was created Free, but that the Sin of *Adam* enſlav'd him to Sin and Vice; and that in Baptiſm we are deliver'd by the Word from Sins, contracted by our Birth.

Towards the latter End of the 11th. he explains wherein the Eaſineſs of Chriſt's Yoke conſiſts excellently, and in a few Words. *What is more Eaſy*, ſays he, *than the Yoke of Chriſt, and what is more Light than his Burthen? It is only to be obliging to all the World; To abſtain from committing Sin; To deſire that which is Good, not to deſire that which is Evil; To Love our Neighbour; To Hate no Body; To lay up for Eternity; Not to addict our ſelves to things preſent; Not to do to another, what we would not they ſhould do unto us.*

In the 12th. he explains after the ſame Manner as St. *Athanaſius*, the Blaſphemy againſt the Holy Ghoſt, by ſaying, That it is the denying of Jeſus Chriſt to be God.

In the 13th. he obſerves, That thoſe who are out of the Church, cannot underſtand the Word of God.

In the 14th. ſpeaking of St. *Joſeph*, he ſays, That he was a *Lock-Smith*, and not a *Carpenter*, as is commonly believ'd.

In the 15th. he obſerves, that thoſe who are to be baptiz'd, make profeſſion of their Faith in Jeſus Chriſt, and of being firmly perſuaded of his Death and Reſurrection; and that their Actions may be agreeable to their Words; they paſs all the time of the Paſſion of Chriſt, in Faſting, that ſo in ſome meaſure, they may ſuffer with Jeſus Chriſt,

He ſpeaks in the 16th. of the Prerogative that St. *Peter* received, when Jeſus Chriſt gave him the Keys of his Church, after this manner: *O happy Foundation of the Church*, ſays he, *in the change of your Name! O Rock, worthy of the Building of Jeſus Chriſt, ſince it was to abrogate the Laws of Hell, to break its Gates, and to open all the Priſons of Death! O happy Porter of Heaven, to whom are entruſted the Keys of admiſſion into it, and whoſe Judgment on Earth, is a fore-judging of what is done in Heaven, ſince whatſoever he binds or looſes upon Earth, ſhall be bound or looſed in Heaven.*

In the 18th. Canon, he concludes with theſe Words of Jeſus Chriſt; *The Angels of theſe Children ſee the Face of my Father.* From whence, ſays he, it may be concluded, That the Angels rejoyce at the Sight of God, and that they preſide over the Prayers of the Faithful, which they offer continually.

tinually to God. *He ſays, that thoſe who are bound on Earth by the Miniſters of Jeſus Chriſt, (that is,* ſays he, *thoſe whom the Miniſters of Jeſus Chriſt leave bound in their ſins,) and that thoſe who are looſed by receiving them unto the Grace of Salvation, upon the Declaration which they make, having obtain'd Pardon of their Sins, ſhall be bound and looſed in Heaven according to the Apoſtolical Judgment.* St. Hilary.

In the 19th. after he has ſpoken of thoſe that voluntarily make themſelves Eunuchs to preſerve their Chaſtity, he ſpeaks of Riches, and the uſe we ſhould make of them. He ſays, That 'tis no Crime to enjoy them, but that we ſhould obſerve Moderation, and employ them innocently: That 'tis dangerous to deſire to enrich our ſelves, and that an innocent Man finds himſelf overcharg'd when he is taken up in purchaſing, in preſerving and encreaſing his Riches. From whence he concludes, That tho' 'tis not abſolutely impoſſible for a rich Man to be ſav'd, yet very few of them ſhall be ſaved, becauſe it is ſo difficult a thing to make uſe of the Goods of this World, as we ought.

In the 20th. he affirms, That *Moſes* and *Elias* ſhall come with Jeſus Chriſt, at the laſt Judgment, and that they ſhall be put to Death by Antichriſt; he rejects the Opinion of thoſe who thought that *Enoch* or *Jeremy* ſhould come before Jeſus Chriſt.

In the 23d. he ſays, That Spiritual Perſons ought not to entangle themſelves in the Affairs of this World; but that they ought to render unto God that which is due, that is to ſay, their Heart, their Soul, their Will. He ſhows the Neceſſity of Loving God in Order to Salvation.

In the 25th. he obſerves, That *Nicholas*, one of the Seven Deacons, was a falſe Prophet and a Heretick, and that the laſt Judgment ſhall be given in the place were Chriſt ſuffer'd.

In the 26th, he ſpeaks of the uncertainty of the time of the laſt Judgment, and obſerves, That 'tis uſeful to keep all Men upon their Guard.

In the 27th. he obſerves, That tho' all Chriſtians are oblig'd to Watchfulneſs, yet the Princes of People, and the Biſhops are more particularly oblig'd to Watch over themſelves and their Flocks.

In the 30th. he aſſerts, That *Judas* was not preſent, when Jeſus Chriſt diſtributed the Sacrament, becauſe he was unworthy of thoſe Eternal Sacraments. He ſays, That when St. *Peter* ſaid ſo boldly, that he would not be offended becauſe of Chriſt, he did not conſider the weakneſs of the Fleſh.

In the 31ſt. he thinks that Jeſus Chriſt had no fear of Death at all. He ſays, He was Conſecrated in the Sacrament of that Blood which he was to ſhed for the Remiſſion of Sins. [This Opinion ſeems not eaſily reconcileable with the Account which the Evangeliſts give of the Agonies of our Saviour in the Garden, and upon the Croſs.]

In the 32d. he obſerves, That St. *Peter*'s Denials were ſtill more and more Criminal. *At firſt,* ſays he, *he only anſwered, That he knew not what ſhe meant; then he deny'd that he was of the number of Chriſt's Diſciples; and at laſt, he ſaid, That he knew him not: But preſently he wept, after that Fault, which he could not avoid, tho' he was fore-warned of it.*

In the 33d. he ſays, That the Words of Jeſus Chriſt upon the Croſs, *My God, my God, why haſt thou forſaken me?* Belong'd to his Body, which complain'd of its Separation from the Divine Word. He compares the Crime of thoſe who abuſe the Gifts given to the Church, with that of the Scribes and Phariſees, who gave Money to *Judas* to betray Jeſus Chriſt, and with the Souldiers who Guarded his Sepulchre, that they might ſay, *He was not riſen.* Laſtly, He obſerves upon the Words of Jeſus Chriſt, *Go and teach all Nations, baptizing them,* &c. He obſerves, I ſay, That Inſtruction ought to precede Baptiſm, becauſe the Body ought not to receive the Sacrament of Baptiſm, unleſs the Soul has receiv'd the Truth of Faith.

There is a Preface prefix'd to the Commentaries of St. *Hilary* upon the Pſalms, wherein he treats of ſome Critical Queſtions. He ſays, That ſome Jews have divided the Pſalms into Five Books, and that others have entituled them, *The Pſalms*; but for his part, he gives them the Title of, *The Book of Pſalms.* He maintains, That they are written by the Perſons whoſe Names they bear at the beginning, and is of Opinion, That thoſe that carry no Name, are written by the ſame Author with the laſt foregoing Pſalm, where the Name of ſome Author is to be found. He ſays, There are ſome that are falſly attributed to *Jeremy*, *Haggai*, and *Zachary*, ſince thoſe Names are not found in thoſe Copies of the Verſion of the *Septuagint*, which he thinks to be authentick. He objects to himſelf, That there is a Pſalm which bears the Name of *Moſes*, wherein *Samuel* is mention'd, who liv'd many Ages after. He contents himſelf with anſwering this difficulty by ſaying, That *Moſes* nam'd *Samuel* by the Spirit of Prophecy. He attributes to *Ezra* that Collection of the Pſalms which we have at preſent. He maintains, That all the Pſalms ought to be Expounded, with a reference to Jeſus Chriſt and the Goſpel. He obſerves that the Hebrews call the Pſaltery *Nabla*, and he thinks that they never diſtinguiſhed the Pſalms at all. He makes the LXX. Interpreters Authors of their Diſtinction, and obſerves, that they have not always follow'd the Order of Time. From this Diſtribution, He paſſes on to the number of Canonical Books. He reckons 22 of them according to the Hebrews, and ſays, that ſome have added *Tobit* and *Judith*. He obſerves, That the Lord's Day is a Day of Prayer and of Reſt for Chriſtians; and that they are forbidden to Proſtrate themſelves, or Faſt on that Day. He explains afterwards the Titles of the Pſalms in general *. He ſays, That thoſe which are called *Songs*, were made to be ſung without any Inſtrument of Muſick; That thoſe which are entituled *Pſalms*, were made to be Play'd upon Inſtruments of Muſick without Singing. That thoſe which are call'd, *Songs of a Pſalm*, were ſuch as the Choriſter Sung after the Inſtrument; but thoſe which are call'd *Pſalms of a Song*, are ſuch as the Choriſter Sung before the Inſtrument of Muſick. Laſtly, That thoſe which are call'd, *in Pſalms*, are ſuch wherein

* [This Diſtinction of the Titles of the Pſalms, is according to the LXX; in that Tranſlation ſome Pſalms are called Ψάλμοι, *Pſalms*: Others, Ωδαὶ, *Songs*. Others Ψάλμοι ᾠδῆς, *Pſalms of a Song*: Others ᾠδαὶ Ψάλμυ, *Songs of a Pſalm*: Others again, ἐν Ψάλμοις & ἐν ὕμνοις, *in Pſalms or Hymns.*

St. *Hilary.* there is a change both of the Perſon and the Voice. He gives alſo ſome Moral Interpretations of thoſe Titles, which are too uſeleſs to be repeated. After all, he ſays, That the Key for underſtanding the Pſalms, is to enquire, what Perſon it is to whom they agree; for ſome of them agree to *David*, and others to Jeſus Chriſt, and others to ſome Prophet, and ſo of the reſt.

In his Commentary upon the Firſt Pſalm, he ſays, That there are three or four degrees of Happineſs mark'd in thoſe words, *Bleſſed is the Man who hath not ſtood in the Counſel of the ungodly, and who hath not walk'd in the way of Sinners, and who hath not ſate in the* Chair of Infection. [According to the LXX, ἐν καθέδρᾳ λοιμῶν] The Firſt degree is, Not to be of the Number of the Impious, and the Hereticks: The Second, is not to be of the number of the Wicked, as the Covetous, the Drunkards, the Incontinent, the Proud, the Detractors, the Robbers, &c. who obſerve not the Diſcipline of the Church. The Third, Is not to ſit in the Chair of Infection. By this Chair, he underſtands the Cares and Affairs of the World, which corrupt Men by an Infection, that is almoſt unavoidable. "For "though, ſays he, ſome Perſons that enter upon Secular Offices, and engage in the Affairs of the "World, have a Holy and Religious Will, yet they are often corrupted by thoſe Affairs in which "they are oblig'd to employ themſelves, and the Rules of this World do not permit them to live "according to the Maxims of Chriſtianity". He adds, That thoſe Three Degrees ought to be crown'd with a Fourth; which is, continual Meditation in the Law of God: That this Meditation, as well as Prayer, does not only conſiſt in Reading, or reciting the Holy Books, but in the Practice of thoſe things which are preſcrib'd and taught in them; and that 'tis not ſufficient to do it out of Fear, but our Practice muſt proceed from Love and Good-will. He applies the reſt of the Pſalm to Jeſus Chriſt, and obſerves, That he reſtores unto Man, that Immortality which the Firſt Man had loſt by his Sin; That the Impious ſhall be as it were annihilated by the Fire of Hell. He confeſſes, That they ſhall riſe again at the Day of Judgment, but he maintains that they ſhall not there be judg'd at all, becauſe they are already condemn'd; and that the Judgment ſhall be only for thoſe, who having had Faith did not live up to the Laws of Chriſtianity. This Opinion is very ſingular, and we may believe that he took it from *Origen*. His next Obſervation is much more reaſonable, which is this, That when it is ſaid in Scripture, That God learns any thing; we muſt not underſtand it as if he were ignorant of it before; but only that he then gave to Men the Signs of his Knowledge: As when he ſays to *Adam*, *Where art thou?* This does not imply that he was ignorant of it before, but only that he had a Mind to put him to ſhame; And ſo again, when he ſays to *Abraham*, *Now I know your Faith*; this does not ſignifie, that he knew it not before, but only that he had now prov'd it.

He begins his Commentary upon the Second Pſalm with this Obſervation, That this Pſalm is call'd the Firſt by St. *Paul* (*Act.* 13.) becauſe in the Hebrew it is one continued Pſalm with the Firſt, though it has been ſince diſtinguiſh'd from it in the Verſion of the *Septuagint*. [In the common Editions of the New Teſtament, this is quoted as the Second Pſalm by St. *Paul*; and in the common Editions of the Hebrew Bible, the Second Pſalm is always diſtinguiſhed from the Firſt.] He ſays, That this Verſion was made in the time of *Ptolomy*, and that its Authors were the Succeſſors of the Seventy appointed by *Moſes*, who entruſted to them ſecret Myſteries, which he would not commit to Writing in his Books: That their Succeſſors, inſtructed by this Tradition, have tranſlated the Pſalms according to thoſe Notices which they had, and fix'd the ſence of many Hebrew words which before were undetermined: That therefore the Verſion of the *Septuagint*, ought to be of great Authority, and is to be preferr'd before all other Verſions, which have been made by ſuch Perſons as were ignorant of the Tradition which *Moſes* left to the Synagogue. After he has made theſe Remarks (whether they be juſt or no, this is not a place to examine) he applies all that's ſaid in this Pſalm to Jeſus Chriſt and his Church. He thinks that the firſt words are ſpoken in the Perſon of God the Father, and that the following words beginning at theſe, *Let us break their Cords aſunder*, agree to the Apoſtles, underſtanding by theſe Cords the Cords of Sin. He obſerves in this Pſalm, That God has no need of any of his Creatures; ſo that God did not create them for himſelf, but for themſelves: That when he requires Men to Love and to Fear him, this is not for any Profit that he can draw from their Service, but only that this Love and Fear may be ſerviceable to their own Salvation. He eſtabliſhes Free-Will, and ſays, That Juſtice is the Conſequence of our Good Will, and Happineſs is the Reward of our Merits, and that Hell is the Puniſhment of Sins freely committed: That God does not put himſelf in a Paſſion to puniſh us, being no ways Subject to Change, but that his Juſtice produces thoſe Effects of Vengeance which Men attribute to Anger. So that he appears not to be Angry, but when he would bring us to Repentance. He ſays upon theſe Words, *Hearken, O ye Kings of the Earth*, That the true Royalty of a Man conſiſts in conquering his Paſſions, and that the Kings of the Earth who are eſtranged from the Commandments of God are Unhappy Kings. He obſerves, That the Motives of Fear and Joy are intermix'd in this Pſalm; That Fear may retain Men in Reverence and Devotion, and that Joy may temper this Fear. At laſt, he aſſures us, That after Death, the Impious are reſerv'd in a place of Torment unto the Day of Judgment; and that the Juſt are conducted by the Angels to the Manſions of the bleſſed in *Abraham*'s boſom.

In the Fragment of a Commentary upon the Thirteenth Pſalm, he Diſcourſes of the Neceſſity that Mankind lay under of having a Saviour and a Phyſician.

In his Commentary upon the Fifteenth Pſalm, he ſays, That this Pſalm is nothing elſe but *David*'s Prayer which he made to God, to beg of him the Knowledge of what a Man ought to do in order to the obtaining of Eternal Bleſſedneſs. By the Tabernacles which he deſires, we muſt underſtand, ſays St. *Hilary*, the Multitude of thoſe Churches that have been Eſtabliſh'd ſince the coming of Jeſus Chriſt, who is this Mountain that *David* ſeeks after. He ſays, That Good Works avail nothing without Faith in Jeſus Chriſt. He ſeems to approve a Lye as Neceſſary upon ſome Occaſions; but he abſolutely condemns Uſury, and chiefly that which tends to the Ruin of the Poor: *If ye be Chriſtians*, ſays

ſays he, *Wherefore do ye draw a Temporal Profit for your Silver? Wherefore do ye not rather lay up for your ſelves a treaſure in Heaven? If ye be Chriſtians, wherefore do ye expect from men a recompence of your Liberality? I do not ſay that you ſhould give them your Goods; but at leaſt ye ſhould be content to demand back again what you had Lent, without Robbing him of more. And remember ye, that he from whom ye exact this Uſury is a Poor Chriſtian, for whom Chriſt was willing to be Poor; Therefore when ye do Good or Evil to this Poor Man, it is to Jeſus Chriſt that ye do it,* &c. He diſcourſes againſt Pride and Falſe Confidence. He ſays, That we muſt reprove with all poſſible ſweetneſs, if we would amend our Brother by it, and we muſt not uſe bloody Accuſations, which only provoke him: That we muſt deſpiſe the Wicked with Freedom, and honour the Good with Humility, and reſiſt the Powers with an holy Boldneſs, when they would oblige us to do Evil. He praiſes this Pſalm, which, ſays he, ſhould be written in the Hearts of Chriſtians, and engraven upon their Memory: They ought to be intent upon it Night and Day, and to make it the ſubject of their Meditations. In effect, it contains the principal Rules of an holy Life. St. Hilary.

He applies to Jeſus Chriſt the 52d. Pſalm., and Exhorts the Rich not to put their Confidence in their Riches, and to make good uſe of them. He ſays, That the Juſt are at Reſt till the Day of Judgment, and that the Wicked are in Pain; That there is no Repentance after Death, becauſe there is no more freedom of Choice.

Upon theſe words in the 53d. Pſalm, *The Fool hath ſaid in his heart, There is no God*; he obſerves That the Wicked commonly dare not ſpeak out the Blaſphemies that they have in their Hearts; That there is no Man but is convinc'd that there is a God, but the Pleaſure that the Wicked take in committing Sin, makes them ſay that there is no God. In the reſt of this Commentary, he diſcourſes of the Goodneſs of God, and the Corruption of Men. He excuſes the Sin of St. *Peter*, and blames the Avarice of ſome Paſtors, *who eat up the People of God*, as it is ſaid in the Pſalm. *They make*, ſays he, *their Belly their God, as the Apoſtle ſpeaks, they make a Trade of their Miniſtry, and enrich themſelves with the Offerings and Gifts of their People; They make ſumptuous Feaſts under Pretence of Religion: They fill their Purſes with the beneficence of Chriſtians, though the uſe of theſe Offerings was intended by the Apoſtles, only for their daily Food, who renounce the World, or are in want.* He condemns thoſe that flatter the Powers, becauſe we muſt Fear God more than Man.

He applies the 54th. Pſalm to Jeſus Chriſt. There you may find a pretty Moral Reflection upon the Diſorders of the Tongue, to which the far greater part of Men are ſubject, either when they are Angry, or when they Complain; when they Reproach, or when they Flatter; or laſtly, when they reprove others. He maintains in the Commentary upon this Pſalm, as well as in his Books of the Trinity, that Jeſus Chriſt did not really ſuffer.

He Interprets alſo the 55th. Pſalm, of Jeſus Chriſt. In his Commentary upon it, you may find a good Paſſage about Prayer. *God deſpiſes*, ſays he, *the Prayers which are accompanied with lightneſs and diffidence, which are diſorder'd with the Cares of this Life, which are mix'd with Deſires of worldly Good Things, and which do not bring forth the fruit of Good Works.*

There is nothing conſiderable in the Commentaries upon the following Pſalms: You may find in that upon the 57th. his ſingular Opinion concerning the Laſt Judgment, which we have already obſerv'd: In that upon the 64th, he approves the Vows that are made to perform certain Actions of Piety, ſuch as the Contempt of one's Body, the Preſervation of our Chaſtity and Faſting. He aſſures us, That Men are Predeſtinated according to their Merits; he diſcourſes of the wonderful Effects of Baptiſm.

His Commentrary upon Pſalm 119th. is very large and full of Moral thoughts: He there diſtinguiſhes the words which are often repeated in this Pſalm, the Law, the Commandments, the Teſtimonies, the Judgments, &c. and gives them ſuch ſences as are not very Natural. He teaches, That Grace is neceſſary to the Obſervation of the Commandments of God; That the Beginning comes from our ſelves, but the Grace of God comes in to our help, and that afterwards it depends upon us, whether we will retain or reject this Grace: That all Men are ſubject to Sin; That their Faults ſhall be expiated by the Fire of the laſt Judgment; *He ſeems alſo to think that the Virgin* Mary *ſhall not be exempted from paſſing through this Fire*; He obſerves, That a Miniſter of Jeſus Chriſt who Preaches his word ſhould be without blame; That he ſhould Pray in the Night-time; That a Chriſtian ſhould ſhun the Pleaſures and the Pride of the Men of this World; That to make our Actions perfect, they muſt be done from a Principle of Love to God; That Celibacy is more perfect than a ſtate of Marriage; and that thoſe who are out of the Church, which is the Body of Jeſus Chriſt are deliver'd up to the Devil. There are alſo in this Commentary, divers pretty Remarks about Alms-giving, Humility, the forbearing of thoſe things which are to others an occaſion of Scandal and Falling, about Faſting, about Charity, about Prayer, about the Attention we ſhould have in time of Prayer, and about many other Subjects.

In the Commentary upon Pſalm 121. he ſays, That God does not forſake us, but when we offend him by our Sins: He maintains, That the Juſt are in *Abraham*'s Boſom till the Day of Judgment; he declaims againſt thoſe who live in Exceſs. He ſays, That in Baptiſm a Man is Purg'd from his Sins, and exchanges his Vices for Vertues.

In Pſalm 123. he diſcourſes againſt Pride; and admirably deſcribes the Slavery into which the Paſſions of the Vicious precipitate them, in his Comment upon Pſalm 125; Theſe are his words: *Conſider*, ſays he, *a Covetous Man, who deprives himſelf of all kind of Satisfaction, leſt he ſhould want Money; you may ſee him buſie, ſad, anxious, reſtleſs; his Mind is always full of fear, leſt he ſhould loſe what he has: He forgets Honeſty, neglects his Friends, and has no Civility: He has neither Religion, nor Sincerity. The ſame may be ſaid of other Paſſions: Into what an Abyſs of Infamy does a Man precipitate*

St. Hilary. *pitate himſelf who is maſter'd by the Paſſion of Love? Who can be more miſerable than he who is a Slave to Drunkenneſs? Can you ſee any thing more Shameful than the Motions of a Man tranſported with Anger?* &c.

In the Commentary upon Pſalm 117. he treats largely of the Fear of God. He ſays, That it is never ſpoken of in Scripture, but there are joyn'd with it many Conditions: That it conſiſts not in Terrour; That 'tis not a Paſſion which proceeds from Nature, but a rational Motion excited by the knowledge and love of Goodneſs and Truth. *Wherefore*, ſays he, *the Fear of God conſiſts entirely in Love. Perfect Charity perfects Fear. The Effects of this love of God, are to obey his Commandments, to follow his Precepts, to believe his Word, and to hope in his Promiſes.*

In the Commentary upon Pſalm 129, he tells us, that 'tis in reſpect of the ſoul that a Man is ſaid to be like God; That the Soul is Spiritual, and the Angels are active Spirits, whom God makes uſe of to aſſiſt the weakneſs of Men.

In his Commentary upon Pſalm 132. he obſerves, That the Woman which anointed the Head of Jeſus Chriſt was different from her that anointed his Feet. He takes notice that ſome have ſaid, That it was upon Mount *Hermon* the Angels deſcended to have commerce with Women; but he rejects this Imagination, becauſe we cannot truſt thoſe things, but to that which is written in the Book of the Law.

In Pſalm 135. he reproves thoſe that are not Attentive to what is Read in the Church.

In the Comment on Pſalm 137. he obſerves, That true Repentance conſiſts in refraining from all thoſe Sins which we know our ſelves to have formerly committed and in doing them no more.

In the Comment upon the following Pſalm, he blames the Miniſters of Jeſus Chriſt, who addict themſelves wholly to the Affairs of this World, that they may purchaſe Temporal Riches. He ſays That we are permitted to hate the Enemies of God; that's to ſay, as far as they are the Enemies of God, according to that excellent Saying, *That we ſhould hate the Vices and love the Perſons.*

Upon Pſalm 140. he diſtinguiſhes Four ſorts of Prayer, Deprecation, Oration, Petition, and Thankſgiving: And he ſays, That *it belongs to our Humility to Pray, to the Majeſty of God to be Pray'd unto; it belongs to our Faith to Petition, and to our Gratitude to Thank God for his Benefits.* He deſcribes the Eaſineſs and Danger of offending God by the Sins of the Tongue. He obſerves that the Book of Wiſdom, which the Latins attribute to *Solomon*, paſſes among the Greeks and Hebrews for *Jeſus* the Son of *Syrach's*.

An infinite number of other Remarks might yet be drawn from theſe Commentaries, but theſe are ſufficient for our Deſign: For if we ſhould give an Account of all the Commentaries of Authors upon the Scripture, and all that they contain, we ſhould never have done. Wherefore we pray the Reader, that he would be content with theſe Extracts which we have made from the Commentaries of St. *Hilary*, which cannot but be too long already. 'Tis plain, That theſe Commentaries are almoſt wholly taken out of *Origen*. They contain many Allegories and many Moral Thoughts: There is much Wit and Learning obſervable in them. He advertiſes the Reader often, that the Latin does not fully expreſs the ſence of the Greek word, which alſo diſcovers that this Work was taken from a Greek Commentary; and that he follow'd the Emphaſis of the Greek words, the ſence whereof the Latin Tranſlator was oblig'd to expreſs. St. *Jerom* calls St. *Hilary* the *Rhoſne* of Latin Eloquence, *Latinæ Eloquentiæ Rhodanum*, alluding not only to the Country where he was Born, but alſo to the Genius of his Stile, which is violent and rapid like the Courſe of the *Rhoſne*: for as this River by the Violence of its Waters carries all before it that hinders its courſe; ſo St. *Hilary* raviſhes the Mind and Judgment, and extorts a Conſent by the Vehemence of his Expreſſions. His manner of expreſſing things ſmites, aſtoniſhes, overthrows, and perſwades. His Periods are commonly long and intricate, which renders him every-where obſcure, and almoſt unintelligible in ſome places. He often uſes barbarous terms, and there are ſome places in his Works, where there is no Syntax. He is full of Figures and Antitheſes; his Reaſons, though ſolid, yet are much improv'd by the lively and ſmart turn that he gives them. He does not ſpare his Adverſaries, but he ſpeaks to Powers and of Powers with an unparallell'd freedom. He is partial to none, but is a rigid Cenſor of Manners, and a ſevere defender of the Faith. Though St. *Jerom* ſays in his Seventh Epiſtle to *Leta*, That one may read St. *Hilary's* Works without meeting any thing that is offenſive to Piety and Religion, *inoffenſo decurrat pede*; yet it muſt be confeſs'd, that there are ſome Errors and ſome Expreſſions which are not agreeable to the Doctrine of the Church. One of the principal, is his Opinion concerning the Paſſion of Jeſus Chriſt. He thinks that he had no ſenſe of Pain, though he received upon his Body the Wounds and Blows which cauſe pain. The Schoolmen have endeavour'd to give a good ſence to this Expreſſion. Some have ſaid with the Maſter of the Sentences, That he does not deny, but Jeſus Chriſt felt Pain; but he denies that the Pain he had was the Effect of Sin, as it is in other Men. Others have ſaid, That he does not exclude his Sufferings, but the Neceſſity of Suffering. Some have affirm'd, That he ſpeaks in this place of the Divinity of Jeſus Chriſt and not of his Humanity. But all theſe Solutions appear to me to be groundleſs; and if one would excuſe St. *Hilary* it might better be done by ſaying That the words, Pain, Suffering, Fear and Sorrow, are not to be underſtood preciſely of the perception that is in the Senſes, but of the trouble that reſults from thence in the Soul and Spirit, of the uneaſineſs of Pain, or the ſenſible Commotions of Fear or Sorrow: And in this ſence it may be ſaid, That Jeſus Chriſt had no Pain, nor Fear; becauſe his Soul continued in a Perfect Tranquillity. St. *Hilary* had not very clear Notions concerning Spiritual Beings; for in the Fifth Canon of his Commentary upon St. *Matthew*, he ſays, That all Creatures are corporeal, and that the Souls which are in Bodies are corporeal Subſtances. He held alſo an intolerable Error concerning the Laſt Judgment. I do not inſiſt upon ſome ſmaller Errors, as when in Canon 31ſt. and 32d. upon St. *Matthew* he excuſes

excuſes the Sin of St. *Peter*, when he ſays in Canon 16th. That the Words of Jeſus Chriſt, *Get thee behind me, Satan*, were not addreſs'd to this Apoſtle; when he affirms in Canon 33d. that the Divinity of Jeſus Chriſt was ſeparated from his Humanity at the time of his Death; upon Pſalm 119. That the Virgin ſhall be Purg'd by the Fire of the Day of Judgment; In Canon 14th. and upon Pſalm 129th. That God created the Soul of the firſt Man before his Body; In Canon 17th. That the World ſhall not continue above 6000 Years; In Canon 20th. That *Moſes* did not Die, and that he ſhall come again at the Day of Judgment. But if this Father had ſome Errors of this Nature, yet it muſt alſo be acknowledg'd, that he held a very Orthodox Doctrine about the chief Myſteries of Faith. He ſpeaks of the Attributes of God in a Sublime and Noble manner; He explains the Myſtery of the Trinity, with wonderful clearneſs and exactneſs. Every time that he ſpeaks of the Myſtery of the Incarnation, he uſes the moſt proper terms to expreſs the Hypoſtatical Union of the two Natures in Jeſus Chriſt. He explains the different Orders of the Angels and their Miniſtry. He makes Happineſs to conſiſt in the Viſion of God, and ſays expreſly, That the Good and Evil are Happy or Miſerable before the Day of Judgment. He thinks that on this Day there will be a Purgatorial Fire to expiate the Sins of the Juſt: He acknowledges the Fall of Mankind in *Adam*, Original Sin, and the Neceſſity of a Mediator. He attributes much to Free-Will, and the Merit of Good-Works; and yet he admits the Neceſſity of the Grace of Jeſus Chriſt, which he ſeems to ſubject to Free-Will. He alledges often the Authority of the Church, and is clearly of opinion, that there is no Salvation out of her Communion. He aſcribes wonderful Effects to Baptiſm, when it is received with good Diſpoſitions. He ſays expreſly in the Eighth Book of the Trinity, That in the Euchariſt we Eat and Drink the Body and Blood of Jeſus Chriſt. He approves of Vows and Invocation of Saints; He praiſes Penance, Faſting and Celebacy: He condemns Simony, Uſury and Luxury: In a word, his Writings are full of moſt pure Morality, and a moſt holy Diſcipline. *St. Hilary.*

The Works of St. *Hilary* were printed at *Paris* in the Year 1500 by *Badius Aſcenſius*: Afterwards *Eraſmus* having corrected them, caus'd them to be printed at *Baſle* in 1535. They were alſo printed in the ſame City in 1550, revis'd by *Juſtus Lipſius*. In 1572, *Gillot* publiſhed a New Edition of St. *Hilary*'s Works, together with a Preface, which contains the Life of this Father, and ſome Notes: It was printed the ſame Year at *Paris*. In 1605. this very Edition was Re-printed more correctly, becauſe ſome Able Men, as *Nicolaus Faber* and *Bongarſius* gave themſelves the trouble to compare this Impreſſion with many Manuſcripts. There is added in this Edition, the Fragments of St. *Hilary*, which were publiſh'd by the *Pithoei*, and printed at *Paris* in the Year 1598, with an excellent Preface of *Nicolaus Faber* about theſe Fragments, and the Commentaries of St. *Hilary* upon the Pſalms 13, 14, 149, and 150, which had not been publiſh'd before. The ſame Edition has been printed anew at *Paris* in 1631, and 1652. *Leunclavius* has publiſh'd under the Name of St. *Hilary*, A Confeſſion of the Faith of the Trinity, Greek and Latin, printed at *Baſle* in 1578. The Book of the Unity of the Father and the Son, was printed at the ſame place in 1528. There is a New Edition expected ſoon from the *Benedictins*.

LUCIFER CALARITANUS

Lucifer Calaritanus.

LUCIFER, Biſhop of *Calaris*, the Metropolitan City of the Iſle of *Sardinia*, was Deputed with *Hilary* and *Pancratius*, by Pope *Liberius*, to the Emperour *Conſtantius*, after the Fall of *Vincentius* of *Capua*. He came to the Council of *Milan*, held in the Year 354, where he Defended *Athanaſius* and his Cauſe, with great Courage. The Emperour being provok'd by his Firmneſs, ſent him into Baniſhment, where he was detain'd till the Reign of *Julian*; but they forc'd him many times to change his Habitation: For, at firſt, he was Baniſh'd to *Germanicia*, a City of *Syria*, whereof *Eudoxus* was Biſhop, afterwards to *Eleutheropolis* in *Paleſtine*, where he was extremely tormented by *Eutychus*, Biſhop of that City. At the Death of *Conſtantius*, he was found baniſh'd in *Thebais*, and he ſuffer'd alſo a fourth Baniſhment, the place whereof is not known: 'Twas at the time when he was in *Paleſtine*, towards the Year 356, that he wrote his Books. They are all againſt *Conſtantius*, in behalf of St. *Athanaſius* and his Defenders. The Two Firſt, have no other Title, but, *The Books in behalf of St.* Athanaſius *againſt* Conſtantius. The Third, is entitled, *Of Apoſtate Kings*. The Fourth, bears this Title, *That we muſt not Aſſemble with Hereticks*. And the Fifth, *That we muſt not Pardon thoſe that Offend againſt God*.

All theſe Books are written with ſo much Heat and Boldneſs, that *Lucifer* muſt needs have a Soul fully prepar'd to ſuffer Martyrdom, when he wrote them, as is obſerv'd by St. *Jerom*. But that which is moſt ſurprizing is, that he was not contented with publiſhing of them, but alſo ſent a Copy of them to *Conſtantius*, and caus'd them to be preſented to him in his own Name. The Emperour being aſtoniſh'd at this Boldneſs, gave this Copy to *Florentius*, Grand-Maſter of his Palace, to ſend it to *Lucifer*, that he might declare, whether the Book was his or no. *Lucifer* confeſs'd it openly, and acknowledg'd that it was by his Order, that it was preſented to the Emperour. He had charg'd one named *Bonoſus*, to report this at Court, and now made Anſwer to *Florentius*, who had written to him, that he was ready to ſuffer Death with Joy. It was probably upon this occaſion, and at this time, that he added his Laſt Book, entitled, *That we ſhould die for the Son of God*. St. *Athanaſius* underſtanding that *Lucifer* had undertaken his Defence with ſo much Courage, ſent a Deacon to him nam'd *Eutychus*, to carry a Letter in his Name, wherein, after he had teſtified the Obligation that he had laid upon the Church, he prays him to ſend him a Copy of his Works; which having receiv'd,

he

Lucifer Calaritanus.

he ſent him a very obliging Letter of Thanks, and tranſlated them into Greek. We have now thoſe Letters of St. *Athanaſius*, the Letter of *Florentius*, and the Anſwer of *Lucifer* at the End of the Works of this Biſhop of *Calaris*; and what we have ſaid of the reſt of his Life is taken out of St. *Jerom*, and a Petition preſented to the Emperours *Theodoſius* and *Valentinian*, by *Marcellinus* and *Fauſtinus*, two *Luciferian* Prieſts.

After the Death of *Conſtantius*, *Lucifer* obtain'd his Liberty as well as the other Biſhops that were baniſh'd for the Faith. He came to *Antioch*, and found the Church of that City in Diviſion. For after that *Euſtathius* had been forc'd to leave it, many Catholicks did always ſeparate from thoſe Biſhops, that ſome would have ſet over them. They were not willing to acknowledge *Meletius*, who was then Biſhop of *Antioch*, tho' they had nothing to reprehend in his Faith. Theſe Catholicks were then govern'd only by Prieſts, and they were call'd *Euſtathians*. *Lucifer*, a ſevere Man and a rigorous Defender of Diſcipline, being come to *Antioch*, was perſuaded, That *Meletius* was Ordain'd by *Arian* Biſhops, or ſuch as were ſuſpected of *Arianiſm*, and had communicated with them, and therefore could not be a lawful Biſhop; whereupon he join'd himſelf to the *Euſtathians*, and Ordain'd *Paulinus* a Prieſt to be their Biſhop. This Ordination, which ſtill heightned the Diviſion of the Church of *Antioch*, was diſapprov'd by *Euſebius* of *Vercellæ*, who was ſent to *Antioch*, in the Name of the Synod of *Alexandria*. He condemn'd the Conduct of *Lucifer*, and retir'd into the Weſt, having no more hope of reſtoring Peace to the Church of *Antioch*; *Lucifer*, on the contrary, to maintain what he had done, reſolv'd to have no more Converſation or Correſpondence with any of the Biſhops who had received into their Communion, thoſe that had formerly ſign'd the *Arian* Creeds. He withdraws therefore into his own Iſland, and ſeparates from the Communion of almoſt all the Biſhops of the World. He died in this Reſolution, and left ſome followers call'd *Luciferians*, who ſpread themſelves over all the World.

The Works of *Lucifer* are written without Art and Eloquence, with much Heat and Paſſion; the Stile is Harſh and Barbarous; there is no Reaſoning, nor Principles in any thing that he ſays. He only propoſes Maxims, which he proves by the Teſtimonies and Examples of Scripture, whether they be pertinent to his Subject or no; from whence it comes to paſs, that his Writings, are nothing but a Collection of Paſſages of Scripture mix'd with *Apoſtrophe*'s, Applications and Reflections.

In the Two Books againſt *Conſtantius*, he deſigns to prove, That this Emperour was very much to blame for endeavouring to compel the Biſhops to condemn St. *Athanaſius*, who was Abſent and Innocent. To prove this Truth, he produces abundance of Hiſtories and Paſſages out of Scripture, which ſhow, Firſt, That God condemns no Man without hearing him; And, Secondly, That 'tis forbidden in Scripture to condemn any Man without hearing his Defence; Thirdly, That thoſe who ſhed the Blood of the Innocent, ſhall be moſt ſeverely puniſh'd; Fourthly, That *Conſtantius*, has no right to command Biſhops, becauſe he is a Profane Perſon, a Heretick, and a Perſecutor.

The deſign of the Treatiſe *Of Apoſtate Kings*, is to prove by the Examples of many impious Kings, That the Succeſs of *Conſtantius*, does not demonſtrate, that he has any right to Perſecute the Orthodox Biſhops, nor that his Doctrine is true.

The other Books ſhew their Arguments by their Titles. The Firſt, is to ſhow, That we muſt neither Aſſemble nor Pray with the *Arians*, who are declar'd Hereticks: The Second, Is to Juſtify the ſevere Conduct of the Catholicks againſt the *Arians*, and the Liberty, that they take to reprove them with boldneſs and vehemence, without ſparing even the Powers themſelves: that is to ſay, this Book is peculiarly deſign'd to juſtify *Lucifer*, St. *Hilary*, and ſome other Catholicks, in their way of ſpeaking to the Emperour *Conſtantius*. The laſt Book contains many Proofs of this Truth, That we muſt die for the Son of God: He blames the Emperour *Conſtantius*, for his Impiety and Cruelty, at the ſame time, he praiſes the Conſtancy of the Catholicks, who ſuffer Martyrdom with Joy, for the Defence of the Orthodox Faith. [*Lucifer*'s Works, with the Letters of St. *Athanaſius* and *Florentius*, were Printed at *Paris*, in 8vo, by *Johannes Tillius*, Biſhop of *Meaux*, in 1568. and afterwards inſerted into the *Bibliothecæ Patrum*.]

VICTORINUS *of* Africk.

Victorinus of Africk.

FABIUS] *MARIUS VICTORINUS*, born in *Africk*; after he had profeſs'd Rhetorick for the ſpace of many Years in the City of *Rome*, with ſo much Reputation, that a Statue was erected for him in one of the publick Places of the City, did at laſt in his old Age, embrace the Chriſtian Religion. The ſtudying of *Plato*'s Books, which he had tranſlated, gave him ſome reliſh for the Holy Scripture; for when he read it, he admir'd it, and ſo became a Chriſtian in his heart. He discover'd this Inclination to his Friend *Simplicianus*, who exhorted him to enter into the Church of Chriſt, ſince he was perſuaded of the Truth of his Religion. *Victorinus*, thinking it was ſufficient to know the Truth, anſwer'd him, as it were jeſting upon his Simplicity, *And do the Walls then make Chriſtians?* But at laſt, being confirm'd in the Faith, by Reading and Meditating upon the Holy Scripture, and conſidering that Jeſus Chriſt would not own him at the Day of Judgment, if he ſhould be aſham'd to confeſs him publickly here; he ſays to his Friend *Simplicianus*, *Let us go to Church*; and after he had been ſome time a Catechumen, he was baptiz'd in the preſence of all the People. St. *Auſtin*, reports this Hiſtory, *B.* VIII. of his *Confeſſions*, *Ch.* 2. which he ſays, he learn'd from St. *Ambroſe*. St. *Jerom* places this *Victorinus* among the Number of Eccleſiaſtical Writers, and obſerves, that he wrote Books againſt *Arius*, compos'd in a Logical Method, *Dialectico More*, which are very obſcure, and

and cannot be underſtood but by Learned Men. He adds, That he had alſo written Commentaries upon the Apoſtle St. *Paul*, but he ſays in another place, that theſe Commentaries were almoſt uſeleſs, becauſe this Author having been wholly addicted to the Study of humane Learning, did not underſtand the true Sence of the Holy Scripture. *Victorinus of Africk.*

We have at preſent thoſe Four Books of *Victorinus* againſt *Arius*, which are printed in the *Orthodoxographa*, and in the *Bibliothecæ Patrum*; but beſides this Book which St. *Jerom* mentions, there are ſome other Tracts which bear the Name of the ſame Author. Theſe are in the *Bibliothecæ Patrum*, *viz.* one in Defence of the Word *Conſubſtantial*, three Hymns of the Trinity, and one Poem of the *Maccabees*: *Sirmondus* has alſo publiſh'd by its ſelf, in the Year 1630, a little Treatiſe againſt the *Manichees* and another about the beginning of Day. All theſe Books are written in the ſame Stile, and by the ſame Author.

In the Four Books againſt *Arius*, dedicated to *Candidus*, he refutes the Errors of this Heretick, and thoſe of his Followers; he proves there the Divinity of the Word, and defends the Conſubſtantiality: But he does it in ſo Scholaſtick and Intricate a way, that 'tis very difficult to comprehend his Arguments. One may find ſeveral Expreſſions about the Myſtery of the Trinity, that are ſcarce Sence, and quite different from that way of ſpeaking which is us'd in the Holy Scripture, and by the Church of God. The Book in Defence of the Term *Conſubſtantial*, is a kind of Summary of thoſe Four Books.

The Treatiſe to *Juſtinus*, who was a *Manichee*, is written againſt the Error of thoſe Hereticks, who admitted two Principles of the Word, and believ'd that the Fleſh was created by an Evil Principle. *Victorinus*, refutes theſe two Errors in few words, and exhorts *Juſtinus* to acknowledge one God only. " Suffer not any more, ſays he, my Friend *Juſtinus*, ſuffer not your ſelf, you who are of " the City of *Rome*, to be abus'd by the Impieties of the *Perſians*, or *Armenians*. In vain do you " macerate your ſelf with extraordinary Mortifications, for after you have made your ſelf lean by thoſe " Auſterities, your Fleſh is of no other kind, than that which ſhall return to the Devil in darkneſs, " who according to you, created it. I adviſe and require you to acknowledge, That God Almighty " is he that created you, that ſo you may be truly the Temple of God, according to the Words of " the Apoſtle, *You are truly the Temple of God, and his Spirit dwelleth in you.* If you have not the " Honour to be the Temple of God, and to receive the Holy Spirit into you, Jeſus Chriſt is not come " to ſave, but to deſtroy you; for if we are his, our Body and Soul muſt belong to him, and then it " may be truly ſaid, *That God is all in all*; That he is the One, and only Almighty and Eternal Prin- " ciple of the whole Univerſe, and perfectly Infinite, to whom be Honour and Glory." This is the Concluſion of this Treatiſe which is pleaſanter and more intelligible than thoſe which are written againſt the *Arians*.

In the little Tract about the beginning of Day, he endeavours to ſhow, That the Days of the Creation which are mention'd in *Geneſis*, do not begin at Night, but at the Morning, and end at the Morning of the Day following.

The Firſt and Third of his Hymns, are in commendation of the Myſtery of the moſt Holy Trinity, which he explains in many Words.

The Second, is a Prayer to God, and is rather in Proſe, like the Creed attributed to St. *Athanaſius* than in Verſe.

The Poem of the *Maccabees*, is a Deſcription in *Hexameter* Verſe, of the Martyrdom of thoſe Seven Brethren. There is nothing extraordinary in this Poem; there is nothing Poetical in it, but ſome mean Imitations of *Virgil*, and for the moſt part, the Verſes are low and deſpicable.

The Commentaries of *Victorinus* upon St. *Paul*, have not yet been publiſh'd. *Sirmondus* found ſome Fragments of them in a Manuſcript, from which he took thoſe two little Treatiſes of which we have already ſpoken. But probably, he judg'd them not worth publiſhing, though he ſays in his Advertiſement, That the Stile of theſe Commentaries is more clear and clean, than that of his Dogmatical Works.

There are many Philoſophical Books attributed to the ſame *Victorinns*, as his Commentaries upon *Tully's* Rhetorick, cited by *Caſſidorus* in his *Bibliotheca*, and by Pope *Sylveſter* the II. in his Epiſtle 130, which have been Printed ſeveral times. There is alſo attributed to him the Verſion of *Porphyry's* *Iſagoge*, which is amongſt *Boetius's* Works, a Book about Poetry, and ſome Books of *Grammar*. But thoſe ſort of Books ought not to come into our *Bibliotheca*, which ſhould contain none but Eccleſiaſtical Monuments.

St. PACIANUS.

ST. *PACIANUS*, Biſhop of *Barcelona*, no leſs Famous, ſays St. *Jerom*, for the Holineſs of his Life, than the Eloquence of his Diſcourſe, wrote many Books, among which there is one entitled, *Cervus* or *The Hart*, and ſome other Treatiſes againſt the *Novatians*. He died under the Reign of *Theodoſius*, towards the Year 380. We have three Letters of his againſt the *Novatians*, addreſs'd to *Sempronianus*, who was of this Sect. *An Exhortation to Repentance*, and a *Treatiſe or Sermon of Baptiſm*, addreſs'd to the Catechumens. All theſe Pieces are written with much Wit and Eloquence. *St. Pacianus.*

The Firſt Letter to *Sempronianus*, has Two Parts. In the Firſt, he makes uſe of the way of Preſcription from the Name and Authority of the Catholick Church, to ſhow, that the Sect of the *Novatians*, cannot be the Church of Jeſus Chriſt. In the Second, he refutes their Doctrine about Repentance.

S. *Pacianus.*

He obſerves at the beginning of the Firſt Part, That ſince the coming of Jeſus Chriſt, there have appear'd an infinite Number of Sects, who have all been denominated from the Names of their Authors; That the Name of Catholick is continued only in the True Church; That the *Novatians* make one of thoſe Sects which are ſeparated from the Catholick Church; That they have forſaken the Tradition of the Church under pretence of Reformation. He oppoſes to them the Authority of the Ancient Fathers of the Church, who were Succeſſors to the Apoſtles. "Why ſhould not we, ſays he, have a Reſpect to the Authority of thoſe Apoſtolical Men? Shall we pay no Deference to the Teſtimony of St. *Cyprian*? Would we teach this Doctrine? Are we wiſer than he? But what ſhall we ſay of ſo many Biſhops diſpers'd over all the World, who are united with theſe Saints? What ſhall we ſay of ſo many Venerable Old Men, of ſo many Martyrs, and ſo many Confeſſors? Is it for us to Reform them? Shall our times corrupted by Vice, efface the Venerable Antiquity of our Anceſtors?" *My Name*, ſays he, addreſſing himſelf to *Sempronianus*, *is Chriſtian, and my Sur-Name, is Catholick. Chriſtianus mihi nomen eſt, Catholicus cognomen.* He explains afterwards, the Name of Catholick, and tells us, that the moſt Learned ſay, that it ſignifies *Obedient*; and that according to others it means, *one thro' all*, and ſhews, that theſe two Significations agree to the Catholick Church, which alone is obedient to the Voice of Jeſus Chriſt, and which only is the ſame in all the World. After he has thus ſpoken of the Church, he proceeds to Penance, and ſo he enters into the Merits of the Queſtion: "May it pleaſe God, ſays he, that none of the Faithful may ever ſtand in need of it; That no Man after Baptiſm may ever fall into the precipice of Sin; That ſo the Miniſters of Jeſus Chriſt may never be oblig'd to Preach and Apply long and tedious Remedies, for fear of Patronizing the Liberty of ſinning by flattering Sinners with their Remedies. Nevertheleſs, we allow this Mercy from our God, not to thoſe who are ſo happy as to preſerve their Innocence, but to thoſe who have been ſo unhappy as to loſe it by their Sins. It is not to the Sound, but to the Sick, that we Preach theſe Remedies. If the Evil Spirits have no more Power over the baptiz'd; If the Fraud of the Serpent which deſtroy'd the firſt Man, and gave ſo great occaſion of Damnation to his Poſterity, has ceas'd; If, I ſay the Devil is gone out of the World; If we may ſport our ſelves in Peace; If Man does not fall into many Sins of Thought, Word and Deed: Then let us not acknowledge this Gift of God; Let us reject this Aid; Let us have no more Confeſſions; Let us no longer hearken to Sighs and Tears; Let Juſtice and Innocence proudly deſpiſe theſe Remedies. But if Man be ſubject to theſe Miſeries, Let us no more accuſe the Mercy of God, who has propos'd theſe Remedies to our Diſeaſes, and Rewards to thoſe that preſerve their Health; Let us no more efface the Titles of God's Clemency by an unſupportable Rigour, nor hinder Sinners by an inflexible hardneſs from rejoycing in thoſe Gifts which he has freely beſtow'd upon them. 'Tis not we who give this Grace of our own Authority, but God himſelf who ſays, *Be converted to me*, &c." After he has ſet down many Paſſages of Scripture, which prove, That God Pardons penitent Sinners, he propoſes this Objection of the *Novatians*: *God only*, will you ſay, *can grant Pardon of Sin*; *That's true*, anſwers he, *but what he does by his Miniſters, he does by his own Power, For he ſays to his Apoſtles, Whatſoever ye ſhall bind on Earth, ſhall be bound in Heaven: and whatſoever ye ſhall looſe on Earth, ſhall be loos'd in Heaven. But, perhaps, he did not give this Power to any but the Apoſtles? If this were true, then they muſt ſay, That they only had alſo Power to Baptize, to give the Holy Spirit, and to Purify the Gentiles from their ſins: For in the ſame place, where he gives them Power to Adminiſter the Sacrament of Baptiſm; he alſo gives them Power to looſe Sinners. Either then theſe two Powers were peculiarly reſerv'd to the Apoſtles, or they are both continued to their Succeſſors, and therefore ſince it is certain that the Power of giving Baptiſm and Unction, is continued in the Biſhops; that ſame muſt conſequently be granted of the Power of binding and looſing.* He adds, That whatever Power the Biſhop has, he receiv'd it from the Apoſtles; That the right of adminiſtring Unction and Baptiſm, of Forgiving Sins, of Conſecrating the Body of Jeſus Chriſt, was devolv'd upon him, becauſe he is Succeſſor to the Apoſtles. He concludes this Letter with ſaying, *I know very well, my dear Brother, that the Pardon of ſins is not to be granted indifferently to all Sinners, and that they are not to be loos'd, before there be ſome Signs of the Will of God, that it ſhould be done; That Abſolution is not to be given, but with much precaution and diſcretion, after Sinners have ſighed and wept long; and when the whole Church has pray'd for them, that ſo no Man may prevent the Judgment of Jeſus Chriſt. If you would write your Thoughts more clearly to me, my dear Brother, I would Inſtruct you more fully. Sempronianus*, having anſwered this Letter, St. *Pacianus*, confirm'd the Two Parts of his Letter, by Two other Anſwers.

In the Firſt, he proves what he had ſaid concerning the Name of the Catholick Church, and as to what *Sempronianus* had objected, that the People of St. *Cyprian* had been treated as Apoſtates, as Sectaries, &c. He ſhews, that they did not commonly carry theſe Names, but on the contrary, were always call'd *Catholicks*, whereas *Sempronianus* cannot deny, but the Sect whereof he was, did bear the Name of *Novatian*. He anſwers afterwards to the Accuſation of *Sempronianus*, founded upon his making uſe of a Verſe of *Virgil* in his Letter, and ſhows, that a Biſhop is allow'd to know humane Learning, and to make a profitable uſe of it. He anſwers alſo another Accuſation againſt the Catholicks, concerning the Perſecution which he pretends the *Novatians* had ſuffer'd from them. He ſays, "That the *Novatians* muſt not attribute to the Catholicks the ſeverity of ſome Princes who would not tolerate them; That this was not done upon the Complaint, and at the deſire of Catholicks, but by the proper Motion of Chriſtian Princes who eſpous'd the Intereſts of the Church; That the Powers had reaſon to Protect the Innocent, and to make uſe of their Authority for the publick Good." The reſt of this Letter, reſpects ſome particular Debates between them, concerning the Perſons of *Novatian*, St. *Cyprian* and *Cornelius*. St. *Pacianus*, defends and praiſes theſe two laſt, and accuſes the

firſt

firſt of Pride and Schiſm. In the laſt Letter to *Sempronianus*, he treats of Penance againſt *Novatian*. He ſays, That all the Doctrine of the *Novatians*, explain'd by *Sempronianus*, is contain'd in this Propoſition, *That Penance is not allow'd after Baptiſm, becauſe the Church cannot forgive Mortal Sin: and in ſhort, That ſhe deſtroys her ſelf by receiving Sinners.* St. *Pacianus*. " Who is it, ſays he, that propoſes this " Doctrine? Is it *Moſes*? Is it St. *Paul*? Is it Jeſus Chriſt? No, it is *Novatian*. And who is this " *Novatian*? Is he a Man pure and blameleſs, who has never forſaken the Church, who was lawfully " Ordain'd Biſhop, and by the common Methods, ſucceeded in the room of a Biſhop deceas'd? What " do you mean, you will tell me? It ſuffices that he has taught this Doctrine. But ſtill, when was " it taught? Was it immediately after the Paſſion of Jeſus Chriſt? Not at all, It was after the Reign " of *Decius*, 300 Years after Chriſt. But did this Man follow the Prophets? Was he a Prophet? Did " he raiſe the Dead? Did he work Miracles? Did he ſpeak all ſorts of Languages? For at leaſt he " ought to have theſe ſigns for eſtabliſhing a new Goſpel; and though he had, yet the Apoſtle aſſures us, " That though an Angel ſhould deſcend from Heaven to teach us a new Goſpel, he ſhould be ac- " curs'd? Was there never any Perſon, ſince the coming of Chriſt till *Novatian*, that underſtood the " Doctrine of Jeſus Chriſt? and ſince the Reign of *Decius*, Is there none but *Novatian* in the way of " Salvation? But you will tell me, We do not acquieſce in Authority, we make uſe of Reaſon. But " as to me, who hitherto have been ſettled in my Religion upon the Authority and Tradition of the " Church, and am ſatisfied with the Communion of this Ancient Society, I will not now diſſent " from it, I will not ſeek after Diſputes; and you who have ſeparated from this Body and divided " from your Mother, ſearch in Books for every thing that is moſt ſecret, that you may diſturb thoſe " that are at reſt. 'Tis not we, but you, that have raiſed this Diſpute. But ſtill let us hear what " you ſay, let us examine your Reaſons. You ſay, That the Church is a Body of Men regene- " rate by Water and the Holy Spirit, who have not deny'd the Name of Chriſt, which is the Temple " and Houſe of God, the Pillar and Ground of Truth: we ſay the ſame alſo. But who has taken away " from us this Living Water? Have we it not, we who draw from its Fountain? But you who are " ſeparated from it, how can you be regenerate by Baptiſm? How can the Holy Spirit, who has " not deſerted the Church, come upon you who are fall'n off from it? How can your People receive " the Holy Spirit, ſince they are not Confirm'd by Biſhops, who have receiv'd the Sacerdotal Unction? " Have not we had ſome Confeſſors and Martyrs? Yes, you will ſay, you have had; but they are " now loſt by receiving of Apoſtates. I will not tell you, that *Novatian*, while he was yet in the " Church, wrote a Book to prove that we ought to receive them; but how do you prove that the " whole Church is periſh'd by receiving Penitent Sinners? If ſome Churches have ſhown too great In- " dulgence, muſt others, who have not approv'd them, but have follow'd the old way, and preſerv'd " Peace, loſe upon that account the Name of Chriſtians? He proves afterwards by many Reaſons, That the Church by receiving Penitent Sinners, did not ceaſe to be the Church, and that the Schiſm of *Novatian* made his Diſciples loſe the Title of the Sons of the Church. He ſtrongly urges the Teſtimony of *Novatian*, who approv'd before his Separation, the Conduct of thoſe that receiv'd the laps'd that were Penitent. He deſcribes afterwards the Origin of the Sect of *Novatians*; and ſays, That *Novatus* an African Prieſt, being convicted in his own Country of many Crimes, came to *Rome* to avoid the Condemnation which he had deſerv'd; and that being arriv'd there, he perſwaded *Novatian* who was vex'd that *Cornelius* was Ordain'd Biſhop of *Rome*; he perſwaded him, I ſay, to procure himſelf to be Ordain'd Biſhop, and adviſ'd him for gaining his deſign, to object againſt *Cornelius*, the ill Conduct he obſerv'd in receiving Penitent Sinners. St. *Pacianus* enters upon this Matter, and juſtifies againſt the *Novatians* the Conduct of *Cornelius*, by ſhowing that we ought to receive Sinners to Penance: and that God has given his Church the Power of forgiving Sins. But at the ſame time, he takes Notice, That there is not the ſame reaſon of Penance as of Baptiſm, for the former ought to be accompanied with much Labour, with Tears and Sighs? He confutes the Objections of the *Novatians*, and ſhows, that the paſſage of St. *Matthew*, *Whatſoever ye ſhall looſe on Earth, ſhall be loos'd in Heaven*, cannot be underſtood of Baptiſm. He proves all the Anſwers of *Sempronianus* to the Paſſages alledg'd in his firſt Letter to him, to be falſe. He objects to the *Novatians* their Hardheartedneſs, with reference to Penitents. He ſhows, That thoſe of this Sect are not ſo pure, nor ſo Innocent as they boaſt themſelves to be, and that there have been many Perſons among them guilty of enormous Crimes. He oppoſes to them the Authority of St. *Cyprian* and *Tertullian* before his Fall. He ends with an Exhortation to *Sempronianus* to return into the Church.

He begins his Exhortation to Repentance with an Introduction, wherein he obſerves, That oftentimes it were better not to mention ſome Sins than to reprove them; becauſe the Sin is rather learn'd than reſtrain'd. He ſays, That the Book that he had written againſt the Play called *Cervulus*, or *the Little Heart*, had the Misfortune to render that Immorality the more common. Concerning which, we may learn by the bye, That the Book of St. *Pacianus*, entiled, *Cervus* or *Cervulus*, *The Little Hart*, mention'd by St. *Jerom*, which is not extant, was compos'd againſt ſome Profane and Laſcivious Play or Ceremony, wherein probably there were us'd indecent Poſtures. He adds, That this Treatiſe was written againſt the Heathens, who mocked at it, and that he was not to expect better ſucceſs from this Exhortation to Repentance, which was addreſs'd to the Chriſtians of his own Dioceſs. He ſays, That we cannot but imagine that this Book was deſign'd only for Penitents, ſince Penance is as it were the Bond of all Eccleſiaſtical Diſcipline: *For*, ſays he, *we muſt take care of Catechumens, that they fall not into Sin; of the Faithful, that they relapſe not after they have been Purified; and of Penitents, that they may receive quickly the fruit of their Humiliation.* After this, he divides his Diſcourſe into Three Parts: He treats in the Firſt of the different ſorts of Sin, leſt any ſhould imagine that all Sins deſerve the ſame Puniſhment. In the Second, he diſcourſes of ſome Perſons that are aſham'd

to make uſe of the Remedy of Penance, and ſo receive the Sacrament with an heart and mind polluted with Sin: *They are fearful*, ſays he, *before Men, but impudent before God, they defile by their impure Hands, and by their corrupt Mouth; they defile, I ſay, that Altar which makes the Angels themſelves to tremble.* The laſt Part, Is of the Pains that they ſhall ſuffer who do no Penance, and of the Reward of thoſe that Purify themſelves by a true and ſincere Confeſſion of their Sins. In the Firſt Part, he diſtinguiſhes Sins from Crimes. He averrs, That we muſt not imagine that Men are oblig'd to do Penance for an infinite number of ſmall Sins, from which no Perſon is exempt; That according to the Diſpenſation under the Old Teſtament, leſſer Faults were rigorouſly puniſh'd, but Jeſus Chriſt is come to deliver us from this Yoke of the Law. *Thus after Pardon, if a Man may ſo ſpeak, of an infinite number of Sins, which need no Powerful Remedies to cure them, there remains a ſmall number which may be eaſily avoided, that deſerve a ſevere Puniſhment.* Amongſt theſe he reckons Idolatry, Murder and Adultery: *As for other Sins*, ſays he, *they may be cur'd by the Practice of Good Works, Inhumanity by Civility, Injuries by Satisfaction, Sadneſs by Mirth, Harſhneſs by Sweetneſs, Lightneſs by Gravity; and ſo of other Vices which are puniſh'd by the contrary Vertues. But what ſhall be the Puniſhment of Idolatry? What ſhall the Murderer do to expiate his Crime? What ſhall be the remedy of an Adulterer or Fornicator? Theſe are, my Brethren, Capital Sins, theſe are Mortal Sins.* After he has terrified thoſe who have committed theſe Crimes, with the dreadful words of Fire and Brimſtone, and almoſt made them deſpair of Pardon; he adds, *However you may be healed, if you begin to be ſenſible of the greatneſs of your Crime, and the ſtate to which you are reduc'd; if you have a Fear that approaches near to Deſpair. I addreſs my ſelf firſt of all to you, who having committed thoſe Crimes refuſe to do Penance; you who are ſo timorous, after you have been ſo impudent; you who are aſham'd to do Penance after you have ſinned without bluſhing; you who are not aſham'd to commit thoſe Crimes, but are aſham'd to confeſs them; you who approach the Holy of Holies, with a Conſcience polluted by theſe Crimes, without trembling, when ye preſent your ſelves before the Altars; you who receive the Myſteries from the hands of the Prieſts in the preſence of the Angels, as if ye were innocent; you who trample upon the Patience and Mercy of God, and preſent at his Altars a defil'd Soul and an unclean Body.* After he has thus ſpoken a word to Impenitent Sinners, he repreſents to them the Puniſhments that God has threatned to thoſe that approach unworthily to Holy Things. He propoſes to them the terrible words of St. *Paul*, and exhorts them by moſt powerful Motives, and moſt convincing Reaſons to diſcover the Wounds of their Conſcience. *The Sick that are Prudent*, ſays he, *do not hide their Wounds from their Phyſicians, even thoſe that are in the moſt ſecret Parts. They ſuffer them to apply the Iron, the Fire, and Cauſticks to Cure them; And ſhall a Sinner be afraid to purchaſe Eternal Life for a little Shame? Shall he dread to diſcover his Sins to God, which are but ill hid from him? He that dares offend againſt God, why does he bluſh at any thing? Would he rather Periſh without Shame, than be aſham'd to Periſh? But though you ſhould be aſham'd to diſcover your Miſery to others, yet fear not to diſcover it to your Brethren, who bear a part in your unhappineſs. It does not become one Part of the Body to rejoyce in the Evil that befalls another Member of the ſame Body, they ſuffer all the ſame Pain, and contribute to the Remedy. The Church conſiſts of the Faithful, and Jeſus Chriſt is in his Church, and ſo he that diſcovers his Sins to his Brethren, is aſſiſted by the Tears of the Church, and Abſolv'd by the Prayers of Jeſus Chriſt.*

St. *Pacianus.*

After this, he ſpeaks a word *to thoſe, who under pretence of being willing to do Penance, lay open indeed their Wounds by Confeſſion, but know not what it is to do Penance, nor what the Remedies which muſt Cure them; who are exactly like thoſe who diſcover their Wounds and Diſeaſes to Phyſicians, but neglect to bind up their Wounds, and to apply neceſſary Remedies; nay, encreaſe their Diſeaſe by taking contrary Remedies and pernicious Potions, and add new Crimes to their old Sins. What can I do for theſe, I who am a Biſhop?* Says he, *'Tis very late to give them a Remedy, but yet if any of you be willing to ſuffer the Iron and the Fire, I can apply them: Behold the Razor which the Prophet preſents me. Turn ye, ſays he, to the Lord your God, with faſting, weeping and mourning, and ſighing, and break your hearts: fear not this Inciſion, for* David *was very willing to endure it.* He relates alſo many other Examples of Penance, and reproves the Softneſs, the Pride, and Looſneſs of the greateſt part of Chriſtians and Penitents. He blames them for not obſerving ſo much as the daily Exerciſes of Penance, which are made in the preſence of the Biſhop; *As to weep in the ſight of all the Church, to diſcover by the uncleanneſs of their Garments the regret they ought to have for loſing their Innocence, to Sigh, to Pray, to throw themſelves at the feet of the Faithful, to deprive themſelves of Pleaſures, to proſtrate themſelves before the Prieſts, to hold the hands of the Poor, to ſupplicate the Widows, to beſeech the whole Church, and implore its Prayers; and in ſhort, to try all ways poſſible to ſave their Souls.* After this, he quickens the Penitents by the Fear of Eternal Puniſhments, which he repreſents to them in a moſt Pathetical manner; and he invites them to Penance by the conſideration of the Mercy and Goodneſs of God, who deſires nothing but the Converſion of Sinners.

The Subject of the Treatiſe of Baptiſm addreſs'd to the Faithful and the Catechumens, is ſet down by St. *Pacian* in the Beginning of his Diſcourſe, *I will ſhow you*, ſays he, *in what Condition we are Born, and how we are renew'd by Baptiſm*------*To make you underſtand this, I ſhall diſcover to you, what the Gentiles are; what is the Fruit of Faith, and what are the Effects of Baptiſm.* In order to the Explication of theſe Three Things, he obſerves, That by the Sin of *Adam* all Men were enſlav'd to Death and Sin; That the Law of *Moſes* diſcover'd this Miſery very plainly, but afforded no Remedy at all; That ſo Sin reign'd from *Adam* till Chriſt, who deliver'd Mankind from the Tyranny of Sin, becauſe as the Sin of the Firſt Man was imputed to all his Poſterity, ſo the Righteouſneſs of Jeſus Chriſt was communicated to all Men by Baptiſm, and by the Aid of the Holy Spirit, provided that Faith precede. He adds, That this Regeneration cannot be perfected but by the Sacrament of Baptiſm, and Unction, and by the Miniſtry of the Prieſt. [*For*, ſays he, *Baptiſm Purifies from Sins, and Unction brings*

brings down the Holy Spirit, and both the one and the other are applied by the Hand and the Mouth of the Bishop; the whole Man is born again and renewed in Jesus Christ, that we may lead a new Life, which shall never end; because though this Body shall die, yet we shall always live in Jesus Christ, in a heavenly and eternal Life. He observes, That being deliver'd in Baptism from the bands of Sin, we renounce the Devil and the World, and if afterwards, by forgetting the Grace which we have received, we relapse into a Crime, our Relapse is almost irrecoverable; because that Jesus Christ suffer'd but once, and we cannot be wash'd and purified above once. He concludes with an Exhortation to those that are newly Baptiz'd, to preserve the Grace which they had received, to Sin no more, to keep the Purity and Innocence of Baptism till the Day of Judgment, and to endeavour to obtain Eternal Treasures by their Prayers and Spiritual Labours. St. Pacianus.

These Extracts which we have drawn from the Writings of St. *Pacianus*, sufficiently discover his Judgment, his Stile and Learning. There is hardly any of the Ancients that speaks more clearly of the Efficacy of the Sacraments of Baptism, Confirmation and Penance: He attributes to Chrism the effect of Confirmation, which is an Opinion very rare among the Latins, who attribute it to Imposition of Hands. Though he speaks advantageously of the Efficacy of the Sacraments, yet he requires very great Dispositions in order to their producing such Effects as they ought to have. He particularly recommends Publick Penance for the Sins of Idolatry, Murder and Fornication: under which Three Sins must be comprehended all the Consequents of them, which extend very far. He thinks that those Sins cannot be pardon'd but by *Publick Penance*. As to all other Sins, he does not believe it necessary to submit to that Penance which the Canons of the Church enjoyned for them. He explains the Fall of all Mankind, that 'twas caus'd by the Sin of the First Man, very clearly, and the unprofitableness of the Law, the Necessity and Effects of the Incarnation of Jesus Christ. He equally condemns the Rigour of the *Novatians*, and the Impenitence of some Sinners, as well as the heedlessness and softness wherewith others perform their Penance. His Exhortations are lively and persuasive, his Thoughts well-weigh'd, his Proofs solid, his way of Writing pleasant, his Stile, elegant, and the Periods short. In a word, These little Tracts may pass for Master-pieces in their kind, and these two Treatises may be look'd upon as a perfect Model of Preaching, or Exhortation to the People.

The Works of this Father were Publish'd by *Tilius*, and Printed at *Paris*, with some other Books in 4to, in the Year 1538, by *Guillardus*; in 1655, in 8vo, by *Melchior Gopnerus*; and together with *Hermas* at *Rome* in 1564, in Folio; and in the *Bibliothecæ Patrum*.

GREGORY *of* Bætica.

GREGORY, Bishop of *Elvira*, a City of the Province of *Bætica* in *Spain*, wrote divers Treatises in a low Stile, and an elegant Book concerning the Faith; which were extant in the latter End of St. *Jerom*'s time. We have in the Fragments of St. *Hilary*, a Letter of *Eusebius* of *Vercellæ* to this Bishop, where he commends him for the Constancy wherewith he defended the Faith of the Church, and resisted *Hosius*. *Marcellus* and *Faustinus* the *Luciferians*, tell us, in their Letter to *Valentinian* the Emperour, That *Hosius* being ready to condemn him, was miraculously thrown upon the Ground, and lost the use of his Speech. But there is no probability that this Relation should be true, as we have already shown, when we Discours'd of *Hosius*. St. *Jerom*, in his Chronicle, joyns this Bishop, with *Lucifer Calaritanus*, and observes, that they would never have any Correspondence with those that were suspected of Arianism. This joyn'd with the Honourable mention that *Marcellinus* and *Faustinus* make of this Bishop, may induce us to believe, that he was of the Judgment and Party of *Lucifer*. He flourish'd from the Year 357, till the latter End of that Century. The Ancients speak of him as a simple, plain, sincere Man, but a zealous Defender of the Faith. His Stile was no ways Sublime, if we believe St. *Jerom*. There have been printed under his Name at *Rome*, in the Year 1575, and in the Two first Editions of the *Bibliothecæ Patrum*, seven little Treatises against the *Arians*, which are thought to be the same with the Book concerning the Faith cited by St. *Jerom*: But it has since been discover'd, that they were written by *Faustinus* a *Luciferian* Deacon, to whom the Abbot *Trithemius* attributes them. They are address'd to the Empress *Galla Placidia*, Sister to the Emperour *Honorius*, which discovers that they rather belong to *Faustinus* than *Gregory* of *Bætica*, who was dead when *Placidia* had the Title of Empress. Gregory of Bætica.

PHÆBADIUS.

PHÆBADIUS (a), Bishop of *Agen*, having seen the Second Creed of *Sirmium*, compos'd in the Year 357, by *Hosius* and *Potamius*, wrote immediately a Treatise against this Creed. He assisted afterwards at the Council of *Ariminum*, held in 359, wherein he defended untill the End of the Council, the *Nicene* Creed, and refus'd to Sign that which was there propos'd. Neither Fear nor Threatnings could change his Resolution; but the Governor *Taurus*, seeing that his Constancy was Phæbadius.

(a) *Phæbadius.*] *Sulpitius Severus*, calls him *Fegadius*; in St. *Jerom*, and the Greek Translator of his Book, he is call'd *Sæbadius*, which is a Fault in the Latin, and ought to be read *Phæbadius*, as it is in the Manuscripts. There is also by mistake in St. *Ambrose* *Fygadius*.

nor

Phœbadius. not to be overcome by theſe means, us'd Entreaties, and beſeech'd him with Tears to take more moderate Courſes, that ſo he might releaſe a great Number of Biſhops, who had been ſhut up for the ſpace of ſeven Months in one City, where they were diſtreſs'd by the Rigour of the Winter, and the want of all things. He remonſtrated to him, That if all the Biſhops did not ſign the Creed that was brought from the Eaſt, there would be no hopes, that they ſhould ever have permiſſion to return from thence: In ſhort, That he muſt fix his Reſolution, and that he ought to follow the Example and Authority of many that had already ſign'd. *Phœbadius* anſwered, That he was ready to go into Baniſhment, and ſuffer all ſorts of Puniſhment, rather than do that which was deſir'd of him, and that he would never receive a Creed made by the *Arians*. Some days paſs'd in theſe Debates; but at laſt, ſeeing that there was no hopes left of obtaining Peace, he departed from his Reſolution, after that *Urſacius* and *Valens* had declar'd, That the Profeſſion of Faith, which they propos'd, was Catholick, and that thoſe, to whom it appear'd not ſufficient, might add to it what they thought fit. This Propoſition was favourably receiv'd by all the Weſtern Biſhops: *Phœbadius* and *Servatio Tungrenſis*, drew up Declarations, wherein they condemn'd *Arius* and his impious Doctrine, acknowledging that the Son of God was without Beginning, and that he was not a Creature. But *Urſacius* and *Valens*, added maliciouſly, that he was not a Creature as others are; and ſo deceiv'd the Biſhops who ſign'd, with thoſe Declarations, the Creed compos'd at *Nice* by the Biſhops of the Eaſt. *Phœbadius*, being upon his return to his own Country, was one of thoſe Biſhops who were moſt troubled for their Fault, and who aton'd for it, by Declarations and Proteſtations againſt what they had done by Surpriſe: He aſſiſted at the Council of *Valentia* in 374. We have a Letter of St. *Ambroſe*, addreſs'd to him and *Delphinius*, Biſhop of *Bordeaux*. St. *Jerom* aſſures us in his Book of *Illuſtrious Men*, That *Phœbadius* liv'd in his time, and that he was then extremely old: He adds, That he alſo wrote ſome other Books, beſides that which we have already mention'd. The Memory of this Saint, is particularly honoured at *Agen*, where he is commonly call'd St. *Fiari*.

We have ſtill extant in the *Bibliothecæ Patrum*, a Treatiſe of this Biſhop, againſt the Second Creed of *Sirmium*, which was firſt publiſh'd by *Pithœus*, in a Collection of Ancient *French* Eccleſiaſtical Authors, printed by *Niveille*, in the Year 1589. This Treatiſe is a refutation of the Second Creed of *Sirmium*, compos'd by *Potamius*, Biſhop of *Lisbon*, and Sign'd by *Hoſius* Biſhop of *Corduba*. In the *Exordium*, he ſays, That if the greater part of Chriſtians had not been circumvented by the Artifices of the Devil, who makes them take Hereſy for Faith, and condemn the Faith for Hereſy; he had not undertaken to ſay any thing of this Writing, which was ſent a little while ago into *France*: That he could be content to continue Firm in his own Faith, without medling with the Examination of other Men's: "But ſince, ſays he, we are reduc'd to this Condition, that we muſt neceſſa-
" rily embrace Hereſy, that we may be call'd Catholicks, or ceaſe to be Catholicks by not rejecting
" Hereſy, we find our ſelves oblig'd to diſcover the Poyſon of Hereſy hid under the appearance of
" Religion, and to lay open that Error, which is wrapt up in ſuch Terms, as appear at firſt ſight
" to be Innocent, that ſo Falſhood being diſcover'd, the oppreſs'd Truth may at laſt take breath.
" We muſt deſtroy the Opinions of Strangers, that ours may be believ'd, and ſo in refuting Error, I
" ſhall prove at the ſame time, the Truth of my Creed, and demonſtrate my ſelf to be a Catholick to
" thoſe that are not over-aw'd by Fear, nor brib'd by Ambition." After this, he Examines the Second Creed of *Sirmium*, diſcovers the Malignity of it, and refutes by Teſtimonies of Scripture, the Errors that it contains about the Trinity. He ſpeaks alſo occaſionally of the Myſtery of the Incarnation, whileſt he refutes a Letter of *Potamius*; who had affirm'd, That by the Incarnation of the Word, God was render'd paſſible, and that the Son of God, and the Fleſh of Man, were become as it were, a Third Perſon, who was neither God nor Man. He diſputes againſt this Opinion, ſhowing by Scripture, That the Two Subſtances, or the Two Natures, continued without mixture in the Perſon of Jeſus Chriſt; That the Word did ſtill preſerve the Properties of the Divine Nature, and the Humanity of the Humane Nature. He is very angry afterwards, that they ſuppreſs'd the word *Subſtance*, which was order'd by the Creed, that he examines. The Biſhops, ſays he, make an Edict, whereby they decree, *That no Perſon ſhall ſpeak of One Subſtance*. "Alas, What have you done,
" O ye Holy Biſhops, Aſſembled at *Nice* from all parts of the World? You have to no purpoſe
" Compos'd with admirable Circumſpection, a Creed which ſhould be the Infallible Rule of Truth?
" To what End was your Labour deſign'd? What is the Fruit of your Care? 'Tis now forbidden
" to teach in the Church, the only Thing which you commanded to be taught there for the Con-
" founding of Error. That is now condemn'd, which you approv'd; and that is now approv'd, which
" you condemn'd; Falſhood is maintain'd, and the Truth is oppos'd. But in vain do they ſtrive to
" do it, for Truth ſhall never be deſtroy'd, it ſhall remain eternally without Change, and ſhall puniſh
" thoſe that ſet themſelves againſt it. *Let no Man, ſay they, make uſe of the Word* Subſtance. Ha,
" What Evil, what Crime is it, to make uſe of this Word? Wherein does it wound the Faith? Is it
" the Sound? Is it the Sence?" Afterwards he makes it appear, That this Word is us'd in Scripture; That the Sence of it is moſt Catholick; and, That 'tis moſt proper to expound the Faith of the Church in ſuch a manner, as it may not be capable of any further Explication. At the End of this Treatiſe, he refutes thoſe that ſay, The Word of God ſuffer'd Pain. At laſt, he concludes with ſaying, *That there is but One only God in Three Perſons*. "This is what we believe, this is what we defend, what
" the Prophets have taught us, what the Goſpel preaches to us, what the Apoſtles left us by Tradition,
" what the Martyrs confeſs'd in their Suffering. This is the Faith which is engraven on the Hearts
" and Minds of the Faithful; and when an Angel ſhall deſcend from Heaven and teach the contrary,
" he ſhall be accurſed." He adds afterwards, as a kind of an Appendix, when he ſpeaks of *Hoſius*, Biſhop of *Corduba*; "I know very well, ſays he, that the Name of *Hoſius*, that ancient Biſhop, may
" be

" be objected to me, whose Faith was always so Firm, and I doubt, not but they will make use of
" his Authority, as a Buckler to cover the Opinion that is contrary to ours. But I answer in a word *Phabadius.*
" to those who will make use of these Arms, that his Authority cannot be alledg'd as an unanswerable
" Argument, because either he is at present in an Error, or else he always was so. The World knows
" what he believ'd till this present time, with what Assurance he approv'd the *Sardican* and *Nicene*
" Doctrine which I defend, and with what Rigor he condemned the *Arians*. But if he be at present
" of another Opinion, if he maintains now what he always condemned heretofore, if he condemns
" now what he always maintained; How can his Authority be objected to me? If he was in an Er-
" ror for 82 Years together, How comes it to pass, that I must believe, that at this Age he found out
" the Truth? But suppose I could believe it, What Judgment can be given of those who died in the
" Faith of the same Doctrine which he maintained before he altered his Opinion? What Judgment
" would he have given of himself, if he had died before that Council wherein he changed? And so
" the prejudice drawn from the Authority of *Hosius*, is of no Consideration, because it opposes it self:
" Besides that, we read in the Scripture, that the Righteousness of a Judge, shall not save him, when
" he shall depart from it.

I was very willing to set down this Passage entire, because it may be of great use to weak Persons, who suffer themselves to be drawn into Errors, by the Authority of those whom they highly esteem and Value. It serves also to discover, that the greatest Men are subject to great Infirmities, and that therefore we must not follow their Example blindly, especially, when Religion is the Matter in question; and that the only Infallible Rule to which we should adhere, is the Authority of the Church, to which we ought to pay a blind Obedience, and without reserve.

To Conclude, This Tract is written very politely, the Stile is clear and clean, the Subject is handled very plainly; and there are sometimes Sallies of Wit, which discover that the Author wrote with much Vigour and Easiness.

St. OPTATUS.

ST. *OPTATUS* (*a*), Bishop of *Milevi* (*b*), a City of *Numidia*, wrote under the Reign of *Valens* and *Valentinian*, about the Year 370, his Books of the Schism of the *Donatists*, against *Parmenianus*, a Bishop of that Sect. There is nothing in particular, known of the Life of this Author. He died, according to the Testimony of St. *Jerom*, under the Reign of *Valentinian* (*c*). St *Austin* and St. *Fulgentius*, cite him with great Commendation, and he has been numbred among the Saints, because of the Service he did the Church, by this excellent Book which he compos'd in its Defence. It was divided into Six Books, since St. *Jerom*'s time: There is a Seventh now extant, but 'tis very probable, that it is Suppositious. First of all, Because *Optatus* himself in his First Book, divides his Treatise into Six Books, without mentioning a Seventh. Secondly, because St. *Jerom* says, That *Optatus* wrote but Six Books against the Schism of the *Donatists*. Thirdly, Because the Stile of the last Book (*d*), comes not near the Elegance and Sublimeness that is in the others. And Lastly, Because it contains Opinions contrary to those that are in the other Books (*e*). This Book therefore was written by some *African*, who lived soon after St. *Optatus* (for it cannot be doubted but that the Book is ancient) who thought he ought to make this Addition, which was afterwards attributed to this Father. St *Optatus*.

St. *Optatus* begins his First Book with words very full of Charity. He complains, That the Peace which Jesus Christ left to his Church, is disturb'd by the Schism and by the Actions of the *Donatists*: Yet he gives them the Name and Title of Brethren. " Though they renounce us, says he, though all
" the World knows that they hate us, that they detest us; though they would not have us call them
" our Brethren, yet we will follow the Command of the Prophet *Isaiah*, in saying unto them, Ye are
" nevertheless our Brethren, though ye be Evil: We have the same Spiritual Birth, but our Actions
" are different". Afterwards, he gives an Account of his Undertaking to write to *Parmenianus*,

(a) St. *Optatus*.] The Name of *Optatus* is very common among the *Africans*. St. Austin speaks of many other Persons of this Name, who are easily distinguish'd from this Bishop.

(b) *Milevi*.] Some Authors have thought that he was Bishop of *Malta*; but this is a gross mistake: *Milevi* is a City of *Numidia* in *Africk*, often mention'd in the *African* Councils.

(c) *He died under the Reign of* Valentinian.] In B II. he places in his Catalogue of Popes, Pope *Siricius*, who was not Bishop of *Rome* till after the Death of *Valentinian*; which would cause a doubt of what St. *Jerom* says, if it were not easy for a Transcriber to add the Name of *Siricius*, when he Copied out this Book after the Death of *Optatus*.

(d) *The Stile of the last Book*] The Stile of it is flat, mean and weak, whereas the Stile of *Optatus* is sublime, masculine, and enrich'd with many Figures; there are also many Terms, which appear not to be *Optatus*'s: The Author of this Book treats of what *Optatus* had already handled in B. I. and III. and the beginning of the IV. which Repetition does also show, that it is none of his.

(e) *Opinions contrary to those that are in the other Books*.] This Author extenuates the enormity of their Crime, who deliver'd up the Holy Books to be burnt; he denies that it was a Capital Crime, and endeavours to prove that it was light and pardonable. On the contrary, St. *Optatus* declares, B I. That it was a great Sin, equal to that of Schism, and that those who committed it, should, purchase some Years of this Life, with the loss of Eternal Life, which supposes, that this Crime was Mortal, and deserv'd Damnation; but the Author of the Seventh Book, teaches the contrary.

whom

St. *Optatus.* whom he calls his Brother: He ſays, That he was the only *Donatiſt* with whom he could have a Conference in Writing, and he ſhews the Uſefulneſs of it: He obſerves, That this Biſhop in writing againſt the Catholick Church had written for it: ſo that it had not been neceſſary to have anſwer'd his Treatiſe, if he had not affirm'd many things whereof he was not well-inform'd, as when he charges the Catholicks with deſiring Souldiers that they might Perſecute the *Donatiſts*. *He owns, That this is the only place in all the Books of* Parmenianus *which is againſt the Church*; and that all others are either for the Catholicks only, as when he proves that there is but one Church only; or for the Catholicks and the *Donatiſts*, as when he ſhows that Hereticks have not the Sacraments of the Church; Or laſtly, againſt the *Donatiſts* only, as when he ſpeaks of the Enormity of their Crime, who deliver'd up the Holy Books and made a Schiſm. He adds, That the Compariſon which *Parmenianus* has made of Baptiſm with Circumciſion, and the Flood, is honourable to the Church, which maintains, that there is but one only Baptiſm, as there was but one Circumciſion and one Flood.

Optatus having made this general Remark upon the Book of *Parmenianus*, gives an account of the Method he has obſerv'd in his Work; and then lays down a Scheme of his Refutation, and propoſes the Subject of his Books. "I ſhall begin, ſays he, Firſt of all, with giving an Hiſtory of the Tra- "ditors and Schiſmaticks, with an Account of their Abode, their Perſons, and their Names; that ſo it "may be known who thoſe are that are guilty of the Crimes that *Parmenianus* has Condemn'd. "Secondly, I muſt ſhow what is the Church, and where it is, becauſe there is but one only, and there "cannot poſſibly be two Churches. Thirdly, I am to prove, That we did not deſire the Souldiers, "and that we are not guilty of the Crimes which are ſaid to be done by thoſe, who would have pro- "cur'd a Re-union. Fourthly, 'Twill be neceſſary to ſhew who is the Sinner, whoſe Sacrifice God re- "fuſes, and whoſe Unction we muſt flee from. In the 5th. Book, I ſhall treat of Baptiſm. In the "6th. I ſhall lay open your Errors and Deſigns". This is the Argument of thoſe Six Books of *Optatus*. In the Firſt Book before we come to the Hiſtory of the *Donatiſts*, which is the Subject of it, we muſt obſerve a Miſtake of *Parmenianus*, who ſays, *That the ſinful Fleſh being drown'd in the Waters of* Jordan, *was purified from all its ſtains*. He reproves this Paſſage of *Parmenianus*, becauſe from hence it would follow, either that the Fleſh of all Men was purified by the Baptiſm of Jeſus Chriſt; or that the Fleſh of Jeſus Chriſt was ſinful. But becauſe he foreſaw very well, that *Parmenianus* might explain his meaning, by ſaying, That nothing elſe was intended by thoſe words, but that the Fleſh of Men was purified in the Fleſh of Jeſus Chriſt, therefore he ſhows that this Expreſſion is improper: for we never ſay, That a Chriſtian was baptiz'd in the Fleſh of Jeſus Chriſt; but in the Name of Jeſus Chriſt. He adds, That the Fleſh of Jeſus Chriſt could not be baptiz'd for the Remiſſion of Sins, ſince he had not committed any. At laſt, That he might not Pardon *Parmenian* in any thing, he blames him even for the term *Drown'd*, which he uſes, and tells us, That he could only ſay of *Pharaoh*, that he continued at the bottom of the Waters, and not of Jeſus Chriſt, who deſcended into *Jordan* that he might come out of it, and who Sanctified the Waters of this River by his deſcent. He ſays, That he cannot paſs over the Imprudence of *Parmenianus*, who having given a Deſcription of the Flood and Circumciſion, and ſpoken in the Praiſe of Baptiſm, ſhould go about (if I may ſay ſo) to raiſe from the Dead the ancient Hereticks, who were buried together with their Hereſies in Oblivion, and whoſe Names and Hereſies were unknown long ago in *Africa*, ſuch as *Praxeas*, *Sabellius*, *Valentinus* and others, who had been confuted in their time, by *Victorinus* of *Paſſaw*, by *Zepyrinus* of *Rome*, by *Tertullian* of *Carthage*, and other Defenders of the Catholick Church.

"Wherefore, ſays he, do ye make ſuch a War with the Dead, as does not concern the Affairs of our "Time: Is it becauſe ye have no Proof that the Catholicks are Schiſmaticks, therefore ye would ſwell "your Book with a Catalogue of the Names and Errors of the ancient Hereticks? Why do ye ſpeak "of thoſe who had no Sacraments which are common to us? Thoſe that are in Health have no need "of Remedies. Vertue and Innocence ſeek no help nor ſupport but in themſelves. Truth wants no "far-fetch'd Proofs. None but the Sick ſeek after Remedies; only the Weak and Sluggiſh truſt to "External Succors, and 'tis a Sign of a Lye when Men take much pains to find out a Juſtification: *Parmenianus* had not mention'd theſe Hereticks, but to tell us, That they had not the Signs of a true Church; That their Churches were Strumpets who had no right to the Sacraments, and could not be the Spouſes of Jeſus Chriſt. *Optatus* was ſo far from refuting this Propoſition, that he approv'd it, but he wondred that *Parmenianus* had joyn'd the Schiſmaticks with them, ſince he himſelf was one of this Number.

"I ſee very well, ſays he to *Parmenianus*, That you know not who were the Authors of the Schiſm "at *Carthage*. Look back to the Riſe of this Affair, and you will ſee that you have condemn'd your "ſelves, by joyning the Schiſmaticks to the Hereticks: for *Cæcilian* did not ſeparate from *Majorinus* "your Predeceſſor, but *Majorinus* ſeparated from *Cæcilian*. 'Twas not *Cæcilian* that deſerted the "Chair of St. *Peter* or St. *Cyprian*, but *Majorinus*, in whoſe Chair you ſit, a Chair that is of no older "Original than *Majorinus* himſelf". This being ſo, he wonders that *Parmenian* ſhould joyn the Schiſmatick with the Heretick, and ſhould ſay of the former as well as the latter after this manner: *How can a Man that is defil'd, cleanſe another by a falſe Baptiſm? How can an impure Man Purifie? How can one that makes others fall, lift up thoſe that are faln down? How can one that is guilty, grant Pardon? or one that is Condemn'd, abſolve?* *Optatus* confeſſes, That all this may be truly ſaid of Hereticks who have corrupted the Creed, and have no ſhare in the Sacraments of the Church; but he denies that this can be ſaid of thoſe that are only Schiſmaticks; who, as he thinks, may lawfully Adminiſter the Sacraments. To prove this, he ſhows the difference between Hereticks and Schiſmaticks. "Two things, ſays he, are neceſſary to render the Church Catholick; The Confeſſion of the true "Faith, and the Unity of Hearts. Schiſm which breaks the Bond of Peace is begotten by Diſcord,

"nouriſh'd

" nouriſh'd by Envy, and confirm'd by Diſputes; thus impious Children forſake the Catholick Church
" their Mother, withdraw and ſeparate themſelves, as you have done, being cut off from the Church St. *Optatus.*
" and become Rebels and Enemies: But they innovate nothing in Doctrine, ſtill retaining what
" they had learn'd from their Mother. The Hereticks on the contrary are Enemies to the Truth, De-
" ſerters of the true Creed, though they are begotten in the boſom of the Church, and being corrupted
" by their Impious Errors, they call themſelves Authors of their Sect". *Optatus* concludes from theſe Definitions, That Hereticks can have no Baptiſm nor valid Sacraments, but that there is not the ſame Reaſon for Schiſmaticks, becauſe they have preſerv'd the true Sacraments of the Church, though they are ſeparated from its Body. After this Digreſſion, he returns to his Subject, and undertakes to prove Hiſtorically, that the Authors of the *Donatiſts* are guilty of delivering up the Holy Books and making a Schiſm. " Tis now, ſays he, 60 Years and more ſince *Africk* was harraſs'd with a violent
" Perſecution, at which time you might have ſeen many Martyrs and Confeſſors; but there were alſo
" ſome Chriſtians who yielded in this Day of Tryal, and others who hid themſelves: To ſay nothing of
" the Laity, Miniſters, Deacons or Prieſts, there were even Biſhops, thoſe that were the Heads and Chief
" of the Clergy, who deliver'd up the Books of the Divine Law, with an aſtoniſhing Impiety; and to
" preſerve for ſome Years this Mortal Life, expos'd themſelves to the loſs of Eternal Life. *Donatus*
" of *Maſcula*, *Victor* of *Ruſiccadia*, *Marinus* of *Aquæ Tibilitanæ*, *Donatus* of *Calama*, and *Purpu-*
" *rius* the Homicide of *Limata*, were of the Number of thoſe Biſhops, together with *Menalius*, who
" fearing to be accus'd of Sacrificing, would not be preſent at the Aſſembly of his Brethren. Theſe
" Biſhops and ſome others, whom we ſhall ſhow to have been your Authors, aſſembled together af-
" ter the Perſecution, on the 12th. of *May*, in the City of *Cirtha*, in the Houſe of *Urbanus Cariſius*
" becauſe the Churches were not yet rebuilt. *Secundus* of *Tigiſis* having ask'd them, they confeſs'd to
" him that they had deliver'd up the Holy Books; and when *Purpurius* objected the ſame thing to
" *Secundus*, they all began to murmur; ſo that *Secundus* being afraid of himſelf, follow'd the Advice
" of his Nephew *Secundus*, who conſeil'd him to leave this Cauſe to the Judgment of God. The
" other Biſhops, *Victor Garbienſis*, *Felix* of *Rotarium*, and *Nabor* of *Centurio*, were of the ſame
" opinion, and therefore, *Secundus* declar'd that all the Biſhops ſhould Sit in the Council. Sometime
" after the ſame Biſhops, Traditors and Murderers, ordain'd *Majorinus* Biſhop of *Carthage*, in whoſe
" Chair *Parmenianus* now Sits. *Optatus* having thus ſhown that the Ring-leaders of the *Donatiſts*
" were Traditors, Convicts them alſo of being the Authors of a Schiſm. In treating of this Separa-
" tion, 'tis certain, ſays he, that there was but one Church in *Africk*, as there is in all other Parts of
" the World, before it was divided by the Biſhops who ordain'd *Majorinus*. It is only to be enquir'd,
" who thoſe were that remain'd united to the Body of the Church with all the World; and who
" they were that departed from it, who it was that ſate in a Chair wherein he had no Predeceſſor, who
" thoſe were that ſet up Altar againſt Altar, who he was that Ordain'd a Biſhop in the room of ano-
" ther Biſhop, yet alive. All the World knows that this was done at *Carthage* after the Ordination
" of *Cæcilian*, and that it was done at the Inſtigation of *Lucilla*, a great Lady: This Woman had
" been reprov'd by the Arch-Deacon *Cæcilian*, even before the Perſecution begun, becauſe before re-
" ceiving the Spiritual Food and Drink, ſhe had kiſs'd the Bones of a Dead Man, who was not pub-
" lickly acknowledg'd for a Martyr, preferring thus the Carcaſs of a Dead Man before the Cup of Sal-
" vation. She retir'd in great Anger, and very much enrag'd at this Reprimand. The Perſecution
" came on, which hinder'd the Biſhop from reducing her within the Bounds of her Duty. In the
" mean time, a certain Deacon, nam'd *Felix*, being cited to appear before the Tyrant, and accus'd
" of writing a Defamatory Libel againſt him, hid himſelf in the Houſe of *Menſurius* the Biſhop:
" who being interrogated about this Fact, deny'd it publickly, and upon his Denial there came an
" Order from Court, importing, That if *Menſurius* did not bring forth the Deacon *Felix*, he ſhould
" be ſent to Court. When he had received this Order, he was very much concerned: He had then in
" the Church a great Number of Ornaments of Gold and Silver, which he durſt neither hide under
" Ground, nor carry away with him; he truſted them with the moſt ancient Men of his Church,
" believing them Faithful, and made an Inventory of them, which he is ſaid to have deliver'd to an
" old Woman, with this Charge, That if he did not return again, ſhe ſhould deliver it to him that
" ſhould be choſen Biſhop in his Room. When he came to Court, he defended himſelf, and being
" permitted to return to *Carthage*, he died by the Way. Liberty being reſtor'd to the Church of
" *Africk* by an Edict of *Maxentius*, *Botrus* and *Celeſius* who were ambitious to be Ordain'd Biſhops
" of *Carthage*, call'd together the Neighbouring Biſhops about this City, without Summoning thoſe
" of *Numidia* to come to them: Yet *Cæcilian* was choſen by the unanimous Suffrages of the People,
" and Ordain'd by *Felix* of *Aptungis*, and ſo *Botrus* and *Celeſius* fail'd of their hopes. The Inventory
" of the Gold and Silver belonging to the Church, was deliver'd to *Cæcilian*; who ſends for the Old
" Men that were entruſted with this Charge: who had already made it their own Property. When
" they ſaw themſelves oblig'd to reſtore it, they alienated the People from the Communion of *Cæci-*
" *lian*. Thoſe who had intrigued for the See, did the ſame thing; and in ſhort, *Lucilla*, an impe-
" rious and powerful Woman, who could not bear a reproof, would not hold Communion with him,
" and hindred thoſe that belong'd to her from doing it. So the Schiſm was begun by the Paſſion of a
" furious Woman, nouriſh'd by the Ambition of *Botrus* and *Celeſius*, and confirm'd by the Avarice of
" the Old Men. Theſe three ſorts of Perſons invented Accuſations againſt *Cæcilian*, and endeavour'd
" to get his Ordination condemn'd. They fetcht *Secundus* Biſhop of *Tigiſis* to *Carthage*: thither they
" came with the Biſhops Traditors whom we have mention'd, and were receiv'd by the Covetous,
" Ambitious and Furious, that we nam'd before, but not at all by the Catholicks, who had choſen
" *Cæcilian*. Not one of them durſt enter into the Church where he was with all the People. *Cæcilian*

St. *Optatus*. " took care to acquaint them, That if his Accuſers had any thing to ſay or prove againſt him, they " had nothing to do but appear. His Enemies could find nothing to blame in his Conduct. But " they accus'd him that Ordain'd *Cæcilian*, of being a Traditor, making this Infamy rebound upon " him. *Cæcilian* alſo told them, That if *Felix* had no Power to conferr Orders, as they pretended, " they might Ordain him anew, as if he had been but a Deacon ſtill: *Purpurius* then anſwer'd with " his ordinary Malice: Very well, let him come; Let us make as if we would lay hands upon him " to Ordain him Biſhop, and inſtead of doing that, let us put him under Penance. This Deſign being " diſcover'd, the Catholicks detain'd *Cæcilian*, and hindred him from expoſing himſelf to the fury of " his Enemies. They muſt then either force him away as a Criminal, or Communicate with him as " an Innocent Man: The whole Church was full of People, the Epiſcopal Chair was filled, the Altar " was in its place, *that Altar* on which the Pacifick Biſhops had offer'd, as St. *Cyprian*, *Lucianus* and " others. Nevertheleſs, they ſet up an Altar againſt this Altar, and made an Ordination againſt all " the Laws. *Majorinus* a Domeſtick of *Lucilla*, who had been Reader when *Cæcilian* was Deacon, " was Ordain'd by the Biſhops of *Numidia*, who had themſelves confeſs'd their Crimes, and Pardon'd " themſelves. 'Tis plain then that *Majorinus* withdrew from the Church, and that thoſe were the " Ring-leaders of the *Donatiſts* who ſeparated themſelves, and deliver'd up the Holy Books". After *Optatus* has thus prov'd that the *Donatiſts* were the Authors of the Schiſm which divided *Africk*, he ſhows by the Example of *Corah*, *Dathan*, and *Abiram*, that there is no Crime greater, or which deſerves a more ſevere Puniſhment than Schiſm: But not contenting himſelf with convicting the *Donatiſts*, he undertakes alſo to juſtifie *Cæcilian*; and proves that he was Innocent by the Judgment of the Council of *Rome*, which Condemn'd *Donatus*, and declar'd *Cæcilian* Innocent. He obſerves that the Ring-leaders of the *Donatiſts* had themſelves deſir'd Judges of *Conſtantine*, and that the Emperour had anſwer'd them in great Paſſion, *Do ye deſire Judges of me, of me who am waiting for the Judgment of Heaven?* He ſhows, That nevertheleſs, he gave them for Judges, *Maternus* Biſhop of *Cologne* *Rheticius* Biſhop of *Autun*, and *Marinus* Biſhop of *Arles*; which Judges came to *Rome*, and there held a Council with *Miltiades*, and Fifteen Italian Biſhops: That *Donatus* was there condemn'd upon the Confeſſion that he made of having re-baptiz'd and re-ordain'd the Biſhops which yielded in the time of Perſecution; That the Witneſſes which he had produc'd againſt *Cæcilian* having declar'd they had nothing to ſay againſt him, he was ſent back acquitted by the Sentence of all the Biſhops, and of *Miltiades* who concluded this Judgment: That the *Donatiſts* having appeal'd to the Emperour, he cry'd out aloud, *O ſtrange Fury! They appeal from us, as if we had given a Pagan Sentence.* That the Emperour detain'd *Cæcilian* at *Breſſia* by the Sollicitation of *Filuminus* a Partiſan of *Donatus*. That there were ſent into *Africk* two Biſhops, *Eunomius* and *Olympus*, to declare where the Catholick Church was; That being come to *Carthage*, they were hindred from doing it by the Seditious Party of *Donatus*; That theſe two Biſhops made Oath in favour of *Cæcilian*; That *Donatus* came firſt to *Carthage* and *Cæcilian* follow'd him, after he had been declar'd Innocent by many Judgments. There remain'd now nothing more for *Optatus* to do, but to Vindicate *Felix* of *Aptungis*, who Ordain'd *Cæcilian*, from the Calumny of being a Traditor, which he proves by the Information that *Elianus* the Pro-conſul had given about this Matter, who after a moſt ſtrict Enquiry into it, had declar'd him Innocent of this Crime.

The Second Book of *Optatus* is concerning the Church. There he ſuppoſes as an unconteſted Principle, That there is but one only Church, which Jeſus Chriſt calls his Spouſe and his Dove. This Principle being ſuppos'd, he proves that the Party of the *Donatiſts* were not the Catholick Church; becauſe from thence it would follow, that the Church had periſh'd in all other parts of the World, and was encloſed in a little Corner of *Africk*; which was contrary to the Signification of the Catholick Church, that ſignifies a Society ſpread over all the Earth. He adds for Confirmation of this Truth, That thoſe who ſhut up the Church within ſuch narrow bounds defeated the Promiſe of Jeſus Chriſt; that they ſtraitned the Extent of God's Mercy, and gave the Lye to the Holy Spirit who has ſpoken by the Prophets. After he has made uſe of this general Reaſon againſt the *Donatiſts*, he proves that the Signs of the True Church do not in the leaſt agree to them. The firſt of thoſe Signs is the Chair, that is, the Succeſſion of Biſhops. He ſays to *Parmenianus*, That he cannot be ignorant of this Sign of the True Church; " For you cannot deny, ſays he, but St. *Peter*, the Chief of the Apoſtles, eſta- " bliſh'd an Epiſcopal Chair at *Rome*; This Chair was one, that all others might preſerve Unity by " the Union they had with it; So that whoſoever ſet up a Chair againſt it, was a Schiſmatick and an " Offender. 'Twas then in this one Chair, which is the firſt Sign of the Church, that St. *Peter* firſt " ſate; to St. *Peter* ſucceeded St. *Linus*, and after him others till *Damaſus*, who is now our Collegue: " by whoſe means, all the Churches of the World are United with us in the ſame Communion, keeping " Correſpondence by Circular Letters. As to your Party, which would willingly be thought to be the " Church, enquire after the Original of your Chair. You tell us, That you are a Part of the Roman " Church, but this is a branch of your Error, which proceeds from the Root of Falſhood, and not " from the Stock of Truth. If *Macrobius* be ask'd in what Chair he Sits, can he ſay, That it is in the " Chair of St. *Peter*, which perhaps he never ſaw; for certainly he never went to the Sepulchre of the " Apoſtles. He is diſobedient to the Command of the Apoſtle, who would have us Communicate to " the Memory of the Saints; and the Relicks of the two Apoſtles, St. *Peter* and St. *Paul* are in the " Church of *Rome*. Tell me, I pray you, if ever he could enter there, if ever he could offer in the Place " where theſe Relicks are certainly kept. *Macrobius*, your Brother, muſt then confeſs, That he ſate " in the Place where *Eucolpius* held the See; and if we could ask *Eucolpius*, he muſt ſay, That he " ſucceeded to *Boniface* of *Balli*, and *Boniface* to one *Victor Garbienſis*, whom ye ſent from *Africk*. " This *Victor* is a Son without a Father, a Diſciple without a Maſter, a Succeſſor without a Predeceſſor,

" a Paſtor

" a Pastor without a Flock, a Bishop without a People. For we cannot call them a Flock or a People
" who were so few, that they had not one of the Forty Churches at *Rome* to keep their Assemblies in, St. *Optatus.*
" and who were oblig'd to shut themselves up in a Cave without the City, to keep their Conventicle there". *Optatus* does not enlarge so much on the other Signs of the Church that are very obscure, but he insists particularly upon its Extent. " Wherefore, says he, would you Unchurch an infinite Number of " Christians that are in the East and the West; You are but a small Number of Rebels who have op- " pos'd all the Churches of the World, with which ye have no Communion: You are also convicted of " Falshood, by the Sacrifices which ye offer; for I believe that you do not omit the Solemn Prayer " that is made at these Sacrifices; I doubt not but you will say, That you offer Sacrifice for that " Church which is one, and scatter'd over all the Earth. Now this Prayer convicts you of a Lye, for " how can you offer Sacrifice for one only Church, since you have divided it into two? How can you " offer for the whole Church, since you are not within the Catholick Church?

Parmenianus objected to the Catholicks, That they had exercis'd Violence and Persecution against them, and concluded from thence that they could not be the true Church, because that ought never to be cruel, nor to feed it self with the Flesh and Blood of the Saints. *Optatus* answers him, That the Church had never Persecuted them, and that he could Name none of the Church that had done it. He retorts this Charge upon the *Donatists*, by observing that in the time of the Emperour *Constantine* the Church enjoy'd a profound Peace, and all its Members liv'd in wonderful Union; That then Pagans were forbidden to exercise their Sacrilegious Ceremonies, then the Devil groan'd in their Temples where he was shut up, and then the *Donatists* were banish'd into Foreign Countries, lest they should disturb the Peace of the Church: But no sooner was *Julian* declar'd Emperour, but they begg'd his leave to return into their own Country, which he granted them very willingly, knowing that they were most fit to trouble the Peace of the Church. He observes, That the same Edict by which he open'd the Pagan Temples, he also restor'd Liberty to them; That they had not so soon obtain'd it; but that they exercis'd horrible Violences in *Africk*. He accuses the *Donatists* of tearing the Members of the Church, of driving away the Bishops, of invading the Churches, of committing Murders, of killing two Deacons at the feet of the Altars, of rending Mens Garments, of dragging the Women, stealing the Children; and in fine, of violating every thing that was most Sacred. *Your Bishops*, says he, *cause the Eucharist to be thrown to the Dogs, and presently the Tokens of God's Anger appear; for the Dogs being enrag'd, turn'd upon their Masters, and tore them as if they had been Thieves whom they never knew, the Justice of God making use of their Teeth to revenge this Sacrilege. They also caus'd a Bottle full of holy Oil to be thrown out at a Window, on purpose to break it: But though it was cast down from a very high place, yet being supported by Angels, it fell upon the Stones without breaking.* He accuses also a Bishop of their Party nam'd *Felix*, of abusing a Virgin to whom himself had given the Veil, and of having afterwards depriv'd an ancient Catholick Bishop, 62 Years old, of his Bishoprick, and put him under Penance. Here he makes a Digression about the Vanity of the *Donatists*, who boasted themselves to be Holy and Innocent. *Whence comes this Sanctity of yours*, says he, *which the Apostle St.* John *durst not attribute to himself, seeing he says, If we say that we have no Sin, we deceive our selves, and the truth is not in us? He that speaks after this manner, does prudently referr himself to the Mercy of God; for a Christian may desire Good, and endeavour to walk in the way of Salvation, but he cannot be perfect of himself: For though he does run, yet there will always remain something to be done by God to perfect him; and 'tis necessary that he should help a Man in his Weakness, for he is Perfection, and there was never any but Jesus Christ the Son of God who was perfect? all other Men are imperfect. It belongs to us to will and to run, but God only can give Perfection. Jesus Christ has not given us perfect Holiness, but has only promis'd it.* *Optatus* afterwards returns to his Subject, and goes on to charge the *Donatists* with the Crimes and Sacrileges which they had committed, and accuses them of exorcising and washing the Walls of Churches, of breaking down the Altars, of throwing the Eucharist to Dogs, of making the People Swear by their Name, of shaving the Bishops, and putting them under Penance, of sparing neither Priests, Deacons, nor the Faithful, of reproaching the Innocent, and putting Christians against their will under Penance; and in fine, of doing an infinite number of things against Piety and Christian Charity.

In the Third Book, *Optatus* vindicates the Church from those Violences of which it was accus'd. In the first place, he says, That if some of those Violences were committed by *Macarius*'s Order, the Predecessors of the *Donatists*, gave occasion to them, because their Seditious Behaviour, oblig'd the Governour to call for Aid, which they no sooner saw come to him, but they presently fled of themselves; and that none but those that were most obstinate had been Banished. But then he maintains, That the Church did not contribute to this Persecution in the least; and that there was nothing of all this done by Her Advice; that she neither wish'd for it, nor knew of it, nor contributed any thing towards it; but the Justice of God alone, had sent this Persecution upon the *Donatists*, to revenge the Dishonour they had done to the Waters of Baptism. Here *Optatus* makes a very obscure Digression concerning Baptism and the Church. And afterwards returning to his Subject, he says, That *Paul* and *Macarius*, were not sent by *Constantine*, to Persecute the *Donatists*, but to carry Alms; That *Donatus* being transported with Rage, demanded of them with unsupportable Pride, what the Emperour had in common with the Church: " That from that time he carried on a Design " of doing Injury to the Kings and Princes of the Earth, contrary to the Precept of St. *Paul*, who com- " mands us to pray for them, that we may lead a quiet Life; *For*, says *Optatus*, *the State is not in the " Church, but the Church in the State*; that is, in the *Roman* Empire. Thus St. *Paul* had reason to " say, That we must pray for Kings, even when they made Profession of Paganism: But how much " more reason have we to show respect to a Christian Prince, one that is Religious and Fears God,

St *Optatus.* " and has ſent Alms to the Poor. Wherefore then was *Donatus* tranſported with Fury? Where-
" fore did he refuſe the Alms which the Emperour ſent? His Officers ſaid, That they were come to
" diſtribute Alms in all the Provinces, to thoſe that would receive them; and *Donatus* told them,
" That he had written to all places, forbidding them to receive them. Does this look as if he took
" Care of thoſe that are in Miſery, or would relieve the Neceſſities of the Poor? God hath ſaid, *'Tis I*
" *that make Rich and Poor.* Can he not then give Riches to the Poor? Yes, but if he had given them
" to all the World, then ſinners had wanted the means of expiating their Faults; for 'tis written,
" *That as Water quenches Fire, ſo does an Alms expiate Sin.* This being ſo, What Judgment ſhould
" we give of him that would give to the Poor, and him that would hinder the giving? What would
" *Donatus* anſwer, if God ſhould ask him, O Biſhop, What do you think of *Conſtantine?* Do you
" take him for an Innocent Man, or a Sinner? If you believe him to be an Innocent Man, Why do
" ye not then receive the Preſents of an Innocent Man? And if you believe him to be a Sinner, Why
" do ye not then permit him to give Alms, ſince 'tis for the Sinner that I have made the Poor?
Optatus adds, That *Donatus* had join'd with his Pride, a pitileſs Diſpoſition: That he would be conſider'd as the Prince and Sovereign of *Carthage*; That he exalted himſelf above the Emperour, *tho' there is nothing above the Emperour, but God only who makes Kings*; That he deſpis'd his Brethren, and would not receive their Oblations; That he made thoſe of his Party Swear by his Name, as if he had been God, and that he would have them carry his Name, inſtead of that of Jeſus Chriſt. In the following Part of this Diſcourſe, he proves, That the *Donatiſts* had not only brought upon themſelves Perſecution, by their Pride, and the Contempt they had teſtified of the Emperour; but alſo that 'twas they who had begun the War. That 'twas *Donatus* of *Bagaïs*, who had firſt gather'd together a Multitude of Seditious Perſons, whom he call'd *Agnoſticks* or *Circumcellians*, to hinder *Paul* and *Macarius* from diſtributing their Alms. *Optatus*, deſcribes the horrible Outrages of theſe deſperate Fellows, and ſhews, That the Souldiers who came only to put a ſtop to theſe Diſorders, being attack'd by theſe Madmen, were oblig'd to defend themſelves, and to beat them: That the Church nevertheleſs had no Hand in this, and that the Seditious could attribute it to none but themſelves. He proceeds further, and ſhews, That they did juſtly ſuffer thoſe Miſchiefs, becauſe they broke the Unity of the Church; That the Perſecution which they endured, was an Evil that was neceſſary for procuring the Good of Peace and Union; That this Proceeding againſt them, was Authoriz'd by the Examples of *Moſes*, who put to Death 3000 Men, for Worſhipping the Golden Calf; Of *Phinehas*, who kill'd Two Perſons for violating the Law of God in committing Adultery; and of *Elias*, who put to Death 450 Falſe Prophets. The *Donatiſts* anſwer'd to theſe Inſtances, That we muſt put a great Difference between the Spirit of the Old Teſtament, and that of the New; That Jeſus Chriſt had forbidden in the Goſpel, the uſe of the Sword, when St. *Peter* drew it to cut off *Malchus*'s Ear. *Optatus* maintains to the contrary, That this Prohibition reſpected only the Time and Circumſtances of that Action of St. *Peter*; That Jeſus Chriſt was come to ſuffer, and not to defend himſelf; That if St. *Peter* had compaſs'd what he deſign'd, Mankind had not been deliver'd by the Death of the Meſſias: But as diſtruſting the Truth of this firſt Anſwer, which indeed is not very Solid, becauſe the Advice of Jeſus Chriſt, is general; he trys another Anſwer, and maintains, That *Macarius* did not uſe the Sword as St. *Peter* did, and that he was not the Author of any Perſecution like that of the Pagan Emperours; That he would only oblige Chriſtians to go all into the Church and Pray unto one and the ſame God in the Spirit of Peace and Unity; That thoſe who ſuffer'd on this occaſion were not Martyrs, ſince they had not Charity, without which, none can be crown'd; That this cannot paſs for a Perſecution againſt the Church, but for a juſt puniſhment of ſome Perſons that were refractary to the Church. He objects to the *Donatiſts*, their obliging ſome Catholicks to call themſelves ſtill Pagans, that they might re-baptize them. He obſerves, That they had ſpread about a Report when *Paul* and *Macarius* came into *Africk*; That thoſe two Officers were to ſet up an Image of the Emperour upon the Altar at the time of Offering Sacrifice, but there was nothing done like it; That even thoſe of their own Party who were preſent at the Sacrifices, had acknowledg'd that 'twas a Calumny, and that they ſaw nothing but the ordinary Ceremonies of the Church: In ſhort, That there was nothing chang'd, nothing diminiſh'd, or added to the Sacrifice. He returns again to *Macarius*, and propoſes to himſelf this Objection: If the Catholicks had not approv'd the Action of *Macarius*, they ſhould have excommunicated him, which they did not do, and therefore are guilty of his Crime. He anſwers, That *Macarius* being no Biſhop, they did not Communicate with him, as one Biſhop does with other Biſhops, and by conſequence the Clergy could not be profan'd by his Communion, becauſe a Lay-man has no right to Preach or to Teach, whereas a Biſhop ſpeaks to the People with Authority, beginning his Diſcourſe, and ending it always with the Name of God. The *Donatiſts*, add, That *Macarius* ought not ſo much as to Communicate with Lay-men. *Optatus*, anſwers, That being a Miniſter of the Will of God, and diſcharging the Office of a Judge, who has Secular Authority in his Hand, the Church ought not to Excommunicate him; That moreover what he had done, might be defended by the Examples of *Moſes* and *Phinehas*; but in ſhort, That tho' we ſhould confeſs that *Macarius* was Guilty, yet the Church could not Excommunicate him who was never accus'd; That there was no Accuſer found, neither had he confeſs'd his Crime, and therefore the Eccleſiaſtical Judges could not condemn him, ſince it was forbidden to one and the ſame Perſon to be both Accuſer and Judge at the ſame time.

In the Fourth Book, he refutes the *Donatiſts* for ſaying that the Catholicks were ſuch Sinners, that we ſhould ſhun their Sacrifices, as it is ſaid in *Iſaiah*, ch. 66. and that we ſhould not receive their Unction, as it is in *Pſal.* 140. *Optatus*, after he has given this Caution in his Introduction, that Men ought not mutually to condemn one another, but to wait for the Judgment of God; and after having

having exhorted them to receive the Title of Brethren, which the Catholicks are willing to beſtow upon them, he proves that thoſe Accuſations which they draw up againſt the Church, are rather applicable to themſelves, than to the Catholicks. For proof of this, he ſets down all the Characters of a wicked Man, which are given in *Pſal.* 49. *God hath ſaid unto the wicked, Why do they preach my Precepts? Why do they open their Mouth to ſpeak of my Law? Ye that hate Diſcipline, and have caſt my Words behind you? You ſit and ſpeak againſt your Brother. If you ſee a Thief, you run along with him, and have made your ſelf the Companion of Adulterers.* He ſhews, That the *Donatiſts* cannot excuſe themſelves from theſe Crimes; that *they hate Diſcipline*, ſince they ſhun Peace, ſince they re-baptize, and rob the Biſhops of their Prieſthood: That they *Preach in their Pulpits againſt their Brethren*; becauſe under pretence of preaching the Goſpel they ſpeak injurious Words againſt Catholicks, and inſpire thoſe with hatred againſt them who hear their Sermons; That they endeavour to perſwade them that according to the Apoſtolical Injunction, they ſhould ſhun them, they ſhould not Salute them, nor wiſh them good Morrow, tho' all this is to be underſtood only of Hereticks, whoſe Diſcourſe creeps like a Serpent; *that they joyn themſelves with Thieves*, ſince they correſpond with the Devil to extirpate one part of the Flock of Jeſus Chriſt. He deſcribes this after a very pleaſant manner. "All "Men, ſays he, that come into the World, tho' they be born of Chriſtian Parents, are fill'd with an "unclean Spirit, which muſt be driven away by Baptiſm: This is done by the Exorciſm which "drives away this Spirit, and makes it fly into remote places. After this, the Heart of Man becomes "a moſt pure Habitation. God enters and dwells there, according to that of the Apoſtle, *We are "the Temple of God.* When therefore ye re-baptize Men, and exorciſe them anew, and when ye "ſay, *O accurs'd come forth of this Man*, 'tis to God that ye ſpeak after this manner, you drive "him diſgracefully out of this Man, and the Devil re-enters into his Heart. This place of *Optatus* is very expreſs for proving Original Sin, and the Antiquity of Exorciſms. At laſt, *Optatus* ſhows. That the *Donatiſts* render themſelves Companions of Adulterers, becauſe they ſeparate from the Church, which is the only lawful Spouſe of Jeſus Chriſt, to unite themſelves with Adulterers. He comes afterwards to the ſecond Paſſage taken out of *Pſal.* 140. *Let not the Oyl of the wicked anoint my Head*; and he obſerves, That this ſhould only be applied to Jeſus Chriſt, and that it is a Prayer, and not a Precept; a Wiſh, and not a Command. Then he explains alſo two other Paſſages which *Parmenianus* had quoted againſt the Catholicks, and ſhews, that the Firſt is to be underſtood of Adulterers or Hereticks; and the Second, of Jews, and that neither the one nor the other is applicable to Catholicks.

St *Optatus*.

In the Fifth Book, *Optatus* proves, That the *Donatiſts* commit a great Crime, in reiterating Baptiſm, which Jeſus Chriſt has commanded to be given but once only. He approves of the Commendations which *Parmenianus* has given this Sacrament, by ſaying, *That it is the Life of Vertue, the Death of Crimes, the Immortal Birth, the means of obtaining the Kingdom of Heaven, the Port of Innocence, and the Shipwrack of Sins.* But he adds, That 'tis not he who gives this Sacrament of Baptiſm, that conferrs theſe Graces, but the Faith of him that receives it and the Virtue of the Trinity; and conſequently, that Baptiſm is not to be reiterated, which is adminiſtred in the Name of the Trinity. He has alſo here a moſt Remarkable Reflection about the Rule which we ſhould Conſult in all Eccleſiaſtical Controverſies. "We ask, ſays he, if it be lawful to repeat Baptiſm "given in the Name of the Trinity? Ye maintain, That it is lawful; we ſay, That it is forbidden. "The People are in ſuſpence, between your affirming and our denying the ſame thing, and they "can neither believe you nor us, for we are all fallible Men: Let us then ſearch after Judges in this "Caſe. But where are they to be found? If they be Chriſtians, they are either of your Party or "ours, and by conſequence cannot be Judges of our Difference. We muſt then enquire after a Judge "out of Chriſtendom. But then if he be a Pagan, he underſtands not our Myſteries; if he be a "Jew, he is an Enemy to the Baptiſm of Chriſtians. There cannot therefore be found any Judge "upon Earth, but we muſt ſeek for one in Heaven. But why ſhould we have recourſe to Heaven, "ſince we have the Teſtament of our Father upon Earth? Let us ſearch after his Will in the Goſpel, "which will inform us, that he who has been once waſh'd, needs not to be waſh'd again. Where-"fore, adds he, we do not re-baptize thoſe who have been baptiz'd, when they return again to us. He proves alſo, That it ought not to be done, becauſe there is but one Faith, one Jeſus Chriſt, and one Sacrament of Baptiſm: That there are three Things to be conſider'd in this Sacrament, the Trinity, the Faith of him that receives it, and the Perſon that adminiſters it: That the Trinity is the firſt Thing of abſolute neceſſity, without which there can be no Sacrament at all; That the Faith of him that receives the Sacrament, is the ſecond Thing, which is no leſs neceſſary, becauſe it ought always to be the ſame; but then there is not the ſame Neceſſity that the Miniſter ſhould be Faithful and Juſt, becauſe the Miniſters are chang'd every day, and it is Jeſus Chriſt who baptizes, and the Miniſter ought not to attribute to himſelf the Effect of the Sacrament which is owing to God only; and in ſhort, becauſe the Sacraments are Holy, and do Sanctify by themſelves, tho' the Holineſs of the Miniſter do not contribute to it. *Optatus* proves this Truth by many Reaſons, and many Teſtimonies. He obſerves by the bye, That thoſe who had been baptiz'd by *John*, before Jeſus Chriſt inſtituted Baptiſm, were not re-baptiz'd; but thoſe who were baptiz'd, after Jeſus Chriſt had inſtituted Baptiſm, have been re-baptiz'd. At laſt, he endeavours to prove, That the Faith of him that receives Baptiſm, is neceſſary to the validity of this Sacrament, which muſt be underſtood of Adult Perſons only.

The Sixth Book is written againſt the Impieties and Sacrileges of the *Donatiſts*, who had broken, cut in pieces, raz'd, and overturn'd the Altars of the Catholicks; Thoſe Altars, ſays *Optatus*, which have born the Offerings of the People, and the Members of Jeſus Chriſt, upon which the Almighty God

St *Optatus.* God has been invok'd, upon which the Holy Spirit has deſcended, where the Faithful have receiv'd the earneſt of eternal Salvation, the Support of their Faith, and the Hopes of a bleſſed Reſurrection; thoſe Altars upon which we are forbidden to offer any other Offerings, but thoſe of Peace. For what is the Altar, but the place where the Body and Blood of Jeſus Chriſt are laid? "What hath Jeſus Chriſt "done to you, ſays he further to the *Donatiſts*, that you ſhould deſtroy the Altars on which he reſts "at certain times? Why do ye break the Sacred Tables where Jeſus Chriſt makes his abode? Ye have "imitated the Crime of the Jews, for as they put Jeſus Chriſt to Death upon the Croſs, ſo ye have "beaten him upon theſe Altars. If ye believ'd that the Euchariſt of the Catholicks is Sacrilegious, yet "at leaſt ye ſhould have ſome reſpect to the former Offerings that your ſelves have made upon theſe "Altars. Upon this occaſion, *Optatus* puts a very pleaſant Objection to them: All the Faithful "know, ſays he, that Linen Clothes are laid upon the Altars, for the Celebration of the Holy My-"ſteries. The Euchariſt does not touch the Wood of the Altar, but only the Linen Clothes: Why "then do ye break? Why do ye ſcrape? Why do ye burn the Wood of the Altar? If the Impurity "can paſs through the Linen, Why cannot it penetrate the Wood, nay, and the Ground alſo? If there-"fore ye ſcrape off ſomething from the Altars becauſe they are impure, I adviſe you alſo to dig into "the Ground, and there to make a great Ditch, that ye may offer in a moſt pure Place: But take "heed that ye do not dig down to Hell, where ye will find your Maſters, *Corah*, *Dathan* and *Abiram*." So pleaſantly does *Optatus* ridicule the folly of the *Donatiſts*. But from this Raillery, he quickly paſſes to moſt bloody Accuſations. "Ye have alſo redoubled your Sacrileges in breaking the Chalices, "which carried the Bloody of Jeſus Chriſt; ye have melted them down to make Ingots of Gold or "Silver, which you have Sold in the Markets to every one indifferently, that offer'd to buy them: "Sacrilegious Perſons as you are, you have not ſhown the leaſt reſpect to thoſe Chalices, wherein "you your ſelves have offer'd. Perhaps, infamous Women bought them for their own uſe. Perhaps, "the Pagans took them to make Veſſels wherewith they might offer Incenſe to their Idols. O enor-"mous Crime! O unheard-of Impiety!" This Declamation of *Optatus*, clearly ſhews, what is the Reverence that we ought to pay to the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, and evidently proves, that it was not conſider'd merely as Bread and Wine, but that it was believ'd to be the Body and Blood of Jeſus Chriſt. The *Donatiſts* anſwer'd to theſe Accuſations, That thoſe Veſſels having been touch'd by polluted Perſons, were thereby become unclean, as 'tis ſaid by the Prophet *Haggai*, *That which is touch'd by an impure Man, becomes unclean:* From whence they concluded, that they had reaſon to make no further uſe of them, but to conſider them as common and ordinary Veſſels. [As if a belief that the Euchariſt was inſtituted for a Remembrance of the Death of Chriſt, and of the Benefits which we receive thereby, had not been ſufficient to have commanded Reverence to thoſe Inſtruments with which it was perform'd.] *Optatus* anſwers them, by ſhewing, That the Catholicks were not defil'd with any Crime; That they had not Sacrific'd to Idols; That no ſuch Accuſation could be prov'd againſt them; That the only thing that could render them odious to the *Donatiſts*, was their Love of Peace, and their endeavours after Union; That they are united by Communion with all the Churches of the World, and that they cannot be accus'd of being defil'd; but ſuppoſing that even the Catholicks were unclean, yet the Veſſels which they touch'd at the Invocation of the Name of God, would not be ſo, becauſe that Sacred Name, Sanctifies even that which is unclean: That the touch of an unclean Perſon, has leſs Power to render a Veſſel impure, than the Invocation of God has to purify it, ſince 'tis the Invocation, and not the Touch that Sanctifies it.

The Second Accuſation that *Optatus* makes againſt the *Donatiſts*, is their putting under Penance the Virgins Conſecrated to God, and making them leave off the Signs of their former Profeſſion, and forcing them to deſire a New one, and doing violence unto them. In this place, he ſpeaks of a little Mitre of Cloth, which they put upon their Heads, and of the Veil wherewith they cover'd them, and ſays, That thoſe Ornaments were Signs that they had profeſs'd Virginity, and that the *Donatiſts*, by taking them away from thoſe Virgins to put them under Penance, had given occaſion to many Perſons to Raviſh and Marry them. He adds, that the *Donatiſts* had carried away by force the Ornaments of Churches, and the Holy Books, and that they had waſh'd the Veſtments, the Walls and the Floors of the Churches with Salt-Water. He laughs at their folly, and asks them, Why they waſh'd the Veſtments, and did not alſo waſh the Books of the Goſpel? Why they waſh'd the Walls, which are only look'd upon? And why they did not alſo waſh the Pavement of the Streets, and how they would make uſe of that Water wherewith the Catholicks had waſh'd themſelves? At laſt, he accuſes them of invading the Cœmeteries, and hindring the Interment of the Catholicks. "Wherefore do you abuſe the Dead, ſays he to them, that you may terrify the Living? Why do "you deny them Burial? If you have any Differences with your Brother while he is alive, yet "Death ſhould put an End to them all. Why do you inſult over him after Death? Why do you "refuſe him Burial? Why do you quarrel even with the Dead? But, ſays he, if you could hinder "his Body from being Interr'd among other Chriſtians, yet you cannot ſeparate his Soul from the Com-"pany of thoſe Holy Souls that are with Jeſus Chriſt." At laſt, *Optatus* ſays, That the *Donatiſts* were ſo extravagantly wicked, that they corrupted all thoſe that came over to their Party: "So thoſe "that were Patient, ſays he, by going over to you, become Furious of the ſudden; thoſe that were "Faithful, become Perfidious; thoſe that were Peaceable, become Quarrelſome; their Simplicity, is "chang'd into Cheating; their Modeſty, into Impudence; their Humility, into Pride. Thoſe who "are gone over to your Party, ſollicite others to come after them, and accuſe of Sloth and Stupi-"dity, all thoſe that are yet in the Boſom of the Church, they lay Traps for them, and make them "to fall into the ſame precipice with themſelves.

The

The laſt Book which is commonly attributed to *Optatus*, is a Recapitulation of ſome Points that have been handled in other places; particularly, he refutes the Objection of the *Donatiſts*, who ſay, That they cannot re-unite themſelves to the Catholicks, becauſe they are the Sons and Succeſſors of Traditors. The Author of this Book, extenuates as much as he can the Enormity of this Crime, and ſhows, that tho' it were much greater, and that thoſe to whom the Catholick Biſhops ſucceed were guilty of it, yet they have no ſhare in that Guilt, neither can it be imputed to them, nor alledg'd againſt them as a juſt Cauſe of Separation. He ſhews, that we ought ſometimes to ſuffer ſinners in the Church, and to diſſemble the Sins of our Brethren for the good of Peace. He obſerves, That there is no Man free from Sin; and that if any one were ſo, yet he ought not to ſeparate from his Brethren, though they were Sinners: That the Apoſtles did not ſeparate from the Communion of St. *Peter* after his Sin; but on the contrary the Keys were given him, that he being a Sinner, might open the Gates of Heaven to the Innocent, and teach thoſe that are Innocent, that they ſhould not ſhut them againſt Sinners. Beſides theſe, there are many other Repetitions of what had been ſaid by *Optatus* concerning *Macarius*, and the Perſecution that he rais'd againſt the *Donatiſts*. St. *Optatus.*

Optatus at the End of his Books, had plac'd many authentick Inſtruments to juſtifie the Matters of Fact which he had propos'd againſt the *Donatiſts*; we have none of thoſe which *Optatus* plac'd there extant, but many other Monuments concerning the Hiſtory of the *Donatiſts* have been added to his Books.

The Firſt is a part of the Acts of the Conference between the Catholick Biſhops and the *Donatiſts*, held at *Carthage* by the Order of the Emperour *Honorius*, in the Year 411, which belongs to another Century.

The Second, is part of the Verbal Proceſs made by *Zenophilus*, who had been Conſul, on the 30th of *December* in the Year 320, by which it appears, That *Silvanus* who ordain'd *Majorinus*, had given up the Holy Books to the Heathens: *Zenophilus* there examines a Grammarian nam'd *Victor*, a Deacon nam'd *Caſtus*, and a Sub-Deacon call'd *Creſcentianus*, and makes them confeſs, That *Silvanus* had deliver'd up the Ornaments of the Church and the Holy Books, according to the Depoſition of *Nundinarius* the Deacon, who was preſent. He cauſes alſo the Verbal Proceſs made in the Year 363. to be read by *Munatius Felix*, Judge of the Colony of *Cirtha*, who further confirm'd the Depoſition of *Nundinarius*. The Letters written to *Silvanus* by the Biſhops of his own Party are ſet down, wherein they reprehend him for his outrageous manner of treating his Deacon *Nundinarius*. He is accus'd alſo of making a Simonaical Ordination, of appropriating to his one uſe the Alms that were given for the Poor, and of being ordain'd himſelf by the Sollicitation of ſome Country Fellows. There are many things very remarkable in this Act: For there one may ſee, That at the Beginning of the 3d. Age of the Church, they us'd Chalices of Silver and Gold, Cups, Lamps and Candleſticks of Silver and Copper; That they kept in the Church Garments for the Poor; That the Readers, who were very numerous, had the Holy Books; That the Chriſtians had a Library near the Church, where they put their Books.

The Third Record, is alſo part of a Verbal Proceſs concerning the Juſtification of *Felix* of *Aptungis*, made by *Ælianus* the Proconſul in the Year 314, in the Month of *February*, as appears by St. *Auguſtin*: There he examines one nam'd *Ingentius*, and Convicts him of making an Addition to a Letter of *Cæcilian*, that he might falſly accuſe *Felix* of being a Traditor.

The Fourth, is a Letter of the Emperour *Conſtantine* to *Ablabius*; wherein he orders him to ſend *Cæcilian* to *Arles*, with ſome Biſhops of his Party, as well as ſome of his Accuſers, that he might receive Judgment from the Council which was to aſſemble there.

The Fifth, is a Letter from the Council of *Arles*, of which we have ſpoken in its place.

The Sixth, is the Letter which *Conſtantine* wrote againſt the *Donatiſts*, when they appeal'd to his Judgment, after they had been condemn'd in the Council of *Arles*.

The Seventh, is another Letter of the ſame Emperour, wherein he acquaints the Biſhops of *Donatus*'s Party, That he once deſign'd to ſend Judges into *Africk*, to determine their Differences with *Cæcilian*; but that he judg'd it more proper to make him come before himſelf.

The Eighth, is a 4th. Letter of the ſame Emperour, written to *Celſus*; wherein he acquaints him, That he will quickly come into *Africk* to decide the Differences between *Donatus* and *Cæcilian* himſelf.

The Ninth, is a 5th. Letter of *Conſtantine*, where in he gives the *Donatiſt* Biſhops leave to return into *Africk*.

The Tenth, is a 6th. Letter of this Emperour about the Cauſe of the *Donatiſts*, addreſs'd to the Catholicks of *Africk*. He tells them, That he had done all that lay in his Power to re-eſtabliſh Peace, but ſince the Obſtinacy of ſome Men had fruſtrated his good Intentions, they muſt now wait upon God only for the Remedy of this Miſchief, and that till it pleas'd the Divine Mercy to remedy it, they muſt proceed with Moderation, and bear with Patience the Inſolence of the Enemies of the Church: That they muſt not render Evil for Evil, ſince Vengeance is reſerv'd to God only, and that by ſuffering patiently the Fury of theſe Inſolent Men, they ſhould certainly merit the Glory of Martyrdom. For, ſays he, Is not this to Fight and Conquer for God, to bear with Patience the Outrages and Injuries of the Enemies of God's People? At laſt he aſſures the Catholicks, That if they obſerve this Method, they will quickly ſee their Enemies Party weakned, and that God will give Grace to many to acknowledge their Error and do Penance.

The following Letter is a further Indication of the Meekneſs of this Emperour, and the Moderation of the Catholicks. The *Donatiſts* had invaded the Church which *Conſtantine* had caus'd to be built in *Conſtantina* a City of *Numidia*; which the Catholicks demanded back again, but they refus'd it.

The

St *Optatus*. The Catholicks to avoid all further Contention, pray'd the Emperour to give them a Place in the Dependances of his Demeſnes thereabouts, where they might Build another Church: To which *Conſtantine* anſwer'd, That he did not only grant their Deſire, but he had alſo written to the Receiver of his Revenues to furniſh them with ſo much Money as was neceſſary for the Building of this Church. In this Letter he praiſes the Moderation of the Catholicks, and condemns the Obſtinacy of the *Donatiſts*; and ordains, That the Laws which he had made for Exemption of the Clergy from all Publick Taxes, ſhould be put in Execution.

The laſt of theſe Records, which are added to the Books of *Optatus*, is a Fragment of the Acts of the Paſſion of the Saints *Dativus*, *Saturnius*, *Felix*, *Ampelius*, and of ſome other African Martyrs, made in the time of *Anulinus*, and written by a *Donatiſt*. This Piece contains ſome part of the Calumnies of the *Donatiſts* againſt *Menſurius* and *Cæcilian*. The Author of theſe Acts accuſes them of hindring the Faithful from carrying Food to the Chriſtians that were in Priſon, and of beating them back with blows of Whips and Cudgels: He adds, That theſe Martyrs would never communicate with *Menſurius*, nor *Cæcilian*, becauſe they had deliver'd up the Holy Books to the Heathens, and that the Church of Chriſt being Holy, ought not to hold Communion with thoſe that are defil'd with a Crime of this heinous Nature. At laſt, he ſays, That thoſe Martyrs who wanted Food by the Cruelty of *Menſurius* and *Cæcilian*, died of Famine in Priſon, and went to Heaven there to receive the Crown of Martyrdom.

The Stile of *Optatus*'s Books is noble, vehement and cloſe, but not enough Polite or Neat. He preſſes briskly upon thoſe againſt whom he Diſputes, and deſcribes very ſenſibly the Tranſactions which he relates, and explains the Paſſages which he produces with a great deal of Wit. He gives his Thoughts a fine and delicate turn, his Expreſſions ſignifie very perfectly what he means to ſay; his Reaſonings are ſubtile, and his Relations pleaſant. In a word, It appears that the Author of this little Book, was Maſter of much Learning and Wit. The Doctrine which he teaches is, and always will be of much uſe to the Church: for there is not the ſame Reaſon of thoſe Queſtions which concern the Truth of the Church, as of thoſe that concern only ſome particular Doctrines. Theſe continue only ſo long as the Sect ſubſiſts which oppoſes theſe Doctrines; and the Books which treat of them become almoſt uſeleſs whenever the Hereſie is extinct. But all Hereſies, all Schiſms having one common Principle, of oppoſing the Church, the Books which are written in its Defence, are contrary to all Hereſies, and will be uſeful as long as there ſhall be any Hereticks in the World whoſoever they be. The Books of *Optatus* teach us alſo a great many very remarkable particulars concerning the Hiſtory of the *Donatiſts*: We find in them many Points of Doctrine, and we may obſerve many things which clear up the ancient Diſcipline. He ſays, That all Chriſtians have but one Faith and one Creed. He explains the chief Myſteries in a moſt Orthodox manner. He ſhows, That there neither is, nor can be any more but one Catholick Church ſpread over all the Earth, that it cannot be ſhut up in a ſmall Part of the World: That this Church is made up of Biſhops, Prieſts, Deacons, Miniſters, and thoſe that are meerly the Faithful. He obſerves, That the Biſhops are above the Prieſts, as the Prieſts are above the Deacons: He conſiders the Church of *Rome* as the chief Church in the World, and as the Centre of Unity, becauſe of St. *Peter*, who was the Head of the Apoſtles: He ſays, That Man by Nature is Weak and Imperfect, and therefore has need of the Grace of Jeſus Chriſt to make him Perfect; That we are all Born in Sin, and that Baptiſm is neceſſary to obtain Remiſſion of it; That when the Sacrament is given in the Name of the Trinity, it ought not to be reiterated: and yet he ſeems to think that we ought to re-baptize thoſe who were baptiz'd by Hereticks; but he does not make the ſame determination for thoſe who were baptiz'd by Schiſmaticks. He mentions Exorciſm with Commendation, as a neceſſary Ceremony at Baptiſm; He ſpeaks of Chriſm alſo as a Holy Thing, and of the Unction that was us'd at Baptiſm. He expreſſes himſelf in ſo plain terms about the Real Preſence of the Body and Blood of Chriſt in the Euchariſt, and about the Adoration that's due to this Holy Sacrament, that nothing can be deſir'd more expreſs. He obſerves many Ceremonies at the Celebration of the Euchariſt, to which he gives the Name of a Sacrifice; and it appears by what he ſays of it, That in his time they offer'd Sacrifice for the whole Catholick Church, and then they recited the Lord's-Prayer; That the Celebration of it was upon an Altar of Wood, which was adorn'd and cover'd with a Linen-Cloth for the greater reſpect; That they then uſed Chalices of Gold and Silver, and alſo had Ornaments. He ſays, That the Church has Judges; That ſhe puniſhes Crimes; That ſhe exacts Penances of thoſe that confeſs their Sins, or are convicted of them. He praiſes Virginity, and yet he ſays, That there is no obligation to it upon thoſe that have not made a Vow. He obſerves, That in his time, this Vow was made Solemnly by the Virgins who dedicated themſelves to God; and that they carried a ſmall covering upon their Head, which was the Sign of the Vow they had made. He teſtifies ſufficiently the reſpect that was paid in his time for the Relicks of the Saints, when he ſpeaks of the Sepulchre of St. *Peter* and St. *Paul*, and ſpeaking of *Lucilla*, he blames thoſe that honour'd the Relicks of falſe Martyrs, which were not own'd by the Church.

The only Error that can be obſerv'd in the Books of *Optatus* is, That he maintains that thoſe who had been baptiz'd with *John*'s Baptiſm, before the Inſtitution of Chriſt's Baptiſm, were not re-baptiz'd [See *Acts* xix. 1--5.] We may add to this, what he ſays of reiterating the Baptiſm of Hereticks, and perhaps alſo what he propoſes about the Power of Free will, to which he ſeems to give the Power of willing and beginning a Good Action, and alſo of advancing in the Way of Salvation, without the help of the Grace of Chriſt, but theſe Errors are light and pardonable. One may alſo reprehend in his Book the Allegorical way in which he explains many Paſſages of Holy Scripture, by giving them a ſence very remote from that which they naturally have, and by applying them to thoſe things with which they have no affinity. This Fault which would be tolerable in a Preacher, ſeems not to be pardonable

pardonable in an Author who writes a Treatise of Controversie, wherein all Proofs should be solid and convincing. But *Optatus* had to do with such Enemies as us'd the same way, who perverted Passages of Scripture, to Calumniate the Church, and commend their own Sect. St. *Optatus.*

The Text of *Optatus* is much corrupted in many places. It was printed at *Mentz*, in the Year 1549. with many Faults. Afterwards *Balduinus* a Learned Civilian, publish'd it at *Paris*, in 1563. revised by a Manuscript which was communicated to him by *Espencæus*, and corrected in many places. He prefixes to it a large Preface against *Calvin*, wherein he refutes the Conclusion that this Heretick had drawn from the History of *Optatus*, That Princes were lawful Judges in Matters of Religion, and at the same time he discovers a great many stupid Mistakes and gross Errors that he had propos'd. He thought it not proper to prefix this Preface to the Second Edition of *Optatus*, which he caus'd to be printed at *Paris* in 1569, together with *Victor Uticensis*, after he had revis'd and corrected it by a Manuscript. 'Twas by this Edition that *Commelinus* made his in the Year 1599. The Annotations of this famous Civilian upon *Optatus*, are most learned and curious, and they perfectly clear the History of the *Donatists*; but they are so long, that they may rather pass for a Commentary than for Notes. In 1631. *Albaspinæus* caus'd the Books of *Optatus* to be printed in One Volume in *Folio*, with short Notes, and large Observations, which he added to the Annotations of *Balduinus*, and some Notes of an unknown Author. He added the Records of which we have spoken already, together with the History of the Conference of *Carthage*, publish'd by *Balduinus*, and the excellent Observations which he made in French and Latin about the Discipline of the Church. In the same Year 1631. *Meric Casaubon* printed in a little Volume the Text of *Optatus* at *London*, with most Judicious Critical Notes. At last, *Philippus Priorius* took care to make a new Impression of this Author at *Paris* by the Widow of *Dupuis*. In 1679, they put in this Edition the Prefaces of *Balduinus*, the Notes of *Albaspinæus*, *Casaubon* and *Barthius*, and those of the unknown Author: *Priorius* also added some, which he put before the others, though they do not deserve such an honourable place. After this follow'd the Commentary of *Balduinus*, and the Observations of *Albaspinæus* upon *Optatus*, the Conference of *Carthage*, and the other pieces of which we have spoken. The History of the Conference of *Carthage*, written by *Balduinus*, is the last Discourse in this Volume, which has some affinity with the Books of *Optatus*. After so many Editions and Commentaries, one would think that this Author were become most correct and plain: and yet 'tis not so, for the Text is still very much corrupted; there are many places that still want to be clear'd up and restor'd. The Notes of *Balduinus* do indeed enlighten the History; but he is mistaken in many passages of it, as *Valesius* has plainly prov'd in his learned Dissertation of the Schism of the *Donatists*. The Notes and Observations of *Albaspinæus* explain some points of Discipline, but they are not always just. Those of *Meric Casaubon*, are the best for understanding of the Text; but those of *Barthius* and others, are not very valuable: The learned *Rigaltius*, after he had publish'd *Tertullian*, *Minutius* and St. *Cyprian*, design'd to publish *Optatus*: And it may be presum'd, that as he was a very able Critick, very well vers'd in the *African* Antiquities, and in the Knowledge of Manuscripts, he would have made considerable Corrections, and restor'd the Text of *Optatus* in many places: But he dyed before he had undertaken this Work. I shall be able perhaps to undertake it, and to publish the Text of *Optatus* revis'd by many Manuscripts, more correct than any hitherto published.

ACACIUS *of* Cæsarea.

Acacius of *Cæsarea.*

ACACIUS Sirnam'd *One-Ey'd*, because he look'd a squint, Succeeded in the Year 338. to his Master *Eusebius* Bishop of *Cæsarea* in *Palæstine*. He joyn'd himself to the *Eusebians*, and came to *Sardica* with them: He was one of those against whom the Council of the Western Bishops, that was held in that City, pronounc'd the Sentence of Deposition. Being return'd into the East, he had some Differences with *Cyril* of *Jerusalem*, and in hatred of this Saint, he separated himself from the *Semi-Arians* and joyn'd with the *Anomæans*, whom he defended stoutly at the Councils of *Seleucia* and *Constantinople*; but he quickly repented of taking their part, and having got *Meletius* Ordain'd, and many other Bishops, whose Doctrine was Catholick, he re-united himself to them, and sign'd the Creed of the *Nicene* Council in the Council of the Eastern Bishops that was held at *Antioch*, under the Reign of *Jovian*. He dyed towards the Year 366. He compos'd many Books before he was Bishop, and wrote a Book against *Marcellus* of *Ancyra*, a Fragment whereof is quoted by *Epiphanius* in *Hæres.* 72. Some time after he was Bishop, he wrote the Life of *Eusebius* his Predecessor and Master as *Socrates* testifies, *Ch.* 4. *B.* II. of his History. St. *Jerom* says, That he wrote seventeen Volumes of Commentaries upon Scripture, Seven Volumes about several Questions, and many other Treatises upon different Subjects. This Author had much Wit and Learning, but he several times chang'd his Opinion and Language as he was mov'd by Interest or Passion.

PHOTINUS.

Photinus.

PHOTINUS Biſhop of *Sirmium*, was originally of *Galatia*. When he was Deacon and Diſciple of *Marcellus* of *Ancyra*, he follow'd ſome of his Errors: He did not diſtinguiſh the Perſon of the Word from the Perſon of the Father, and ſaid, That we ought not to give him the Name or Title of the Son of God, before he was born of *Mary* [a]: He had hardly diſcover'd his Error [b], but it was condemn'd by the Biſhops of the Eaſt, in a Council held at *Antioch* in the Year 345, and by the Biſhops of the Weſt in the Council of *Milan* in 346. Theſe laſt aſſembled two Years after at *Sirmium* to depoſe him, but they could not compaſs their Deſign, becauſe of the Oppoſition that was made by the People of that City, and therefore they were contented to draw up a Sentence againſt him, and to write of it to the Biſhops of the Eaſt: But at laſt, the Eaſtern Biſhops being aſſembled at *Sirmium* in the Year 351, when the Emperour *Conſtantius* was Maſter of this City, after the Defeat of *Vetranio*----they depoſed *Photinus*, and procur'd his Baniſhment. He dyed in *Galatia* the place of his Exile, under the Reign of *Valentinian* and *Valens*, towards the Year 376. This Heretick was a great Maſter of Wit and Eloquence, was acute and ſubtle in his Reaſonings, and led an unblameable Life. He wrote many Books, but the chief of them were his Treatiſe againſt the Gentiles, and his Books addreſs'd to the Emperour *Valentinian*. St. *Epiphanius* relates in *Hæreſ.* 71. ſome Extracts of the Conference he held with *Marcellus* of *Ancyra*, in the Council of *Sirmium*; and we have nothing elſe of his. *Vincentius Lirinenſis* aſſures us, That he had much Wit, Learning and Eloquence, and that he ſpoke Greek and Latin equally well, as may be ſeen, ſays he, in his Works, whereof he wrote part in Greek, and part in Latin.

[a] *He did not diſtinguiſh*, &c.] After this manner St. *Athanaſius* in his Second Apology, in his Book of Councils, and St. *Epiphanius* in *Hæreſ.* 51. explain the Error of *Photinus*. He is commonly accus'd of renewing the Errors of *Paulus Samoſatenus* and *Ebion*; but though he ſpeaks like them, yet he was not wholly of their Opinion. For he did not believe with *Ebion* and *Paulus Samoſatenus*, That Jeſus Chriſt was a mere Man; but he ſaid, That the Son of God was born of *Mary*, becauſe he did not believe that he had the Title of the Son of God, before he was born of the Virgin. He comes nearer to the Error of *Sabellius*, becauſe he did not diſtinguiſh the *Word*, before he was born of *Mary*.

[b] *He had hardly diſcover'd his Error.*] Some ſay, that he begun to publiſh it under the Reign of *Conſtantine*, which they ground upon the Authority of *Severus Sulpitius*. But *Socrates*, *B.* II. *Ch.* 18. and St. *Hilary* in his Book of Fragments, teſtifie, That the Error of *Photinus* was not known till a little while before the Council of *Antioch* in the Year 345. All that we have ſaid of the Hiſtory of *Photinus*, is taken out of the Fragments of St. *Hilary*, and what we have obſerv'd about his Writings, is taken out of St. *Jerom* in his Catalogue.

AETIUS *and* EUNOMIUS.

Aëtius and Eunomius.

THeſe two Impious Wretches deſerve not to be plac'd amongſt the Eccleſiaſtical Writers, neither ſhould we ſpeak of them here, but to condemn their Books, and their way of Writing about Religion. *Aëtius* was of *Cœleſyria*, the Son of a Souldier in the Governour's Guard. For ſome time he was a Goldſmith, but leaving that Trade, he applyed himſelf to the Study of Logick, and retir'd to the City of *Tyre*, where he put himſelf under the Diſcipline of *Paulinus* Biſhop of that City, about the Year 330. After the Death of this Biſhop, he was driven away by *Eulalius*, and forc'd to withdraw to *Anazarbus*, where he convers'd with two Diſciples of the Martyr *Lucianus*. From thence he came to *Antioch*, where he knew *Leontius*, who was afterward Biſhop of that City, and drove him away a little while after. And now not knowing where to hide his head, he ſet up for Controverſie, and diſputed publickly with very little ſucceſs againſt two Hereticks. But probably finding that this Art would not maintain him, he try'd a little at Phyſick. This is what *Philoſtorgius*, a great Admirer of *Aëtius*, relates of the Beginning of his Maſter's Life. St. *Gregory Nyſſen* paints him forth in very black Colours. He ſays, That from a Vine-Dreſſer, he became a Blackſmith, that he was Indicted in a Court of Juſtice for taking a Gold Chain from a Woman, and returning her one of the ſame form and thickneſs which was nothing but Copper gilt: That afterwards he put himſelf in the Service of a Quack, and having gain'd ſome Money with him, he ſet up for a Phyſician; and that at laſt he learn'd the Subtilties of *Ariſtotle*'s Logick, and by this means was admitted into the preſence of *Gallus Cæſar*. However it was, this is certain that *Aëtius* learn'd all the Subtilties and Sophiſtical Tricks of the *Ariſtotelian* Logick, but he was ignorant in Scripture and Eccleſiaſtical Antiquity. A Man of this Temper was very proper to advance all ſorts of Impiety, to maintain them with Impudence, and alſo to entangle thoſe that he diſputed againſt. He was Ordain'd Deacon by *Leontius* of *Antioch*, who depos'd him ſoon after. *Eudoxus* try'd in vain to reſtore him, and was hindred from doing it by the hatred which the Chriſtians of *Antioch* bore towards him. He continued nevertheleſs in this City, being in Friendſhip with *Eudoxus*, till he was baniſh'd to *Pepuza*, by the Order of the Emperour *Conſtantius*. He came to the Council of *Conſtantinople*, where he diſputed with the *Semi-Arian* Biſhops, who having detected his Impiety, rendred him odious to the Emperour, and procur'd his Baniſhment from the Palace. So that *Eudoxus*, *Acacius*, and thoſe of his own Party, were oblig'd to condemn him in the Year 360. After this Condemnation he was baniſh'd to *Mopſueſtia*, and from thence removed to *Amblada*, a Caſtle in *Phrygia*. He return'd under the Emperour *Julian*, and *Eudoxus*, who was gone

Aëtius and Eunomius.

gone to the See of *Constantinople*, wrote to *Euzoius* Bishop of the *Arian* Party at *Antioch*, to receive him; and the Sentence of Condemnation pass'd against him. But *Euzoius*, not doing it very readily *Eudoxus* caus'd him to be Ordain'd Bishop, by some Bishops assembled at *Constantinople*; and soon after, *Euzoius* having assembled a Council of Nine Bishops, declar'd the Sentence null which was given against this Heretick at *Constantinople*. But at last, under the Reign of *Jovian*, *Aëtius* being abandon'd by *Eudoxus*, and the other Bishops that had maintain'd him, made a Faction by himself, and Ordain'd many Bishops for his own Party. He was forc'd in the time of the Emperour *Valens*, to retire to the Isle of *Lesbos*; and yet he died at *Constantinople*, in the Year 366.

The Doctrine of *Aëtius*, was the pure Doctrine of *Arius*, without disguise; but he us'd Terms and Comparisons that were very odious to explain it. He affirm'd without hesitation, That the Son of God was unlike to his Father; That he was of another Substance; That he was created of nothing: Wherefore his Disciples were call'd *Anomœans*, *Heterousians*, *Exoucontians*, Terms that denote the three Dogmes, which we just now mention'd. He affirm'd the same things of the Holy Spirit, as of the Word: He imagin'd, That God reveal'd to himself the Mysteries that were unknown to the Apostles: He affirm'd, That he had a clear and distinct Knowledge of God, and comprehended him even as he comprehends himself. He maintain'd also with *Arius*, That the word assum'd the Flesh without a Soul. His Disciples baptiz'd with one Immersion only, and in the Name of the Death of Jesus Christ, they re-baptiz'd those that came over to them, tho' they had been baptiz'd by Catholicks. Some of them are accus'd of having Taught, That the most enormous Crimes would not hinder the Salvation of those that were of their Judgment.

Aëtius, as *Theodoret* observes, made Theology an *Art of Tricks*, or *Sophistry*. He rais'd a great number of Propositions, which contain'd unanswerable difficulties in his Opinion, to destroy the Mystery of the Trinity. We have in the *Hæres.* 76. of *Epiphanius* a Libel which contains 47 Propositions of this Nature; and the same Author attesteth that *Aëtius* compos'd 300 of the very same sort: I shall set down one or two of them, by which ye may sufficiently judge of the rest. *Is it possible for God to make that a Person begotten should not be begotten?—If God is not begotten according to his Essence, How can it be said, that he who is begotten is of his Essence? Can the same Essence be begotten, and not begotten?*

Eunomius, the Disciple of *Aëtius*, was the Son of a Husbandman in a Village of *Cappadocia*: He wrote some time for the publick, after which he was made Master of a School, and at last he put himself under the Discipline of *Aëtius*. He was not so subtile as his Master, but he had a greater command of Words. After he was ordain'd Deacon by *Eudoxus*, he was quickly banish'd to *Myda* a City of *Phrygia*. He return'd to *Constantinople*, at the time of the Council in the Year 359, and some time after, he was Ordain'd Bishop of *Cyzicum* by *Eudoxus* his Protector, who advis'd him to conceal his Doctrine: But he not following this Counsel, was accus'd by his People, and *Eudoxus* was oblig'd to Condemn and Depose him. Afterwards he separated himself wholly from this Bishop, and retir'd to a House which he had at *Chalcedon*, where he hid the Tyrant *Procopius*. His Master *Aëtius* being return'd to *Constantinople*; he liv'd some time with him, and did the last Offices to him: But he was quickly forc'd to retire to *Chalcedon*, and being accus'd before the Emperour, of giving Sanctuary to his Enemy, he was banish'd into *Mauritania*. But *Valens*, Bishop of *Mursa*, obtain'd his Restauration, and he would have obtain'd the Favour of the Emperour, if *Eudoxus* had not hinder'd him from coming into his sight. About the End of the Reign of *Valens*, *Modestus* the Prætorian Prefect, banish'd him into the Isle of *Naxos*, as a Disturber of the Peace of the Church. After the Death of this Emperour, he return'd to *Chalcedon*; but *Theodosius* immediately banish'd him to *Halmyris*, which Castle being taken by the Enemy, he was remov'd to *Cæsarea*, a City of *Cappadocia*. But the Inhabitants of this City not being able to endure him, because he had formerly writ against St. *Basil*, their Bishop, he obtain'd leave to dwell in the place of his Nativity, where he died. He was alive when St. *Jerom* wrote his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers. He wrote many Books against the Church, and Seven Books of Commentaries upon the Epistle to the *Romans*, which are mention'd by *Socrates*, *Ch.* 7. of *B.* IV. of his History. The same Author observes, That he imitated the Sophistical Stryle of his Master, and follow'd his way of Arguing; That he was not Learned in the Holy Scripture, and had no understanding of it; but that he had abundance of Words; and repeated oftentimes the same thing in different Terms, without ever explaining clearly, what he propos'd; That tho' he employ'd many Words to explain the Epistle of St. *Paul* to the *Romans* yet he could never discover the true Sence of that Apostle. He adds, That his other Books were written after the same manner, and that whoever would take the Pains to read them, would find multitudes of Words and very little Matter. St. *Basil*, quotes in his Books against *Eunomius*, some part of the Books of this Heretick, which he afterwards refutes. *Eunomius*, answer'd St. *Basil*'s Book by an Apology, and St. *Gregory Nyssen*, undertook the Defence of his Brother, and the Refutation of this Heretick's Apology. He quotes also some of his Passages, and many of his Arguments. These Fragments of *Eunomius* shew us, that he follow'd the Method of his Master, but that he was more plain and copious.

George of Laodicea.

GEORGE *of* Laodicea.

THIS *GEORGE* was a Priest of the Church of *Alexandria*, in the time of *Arius*. He espoused the Interests of this Heretick, and making a show of being Mediator between *Alexander* and him, he maintain'd his Impiety. We have in *Athanasius*'s Book of Synods, Two Letters of this Man's, one written to *Alexander*, wherein he would perswade him, that we may say, That there had been a time when the Son of God was not; and the other to the Followers of *Arius*, wherein he counsels them to acknowledge, That the Son was of the Father, and of God, since all things are of God. *Alexander* cast him out of the Church, not only because of his Heresie, but also upon some other Account. Being Excommunicated at *Alexandria*, he endeavour'd to procure a Reception among the Clergy of *Antioch*; but *Eustathius* refusing him, he retir'd to *Arethusa*, and was there receiv'd; for *Constantine* calls him the Priest of *Arethusa*. He was afterwards Ordain'd Bishop of *Laodicea*, and assisted the *Eusebians* at the Council of *Tyre* and *Antioch*. The Western Bishops pronounc'd Sentence of Deposition against him in the Council of *Sardica*. Afterwards he declar'd himself an Enemy of the *Eunomians*, and the Head of the Party of the *Semi-Arians*. 'Twas he that wrote a Circular Letter to the Bishops of his own Country, against *Aëtius* and *Eudoxus*, set down by *Sozomen*, Ch. 14. of *B.* IV. of his History, wherein he exhorts them to Assemble themselves, that they may condemn those impious Men, as they had done in the Council of *Ancyra*, in the Year 358; soon after this *George* died. He past in those ancient times for a very able Man in Philosophy. *Theodoret* testifies, That he had written against the *Manichees*, and *Socrates* quotes a Book which he compos'd of the Life of *Eusebius Emisenus*.

Theodoret. Hæret. Fab. l. 1. c. 26. *Socrates*, l. 2. c. 9. and lib. 1. c. 24.

The APOLLINARII.

The *Apollinarii*.

APOLLINARIUS [a], the Father, was a Citizen of *Alexandria*, who forsook his Country, and went to teach Grammar at *Berytus*. From thence he past to *Laodicea*, where he had a Son of his own Name, whom he brought up to Learning. This young Man who had a great deal of Wit, in a short time, made a wonderful Progress in Knowledge, and capacitated himself for teaching Rhetorick publickly at *Laodicea*, while his Father was writing Books of Grammar. Both of them afterwards applying themselves to the Study of the Scriptures, the Father was Ordain'd Priest, and the Son Reader. But having a great Affection for profane Learning, they maintain'd an intimate Correspondence with a Pagan Sophist, call'd *Epiphanius*, which render'd them odious to the Christians. *Socrates* says, That *Theodotus* Bishop of *Laodicea*, cast them out of the Church for this cause; and 'tis certain, that *George* the Successor of *Theodotus* laid hold of this Pretence, to Excommunicate them, because they took part with *Athanasius* against him. Nevertheless, *Apollinarius*, the Son was chosen Bishop of *Laodicea* [b], and was belov'd and esteem'd by St. *Athanasius*, St. *Basil*, and St. *Epiphanius*, and all the great Men of his Age [c], upon the account of his Knowledge and Learning. But afterwards falling into Errors concerning the Mystery of the Incarnation, he was look'd upon as a Heretick, and he gave Name to a Sect which was condemn'd by the Church: He died under the Reign of *Theodosius*, about the Year 380. All the Ancients testifie, That this Author wrote an infinite number of Volumes [d] upon the Holy Scripture, and upon other Subjects. He made Books against the *Arians*, *Eunomius*, *Origen*, and against many Hereticks. He compos'd also many Ho-

Claudius Apollinaris Sen.

[a] *Apollinarius.*] The Greeks always called him, Ἀπολλινάριος: St. *Basil* is the only Person that wrote it with a double λλ. St. *Jerom*, called him, *Apollinarius*. The generality of the Latins for softness sake, give him the Name of *Apollinaris*.

[b] *Bishop of* Laodicea.] St. *Athanasius* in a Letter to the *Antiochians*, St. *Epiphanius*, in *Hæres.* 77. St. *Basil*, in Letter 293. *Ruffinus*, in *B.* II. *Ch.* 20. and St. *Jerom* in his Catalogue, all agree, that he was Bishop of this City. *Theodoret* in *B.* V. of his History says, That *Apollinarius* would have invaded the See of *Antioch*, but by his Disciple *Vitalis*.

[c] *He was belov'd and esteem'd by all the great Men of his Age.*] He was a very good Friend to St. *Athanasius*, who had seen him at his return from his Banishment, as St. *Epiphanius* testifies in *Hæres.* 77. *Leontius* in *B.* III. against *Nestorius*, says, That *Apollinarius* boasted, of receiving Letters from *Athanasius*, *Serapion*, and the great Men of his time. He quotes a Fragment of a Letter of *Apollinarius*, where he glories in having Letters from St. *Athanasius*. His Deputies assisted at the Council of *Alexandria*, and sign'd there as the Deputies of an Orthodox Bishop. It does not appear that St. *Athanasius* did ever break with him. St. *Basil* says in his Letter 82, That he ow'd respect to this Man; That he was so much his fast Friend, that he would take his Faults upon himself. St. *Epiphanius* calls him, a Venerable Old Man, and says, That he was very dear to St. *Athanasius*, and all the Orthodox Bishops. St. *Jerom* in his 64 Letter, says, That he had often seen him at *Antioch*, that he honour'd him, and had learn'd many things from him. I pass over in silence, the Testimonies of *Socrates*, *Sozomen*, *Philostorgius*, *Vincentius Lirinensis*, &c.

[d] *An infinite number of Volumes*] St. *Basil* in Epistle 47, says, That he had fill'd the World with his Books. *Theophilus* in his first Epistle, says, That he wrote against *Origen*, against the *Eunomians* and *Arians*. *Acacius* of *Berœa*, in his Letter to St. *Cyril*, Tom. 3d. of the Works of this Father, *p.* 63. says the same thing; and St. *Jerom*, says, That he made an infinite number of Books. *Vincentius Lirinensis*, says, That 'twere too long to give a Catalogue of his Books.

milies,

milies, and wrote several Letters e. But his chief Work in the Judgment of all Men, was his great Treatise divided into 30 Books, which he wrote in Defence of Religion against *Porphyrie* the Philosopher f. It excell'd in Beauty and Strength, all that had been written before by *Eusebius* and the Ancients against the Pagan Religion. He wrote also in the time of *Julian*, another great Book of the Truth of Religion against the Emperour and the Pagan Philosophers. 'Tis said, That *Julian* having perus'd it, wrote to him that sent it, *I have read it; I have understood it; I have condemn'd it*; and that St. *Basil* or some other Bishop made answer to him; *You may have read it, but surely you never understood it; for if you had understood it, you had never condemn'd it.* Under the Reign of the same Emperour, *Apollinarius* seeing that Christians were forbidden to read to their Children the Greek Poets, Orators and Philosophers, wrote in Heroick Verse the History of the Jews, down to the time of *Saul*, and divided this Work into 24 Books, in Imitation of *Homer*. He took Subjects also from the Old Testament, to make Tragedies, Comedies and Odes, in imitation of *Euripides*, *Sophocles* and *Pindar*. Besides that, he turn'd the Gospels and the Epistles into Dialogues, in imitation of *Plato*'s Books: And thus he supplied to Christians, the want of profane Authors of all sorts. *Socrates*, attributes the Poetical Books to *Apollinarius* the Father, and 'tis probable that they were rather his, since they are more agreeable to his Profession. We have also a Translation of the Psalms in Verse, which bears the Name of *Apollinarius*; and this is the only entire Book we have extant of this Author. 'Tis an exact, faithful, and noble Translation of all the Psalms: Some have also attributed to him the Tragedy, entitled, *Christ Suffering*, which bears the Name of *Gregory Nazianzen*; but it has neither the same Air nor Stile. *Theodoret* relates some Passages of *Apollinarius* in his Dialogues, which prove that this Author acknowledg'd, That Jesus Christ took Flesh in the Womb of the Virgin, and that this Flesh was not changed into the Divinity; but then withal, they show, That he deny'd that the Soul of Jesus Christ had an Understanding or Mind. *Eulogius* in the extract made by *Photius*, Vol. 230 of his *Bibliotheca*, produces a passage of *Apollinarius*, wherein he seems to admit one Nature only in Jesus Christ. *Polemon*, the Disciple of *Apollinarius*, who is mention'd in the same place, and in the Fourth Book of the Fables of Hereticks, written by *Theodoret*, was of the same Opinion, and attributes it to his Master. The Extracts taken out of the Discourses of *Apollinarius* and *Polemon*, produc'd in the Council of *Lateran*, under *Martin* the V. *Sess.* 5. prove also that *Apollinarius* maintain'd, That there was but one Nature in Jesus Christ after the Union. And yet he ackowledges in the Passages recited by *Theodoret*, That the Divine and Humane Nature, remain'd in Jesus Christ without Mixture or Confusion, and that each of them retain'd their own Properties. This probably is that Contradiction which made St. *Basil* say, That the Judgment of *Apollinarius*, about the Incarnation, was very obscure and intricate. The same Father, in Letter 59, and 293, and St. *Gregory Nazianzen*, in his first Letter to *Cledonius*, accuse him of the Error of *Sabellius*, who confounded the three Divine Persons. But *Theodoret* observes, That at the bottom he believ'd the Mystery of the Trinity as we do, tho' he explain'd it in such a manner, as gave occasion to accuse him of Error, because he admits Degrees among the three Persons of the Trinity, and seems not to distinguish the Personal Subsistences. And indeed, St. *Epiphanius* vindicates *Apollinarius* from the *Sabellian* Heresie, and says, That *Vitalis*, his most famous Disciple, who calls himself Bishop of *Antioch*, was so far from holding this Heresie, That the Pretence which he alledg'd for his Separation from *Paulinus*, was because he believ'd him to be of *Sabellius*'s Opinion. In short, *Vincentius Lirinensis*, and *Leontius*, vindicate *Apollinarius* from the Suspicion of *Sabellianism*. There are two Errors more attributed to him, which were common to him with many Ancients. The first, is that famous Opinion of the Reign of Christ, and the Saints upon Earth, for the space of 1000 Years, which St. *Basil*, Epist. 47. and 293; St. *Gregory Nazianzen*, Epist. 2. and St. *Jerom* in his Catalogue, *Ch.* 28. do all charge him with. The second Opinion is, That the Souls of Men are produc'd by Souls, as the Bodies are by Bodies. St. *Jerom* and *Nemesius*, are the only Persons that accuse him of this Error; the first in *Ep.* 28. the second in *Ch.* 2. of his Treatise.

The Opinion of *Apollinarius* about the Incarnation, was condemn'd in the Council of *Alexandria*, where it was declar'd, That Jesus Christ assum'd a Body, a Soul and Spirit, such as we have. *Paulinus* of *Antioch*, did also profess this Doctrine in a Discourse by its self, which is at the End of the Council of *Alexandria*, and in St. *Epiphanius*, *Hæres.* 77. In the Year 373. *Vitalis* the Disciple of *Apollinarius*, who caus'd himself to be ordain'd Bishop of *Antioch*, went to find out Pope *Damasus*, and presented to him a Confession of Faith about the Incarnation, which seem'd to be Catholick, and clearly rejected the Error of *Apollinarius*. St. *Cyril* produces a Fragment of this Confession of Faith, in the Book which he dedicated to Queens. When the Pope saw this Confession, he believ'd that *Vitalis* was a Catholick, and therefore did not refuse him his Communion; but having no full Assurance of his Sincerity, he wrote to *Paulinus*, and sent him Articles about the Trinity and the Incarnation, which he should cause *Vitalis* and all those that would be restor'd, to Sign. When these Articles were brought into the East, *Vitalis*, and those of his Sect would not sign them. Damasus *understanding this, says St.* Gregory Nazianzen, *and being informed that they persisted still in their ancient Error, cast them out of the Church, and tore the Libel and Anathematisms which had been presented to*

The *Apollinarii.*

e *Many Homilies, and wrote several Letters.*] There are many of his Sermons quoted in the Council of *Lateran*, under *Martin* the V. whose Extracts are produc'd in *Tom.* 6. of the Councils. *P.* 314, 315. And *Sozomen*, B. II. *Ch.* 17. relates a Fragment of *Apollinarius*, concerning St. *Athanasius*. He wrote also against *Diodorus* of *Tarsus*, as appears by *Suidas*, B. 3. Ch. 4.

f *His chief Work in the Judgment of all Men, was his Treatise against* Porphyrie *the Philosopher.*] St. *Jerom*, says, That his 30 Books against *Porphyrie*, were the most esteem'd of all his Works. *Vincentius Lirinensis* says, That it was his greatest and most excellent Work.

him

him by Vitalis, *being very much troubled that he had been ſo deceiv'd.* He gave this Judgment in a Council at *Rome*, held in the Year 377, at which, *Peter*, Biſhop of *Alexandria*, aſſiſted. The Biſhops of the Eaſt, approv'd of what *Damaſus* had done, and confirm'd the Judgment which the Pope had given againſt the *Apollinarians*: For in the Synod of *Antioch*, in the Year 378, they ſigned a Tome or a Writing of the Weſtern Biſhops, which condemned their Errors. Afterwards, the *Apollinarians* were always look'd upon as Hereticks, as appears by the Council of *Conſtantinople*, where they are joyn'd with the *Arians*, *Eunomians*, and other declar'd Hereticks.

The *Apollinarii*.

Apollinarius, of all the Chriſtian Writers, had moſt ſtudied Grammar, Rhetorick, and profane Philoſophy: But he was not profoundly Learned in the Scripture and Religion; he Philoſophiz'd too much upon our Myſteries, and did not confine himſelf enough to the ſimplicity of the Scriptures, which fault was the occaſion of his falling into Error: For when once Men give themſelves up to humane Reaſonings in the Explication of Myſteries, they preſently wander from the right way, and are in danger of falling head-long. He had not the ſublime and affected Eloquence of the Bar, but a Philoſophical kind of Eloquence which conſiſted in turning his Thoughts and Reaſons; after an eaſie, clear and pleaſant manner. *Philoſtorgius* quoted by *Suidas*, compar'd him to St. *Baſil*, and St. *Gregory Nazianzen*, and ſays, "That theſe three were the ableſt Men of their Time. That "they excell'd thoſe who had written before them, and that St. *Athanaſius* in compariſon of them, "appear'd but a Child; That they were well vers'd in profane Learning, and had made a great Pro- "greſs in them; That with all this, they had all that was neceſſary for Reading and Underſtanding "the Scriptures, and chiefly *Apollinarius*, who underſtood Hebrew. That each of them excell'd in his "kind; That the Stile of *Apollinarius* was fitteſt for Writing Books; That St. *Baſil*'s Stile was beſt for "publick Orations, but *Gregory Nazianzen* ſurmounted them both in the ſublimity of his Stile, which "was more lofty than that of *Apollinarius*, and more grave than that of St. *Baſil*. He adds, That "theſe three Perſons had all the Qualities which were moſt proper for winning the Admiration of all "Mankind. The Life of *Apollinarius*, was probably no leſs Holy than that of the other two great Men. "In ſhort, he might have been equal to the greateſt Pillars of the Church, as *Vincentius Lirinenſis* "ſays excellently, if his profane Curioſity had not carried him to the Invention of Novelties, which "made him loſe the Fruit of all his Labours, and made his Doctrine an occaſion of Scandal, rather "than Edification.

Apollinarius's Paraphraſe or Tranſlation of the Pſalms, was printed in Greek at *Paris*, in the Year 1580; and together with the Verſion of *Sylburgius*, by *Commelinus*, in the Year 1596. Since that time, it has been put into the *Bibliotheca Patrum*. The other Works of this Author are loſt, except ſome Fragments; and his Error was probably the cauſe of this Loſs. The Catholicks had ſo great a Horror of Books of Hereticks, that they would not ſo much as preſerve thoſe that did not concern their Hereſie, and which might have been uſeful to the Church: Upon which account it is, that we have ſcarce any Book of the ancient Hereticks, and that the *Eutychians* were oblig'd to publiſh *Apollinarius*'s Books under the Names of Catholick Authors, as we have obſerv'd when we ſpoke of the Writings of Pope *Julius*.

TITUS *of* Boſtra.

Titus of *Boſtra*.

TITUS, Biſhop of *Boſtra*, a City of *Arabia Petræa*, wrote a Treatiſe againſt the *Manichees*, and ſome other Works, in the time of the Emperours *Julian* and *Jovian*. *Julian*, who perſecuted all the Biſhops who had any Reputation, did all that lay in his power, to drive this Biſhop out of his Countrey, and to render him odious to his people. "He wrote to him, that if any trouble 'happened in the City of *Boſtra*, he ſhould impute it to himſelf and to his Clergy. This Biſhop 'anſwered him, That he kept his People in Peace by his Exhortations, and that tho' he had as many 'Chriſtians as Pagans in his City, yet he ſo order'd the Matter, that there was no Contention amongſt 'them.' *Julian* laid hold on this occaſion, to write to the Inhabitants of *Boſtra* againſt their Biſhop, endeavouring maliciouſly to perſwade them, that his Anſwer reproached them, becauſe it ſuppoſed that without his Exhortations, they would not have continued in their Duty. However this ill-natur'd Accuſation of the Emperour *Julian*, did not hinder them from putting Confidence in their Biſhop, ſo that he continued in his See till the time of the Emperour *Valens*, under whoſe Reign he dyed, about the Year 370. He aſſiſted at the Council of *Meletius*, held at *Antioch*, under the Reign of *Jovian*, in the Year 364.

The Book of *Titus* of *Boſtra*, againſt the *Manichees*, was written in Greek, and divided into four Parts: There is nothing now extant, but the Verſion of three of thoſe Books made by *Turrianus*, and Printed in *Caniſius*'s Collection of Ancient Pieces, and in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*. To the Text of the Author, there are perfixed the Arguments of the Four Books tranſlated out of Greek, which inform us what is the Subject of them. "The firſt Book, ſays the Author of thoſe Arguments 'contains a Refutation of the principal Points of Doctrine taught by the *Manichees*, which 'contradict common Senſe, and the Principles of natural Reaſon. The ſecond is intended to ſhow, 'That Man is not addicted to Sin by a Principle that is Eternal and without Beginning, or by a 'Being that is contrary to the True God: That there is no Subſtance of Evil in the World; That 'there is not in us two ſorts of Natures, one Good, and the other Evil; That 'tis Folly and Impiety 'to Condemn and Reprehend the manner of Governing the Univerſe. In ſhort, This Book con- 'tains all that can be ſaid of Providence, and invincibly proves, That 'tis in no wiſe neceſſary to

'admit

'admit a Second Principle contrary to God. The Third Book is intended to defend the Law and the 'Prophets, and to ſhow that God is the Author of the Old Teſtament; That there is nothing of Evil 'to be found in it; That it does in every thing agree with the New, and therefore there is no need 'for the Explication of it to have recourſe to a Second Principle contrary to God. The Fourth 'Book defends the New Teſtament againſt the Blaſphemies of the Hereticks: There he ſhews 'that there is nothing in the Goſpel which favours their Error; That they abuſe ſome Paſſages of 'Scripture to prove their Impiety to no purpoſe; and that the Diabolical Explications which they give 'of them cannot help to eſtabliſh what they ſay againſt God". In the firſt Book, he propounds the Doctrine of the *Manichees*, and detects the Abſurdities of it by Metaphyſical Arguments. In the Second he ſhows, That there is but one God only, and that he is the only Principle; That he is not the Author of Sin; That he made Man free and capable of doing Good and Evil; and ſo 'tis not God but Man who is the Author of Sin, which proceeds not from the Nature of Man, but from his Will. He explains the great difficulty that's urg'd by the *Manichees*, why the Juſt are ſo often Unhappy, and the Wicked Happy in this World; and ſhews that the Juſt are always Happy and the Wicked Unhappy, becauſe Innocence is the chief Happineſs. He adds, That Afflictions are uſeful to prove and to exerciſe Vertue. He maintains, That Death is not an Evil, becauſe 'tis the end of ſinning to the Wicked, and the Beginning of Recompence to the Good. In ſhort, having ſurvey'd all things in this World, and all the occurrences of this Life, he proves that they are eaſily reconciled to the Providence of God.

Titus of *Boſtra.*

In the Third Book he ſhows, That the Old and New Teſtament agree very well together, and that one and the ſame God is the Author of them both.

There are in theſe Books much Metaphyſicks and Logick; the Arguments are ſolid and ſubtil; the Stile is fine and clean enough for a Work of this Nature. It is indeed a ſurprizing thing that he never makes uſe of Original Sin for the explaining all the Difficulties objected by the *Manichees*: which might have ſerv'd as one general Solution to almoſt all their Objections. For when once Original Sin is admitted, there is no difficulty in underſtanding, Why a Man is addicted to Sin; Why he ſuffers Affliction; Why he is ſubject to Hunger, to Pain, to Diſeaſes, to Miſeries, and to Death; and yet he never urges it to explain thoſe Queſtions, but examines them as a Philoſopher. He ſays not one Word of the Grace of Jeſus Chriſt, and ſeems to ſuppoſe, That Man could do Good of himſelf as well as Evil.

There is a Commentary upon the Goſpel of St. *Luke*, which is attributed to *Titus* of *Boſtra*; but this can be none of his Book, ſince he who is the Author of it, cites St. *Jerom*, St. *Iſidore Peluſiota*, and St. *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, who had not written till after the Death of this *Titus* of *Boſtra*, whom we now ſpeak of. Yet this is a very good literal Commentary upon St. *Luke*, and ſeems to me to be very ancient. There was a Verſion of it publiſh'd by *Peltanus*, and printed by *Sartorius* at *Ingolſtadt* in the Year 1579. Since that, *Fronto Ducæus* publiſh'd the Greek from a Manuſcript out of the King's Library, and it was printed in Greek and Latin in the Supplement to the *Bibliotheca Patrum*: 'Tis ſaid, That there is a Commentary of the ſame Author upon St. *Matthew*, and there is ſome probability for it, becauſe in the Commentary on St. *Luke*, he never attempts to explain any thing in this Evangeliſt but what is not to be found in the Goſpel of St. *Matthew*. In ſhort, Father *Combefis* has publiſh'd in his *Auctuarium* to the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, a Sermon upon *Palm-Sunday*, which bears the Name of *Titus* of *Boſtra*, but is not written by the true *Titus* of *Boſtra*, nor by the Author of the Commentaries upon St. *Luke*, it having no Affinity with the Air and Stile of either of thoſe two Writers.

DIDYMUS *of* Alexandria.

NOthing is more ſurprizing than what the Ancients have related of this Author. St. *Jerom* and *Ruffinus*, who were his Diſciples, aſſure us, That having loſt his Sight from the Age of five Years, at which time he was ſcarce able to read, he applyed his Mind ſo vigorouſly to Study, that he learn'd in Perfection, not only *Philoſophy*, *Rhetorick* and *Muſick*, but even *Geometry*; which one would think could not be learnt without the help of Sight. He particularly addicted himſelf to the Study of Divinity, and was choſen as the moſt Able Perſon to fill the Chair of the famous School of the Church of *Alexandria*. His Reputation drew to him a great number of Scholars, of whom the moſt famous were St. *Jerom*, *Ruffinus*, *Palladius* and *Iſidore*. He had a wonderful Eaſineſs of expreſſing himſelf, a pleaſing way of declaiming, and a ſurprizing ſharpneſs of Wit. He anſwer'd immediately to all the Queſtions that were made upon the Scriptures, he confuted the Arguments which the Hereticks propos'd to him againſt Religion, and ſhow'd in an inſtant where the weakneſs of their Reaſons lay. He has written many excellent Books. St. *Jerom* mentions theſe following in his Catalogue: Commentaries upon all the *Pſalms*, Commentaries upon the Goſpel of St. *Matthew* and St. *John*, Commentaries upon the Epiſtle to the *Galatians*, Eighteen Tomes of Commentaries upon *Iſaiah*, Three Books of Commentaries upon *Hoſea*, *which are addreſs'd to me*, ſays St. *Jerom*, and Five Books upon *Zachary*, *which he wrote at my deſire*, ſays the ſame Father; Commentaries upon *Job*, and an infinite number of other Diſcourſes, which would require a particular Table. He wrote alſo a Treatiſe upon the *Dogmes*, or upon the Sects, Two Books againſt the *Arians*, and a Book of the Holy Spirit, *which I tranſlated into Latin*, ſays the ſame St. *Jerom*. He alſo interpreted *Origen*'s *Principles*, and defended them againſt thoſe that condemn'd them. He conſider'd this Author as his Maſter, and eſpouſed his Opinions. He was alive when St. *Jerom* wrote his Catalogue of Eccleſiaſtical Writers, *i. e.* in the Year

Didymus of *Alexandria.*

Didymus of Alexandria.

Year 392, and was then 93 Years old and more; and 'tis thought that he dyed two Years after. His being addicted to the Opinions of *Origen*, was the cauſe of his Condemnation in the Fifth General Council, and in the Fifth Seſſion of the *Lateran* Council by *Martin* the Fifth, though he died in the Communion of the Church, and all the Ancients, even St. *Jerom*, ſpeak of him as one whoſe Doctrine was very Orthodox. We have among St. *Jerom*'s Works, a Tranſlation which this Father made of *Didymus*'s Book concerning the Holy Spirit. He ſays in his Preface, "That being in *Babylon*, dwelling 'in this Province cloath'd with Purple (by which word, he means the City of *Rome*) he had a deſign to 'write a little Book of the Holy Spirit, and to Dedicate it to the Biſhop of that City; but that imme- 'diately the Senate of Phariſees cry'd out againſt him, and the Faction of Ignorant Men conſpir'd 'againſt his Perſon, which oblig'd him to return to *Jeruſalem*, where he finiſh'd his Work at the de- 'ſire of *Paula* and *Euſtochium*; but that he could not Dedicate it to *Damaſus*, who was dead when 'it was finiſh'd. He adds, That he put at the beginning of it the Name of the Author whom he 'tranſlated, and thought it better to be only the Interpreter of another's Work, than to mix bad 'thoughts with that which is good in the Greek Authors, as ſome Latins have done'. He has divi- ded this Treatiſe of *Didymus* into three Books: Though it is rather a continued Diſcourſe which ought not to be parted, or at leaſt, ought not to be divided but into two Parts.

This Treatiſe is the moſt Demonſtrative and Methodical of all thoſe that the Ancients have written to prove the Divinity of the Holy Spirit. He begins with theſe Words. 'Though we ought to ſpeak 'with Reverence and Exactneſs of every thing that concerns the Divinity, yet this ought chiefly to 'be done, when we ſpeak of the Holy Spirit, ſince the Scripture tells us, That the Blaſphemy which 'is ſpoken againſt him is unpardonable. Wherefore we muſt give diligent heed that we may under- 'ſtand what is ſaid of him in the Holy Scripture, leſt we fall into ſome Error, which may make us 'ſpeak Blaſphemies. And upon this account, it ſeems to be convenient for a faithful Chriſtian, who 'is ſenſible of his own weakneſs, as I am, to keep ſilence in a Queſtion which is above his Power, 'rather than venture to treat upon a Subject where he runs ſo great a hazard. But ſince there are 'ſome Men, who by a ſurprizing boldneſs exalt themſelves againſt Heaven, and ſpeak of the Holy 'Spirit ſuch things as are no where to be found in Scripture, and which have never been propos'd 'by any Eccleſiaſtical Writers, I thought my ſelf oblig'd to yield to the frequent Entreaties of my Bre- 'thren, and to prove my own Opinion by Teſtimonies of Scriptures, leſt ſome of the Faithful that 'are Ignorant of this Doctrine, ſhould be ſeduc'd by thoſe that hold the contrary'. After he has in the following words obſerv'd, That the Holy Spirit is no where ſpoken of but in the Holy Scripture, and that the ſame Spirit inſpir'd the Prophets and Apoſtles, he enters upon the Matter, and proves by many Arguments founded upon Paſſages of the Holy Scripture, That the Holy Spirit is not a Creature, but that he is of one and the ſame Nature with the Father and the Son. He ſhows that the Holy Spirit is not a Creature. 1. Becauſe every Creature is either Corporeal or Spiritual. Now the Holy Spirit, ſays he, is not a Corporeal Creature, ſince it dwells in the Soul; neither is he a Spiritual Creature, be- cauſe Spiritual Creatures receive into themſelves Vertues, Knowledge and Holineſs, whereas the Holy Spirit produces them in others, being himſelf Subſtantially Vertue, Light and Holineſs. 2. Becauſe every Creature is liable to Change and circumſcrib'd within a place; but the Holy Spirit is immutable, and every where preſent, and therefore the Holy Spirit is not a Creature. 3. Becauſe he who Sanctifies, and he who is Sanctified, are of different Natures; but the Holy Spirit Sanctifies all Creatures, and therefore he is not of their Nature. He adds, That 'tis never ſaid that Men are fill'd with a Creature, as 'tis ſaid that they are fill'd with the Holy Spirit. He ſhows, that the Holy Spirit is not deviſible; but that it receives different Names according to the different Effects it produces, though it be always one and the ſame Spirit. In ſhort, he ſhows, That the Apoſtle St. *Paul* put an Eſſential Difference between the Holy Spirit and the Angels, which ſufficiently diſcovers that it is not a Creature. After- wards he refutes thoſe that ſay the Holy Spirit is of the number of thoſe things which were created by the Divine Word. He explains a place in the Fourth Chapter of the Prophet *Amos*, where 'tis ſaid, That *God created the Spirit*, *Creans Spiritum*, by ſhowing that this place is literally to be underſtood of the Wind, and that it cannot be applied to the Holy Spirit, but in an Allegorical and Figurative ſence.

After he has thus ſhown that the Holy Spirit is not a Creature, he proves, That he is of the ſame Nature with the Father and the Son: 1. Becauſe they have but one and the ſame Operation, and by conſequence muſt be one and the ſame Subſtance. 2. Becauſe to lye to the Holy Spirit is to lye unto God, as appears by the words of St. *Peter* to *Ananias*. 3. Becauſe the Wiſdom and Teaching of the Holy Spirit is call'd the Wiſdom and Teaching of God. 4. Becauſe the Holy Spirit is call'd the Finger of the Father. 5. Becauſe 'tis ſaid of him, that he is Wiſdom it ſelf. 6. Becauſe we are to believe in the Holy Spirit, as we do in the Father and the Son, and we are baptized in the Name of the Holy Spirit, as we are in the Name of the Father and the Son. 7. Becauſe he is call'd Lord, as the Father and the Son are. 8. Becauſe he is ſent from the Father in the Name of the Son, as having the ſame Nature with the Son. 9. Becauſe the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are never ſeparated; every thing that agrees to one of the three Perſons, agrees to the other two, and whatever is ſaid of one, is ſaid of the other two, and whatſoever one does, is done by the others, *&c.* And therefore they have all three the ſame Nature and the ſame Subſtance. He concludes with theſe words, 'Since there is no pardon for thoſe 'that Blaſpheme againſt the Trinity, we muſt be very cautious in ſpeaking of this Myſtery, leſt we 'be miſtaken in the leaſt Expreſſion: And every one who deſires to read this Book, muſt purifie him- 'ſelf, that ſo by an enlightned Mind he may underſtand what is contain'd in it, and by a Heart full 'of Charity and Holineſs, he may Pardon us, if we do not always anſwer the expectation of the 'Reader. He muſt only conſider the Mind wherewith we have written, and not tie himſelf up to

'our

'our manner of Expreſſion: For as the Teſtimony of our Conſcience makes us boldly affirm, That 'our Doctrine is that of the Chriſtian Religion; ſo our Sincerity makes us confeſs, That in the manner of Writing, we do not come near the politeneſs, fineneſs, and eloquence of others; becauſe we 'have only attempted to give a religious Explication of what the Holy Scripture teaches us, without 'ſtudying to polliſh and adorn our Diſcourſe': But though he ſpeaks thus of his Stile, and St. *Jerom* ſays alſo, That this Author is not a very able Penman, yet this Treatiſe is very well written for a Dogmatical Treatiſe. I ſpeak not this of the Words or Terms, ſince we have not now the Original Greek, but of the turn of his Thoughts, the methodizing of his Arguments, and the manner of expreſſing himſelf about a Myſtery ſo difficult to explain as this of the Trinity. He treats of the Subject in a very clear Method, without diverting from the Difficulties of it. He propoſes his Arguments plainly and ſmoothly: His Reaſons are cloſe and convincing, one may obſerve a Vein of Logick which runs through all his Diſcourſe without intermiſſion. He quotes the paſſages of Scripture in their natural ſence, and makes many very curious and profound Remarks. He uſes the moſt proper and moſt fit Terms for Explication of the Myſteries. He does not too nicely diſtinguiſh, and yet he clears up all Difficulties. In a word, it were to be wiſh'd that all the Schoolmen had taken this Treatiſe for their Pattern, and had follow'd his Method in treating of the Myſteries of Religion. I forgot to obſerve that he ſpeaks occaſionally of the Incarnation, and that he ſays, Jeſus Chriſt is God-man; and yet we muſt not affirm that there are two Perſons in him, but believe, that he being God and Man both together, there is attributed to him what agrees to the Nature of God, and the Nature of Man. 'Twas good to obſerve this againſt the Error of the *Neſtorians*.

Didymus of Alexandria.

We have in the *Bibliothecæ Patrum*, Commentaries in Latin, upon all the Canonical Epiſtles which go under the Name of *Didymus*. They ſeem to be Ancient, and they may poſſibly be a Tranſlation from a Greek Commentary of this Author. He ſpeaks of the Opinion of thoſe who thought that Spirits were from all Eternity, and he neither Condemns nor Approves it. He maintains, That Predeſtination is nothing elſe but the Choice which God made of thoſe that he foreſaw would believe in Jeſus Chriſt, and do good Actions. He rejects the *Millennium*, and affirms, That the Pleaſures and Joys of Paradiſe are all Spiritual. He diſapproves of ſervile Fear; He believes with *Origen*, That the Incarnation of Jeſus Chriſt was profitable to Angels as well as Men, and that it purifies them from their Faults. He obſerves, That the Second Epiſtle of St. *Peter* is not in the Canon, and believes that it is corrupted. Theſe Commentaries are very clear and intelligible, and contain Uſeful and Judicious Inſtructions and Reflections, which are not unworthy of the famous *Didymus*.

There is alſo a little Tract, or rather the Fragment of a Tract againſt the *Manichees*, tranſlated from Greek by *Turrianus*, printed by *Poſſevin* in his *Apparatus*, and inſerted into the *Bibliothecæ Patrum*, which goes under the Name of *Didymus*, which agrees well enough with the Treatiſe of the Holy Spirit written by this Author. There he refutes by Metaphyſical Arguments, the Opinion of the *Manichees*, who admitted two Principles, the one Good and the other Evil. He explains the ſence in which Men are call'd in Scripture *Children of Wrath*, by ſaying, They are ſo call'd, becauſe they become the Object of the Wrath of God by the Sins which they voluntarily commit; as others are call'd Children of the Light, and Children of Wiſdom, who are Purified by the Light of Truth. He ſays, That *Judas* is call'd a Son of Perdition, becauſe he did thoſe things that deſerv'd Perdition. He is mightily perplex'd when he explains the Reaſon why the Fleſh of Man is call'd *Sinful Fleſh*. He ſays firſt of all, That it is ſo call'd, becauſe it was produc'd by the uſe of Marriage, which commonly was not free from Sin before the coming of Jeſus Chriſt, who ſanctified it: That there is none but Jeſus Chriſt and the Firſt Man, whoſe Fleſh could not be called *Sinful*; for Jeſus Chriſt was Born of a Virgin, and *Adam* was made out of the Earth; That all Men being begotten by Men after the Sin of the Firſt Man, are ſubject to Sin; and that if the Body of Jeſus Chriſt had been form'd in the ordinary way of Generation, it had been liable to Sin, to which all the Poſterity of *Adam* are ſubject. He adds, That the Uſe of Marriage, though it is permitted, is called Sin, in Compariſon of Virginity; which is a much more excellent ſtate. After this, he proves that the Devil was not Wicked by Subſtance, but by Will; He demonſtrates, That God is not the Author of Evil, becauſe he created a free Agent, which could incline it ſelf to Good or Evil; That the Divine Conduct cannot be blam'd, and that thoſe who commit Sin ought not to impute it to any but themſelves, ſince it was in their own Power to do Good, and to ſhun that which is Evil. In a word, That Man is not naturally Wicked, but by his Will only; ſince he that has been Wicked and Impious, may change his condition by Repentance, and become Good and Vertuous.

PETER *of* Alexandria.

Peter of Alexandria.

ST. *Athanaſius* dying in the Year 373, the Catholicks choſe in his room *Peter*, whom St. *Athanaſius* had deſign'd for his Succeſſor. He had no ſooner taken Poſſeſſion of his Church, but he was forc'd away from it by the Governor of the Province nam'd *Palladius*, and neceſſitated to fly to *Rome*. Some time after *Euzoius* of *Antioch* brought with him one nam'd *Lucius*, whom he Ordain'd Biſhop of *Alexandria*, and caus'd the Churches to be given to him. This Man being an Enemy to the Doctrine of his Predeceſſor, was hated by all the Chriſtians of *Alexandria*, who would not afterwards come any more to the Aſſemblies of the Church: Whereupon *Lucius* was oblig'd to get a Guard of Pagan Souldiers, who committed by his Order infinite Outrages againſt the Catholicks. *Peter* of *Alexandria* wrote at this time a Letter againſt the Exorbitances that were done by the *Arians*, which

Peter of Alexandria.

Theodoret produces in the Fourth Book of his Hiſtory, *Chap.* 22. It charges them with cauſing a Multitude of Infidel Souldiers to enter into the great Church of St. *Theonas*, who vomited up Thouſands of Blaſphemies, violated Virgins, and put to Death many Chriſtians. He adds, That they had committed abominable Sacrilege, in making a young Man dance upon the Altar in Womens Apparel, and making him go up into the Pulpit, where he utter'd infamous and impious Words. Afterwards he charges the *Arians* with carrying away *Lucius* to place him in the Epiſcopal See, though he had neither been choſen by the Suffrages of the Clergy and the People, nor Ordain'd by a Lawful Synod as the Eccleſiaſtical Canons requir'd. Afterwards he gives an account of the manner in which he entred into the Church, being accompanied with *Euzoius*, and the Chief Treaſurer of the City; how he would have forc'd the Prieſts and Deacons to approve *Arianiſm*, to pleaſe the Emperour *Valens*; with what boldneſs and conſtancy they anſwer'd him, and how they were Impriſon'd, Tormented, and ſent a Shipboard without Victuals. In ſhort, he relates the Cruelties committed againſt the People of *Alexandria*, againſt the Deacon ſent by Pope *Damaſus*, and againſt Eleven Biſhops of *Egypt* baniſh'd to *Diocæſarea*, together with a great number of Prieſts and Deacons. We have in *Facundus*, two Fragments of another Letter written by the ſame Father to thoſe that were baniſh'd. The Firſt, is in *Chap.* 2. of the Fourth Book, againſt *Timotheus* the Diſciple of *Apollinarius*, whom he accuſes of having Anathematiz'd St. *Baſil*, St. *Paulinus*, St. *Epiphanius*, and *Diodorus*, that he might communicate with *Vitalis* only. The Second Fragment is in *Chap.* 2. of *B.* XI. where he commends the Epiſtle of St. *Athanaſius* written to the *Antiochians*. We have not any other Fragment of the Letters of this Saint, though 'tis probable, that he wrote many more during the ſpace of Six Years that he ſtay'd at *Rome*. But when *Valens* being to march againſt the *Goths*, gave leave to the baniſh'd Biſhops to return, he came to *Alexandria* with a Letter of Recommendation from Pope *Damaſus*. The People receiv'd him and drove away *Lucius*. Sometime after, *Peter* indiſcreetly Ordain'd *Maximus* the Cynick Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, though he had approv'd by a Letter the Care which *Gregory Nazianzen* took of that Church. He dyed about the End of the Year 381. The Stile of the Letter produced by *Theodoret* is Simple and Natural, and alſo very Significant.

LUCIUS.

Lucius.

ST. *Jerom* places this *Lucius*, the Adverſary of *Peter* of *Alexandria*, among the Number of Eccleſiaſtical Writers, of whom we have already ſpoken. He ſays, That he govern'd the Church of *Alexandria* till the time of *Theodoſius*: But we have obſerv'd that he was driven away a little while before the Reign of this Emperour. He adds, That he wrote Letters concerning the Solemnity of *Eaſter*, and ſome Books upon different Subjects.

AQUILIUS SEVERUS.

Aquilius Severus.

AQUILIUS SEVERUS a Spaniard, of the Race of that *Severus* to whom *Lactantius* addreſs'd two Books of Letters, wrote a Volume in the form of an *Itinerary*, which contains all the Hiſtory of his Life in Proſe as well as Verſe. 'Tis entituled, *The Cataſtrophe, or the Experiment.* He dyed under the Reign of *Valentinian*, that is to ſay, about the Year 370. This is what St. *Jerom* has told us of this Author, and 'tis all that we know of him. This ſort of Books which contain the Lives of Authors are pleaſant when they are written of Great Men who had a ſhare in the Management of Affairs, or of ſuch Perſons whoſe Lives were full of extraordinary and ſurprizing Accidents; and they are uſeful when they are written of Perſons of great Virtue and Merit. But when no ſuch thing is to be found in them, they are commonly tedious and uſeleſs Books. 'Tis probable that this Life of *Aquilius* was fill'd with Extraordinary Occurrences, which was the reaſon why he wrote it, and why he gave it the Title of *The Cataſtrophe, or the Experiment.* Wherein he probably gives us cauſe to admire the Providence of God in the wonderful Changes that happened to himſelf. This is all that we can ſay by Conjecture, having no certain Knowledge of this Matter.

EUZOIUS.

Euzoius.

EUZOIUS was the Scholar of *Theſpeſius* the Rhetorician, together with St. *Gregory Nazianzen*. He Studied in his Youth at *Cæſarea* in *Paleſtine*, whereof he was afterward Biſhop. He repaired the Library of *Origen* and *Pamphilus*, cauſing the Books to be written out upon new Skins, becauſe the old ones began to rot. He was at laſt turn'd out of the Church in the time of *Theodoſius*. He wrote many Treatiſes, which were eaſie to be known in St. *Jerom*'s time. This is what this Father has told us of this Author. St. *Epiphanius* ſpeaks of him in *Hæreſ.* 73. and places him among thoſe Biſhops that were purely *Arian*: And yet he is different from the famous *Arian* Euzoius Biſhop of *Antioch*.

St. CYRIL

St. CYRIL *of* Jeruſalem.

ST. *CYRIL* was ordain'd Prieſt of the Church of *Jeruſalem*, by *Maximus*, Biſhop of that City; but if we believe St. *Jerom*, he would not do the Office of a Deacon, as long as that Biſhop liv'd. After his Death [a], he was plac'd in his room, by *Acacius* and the Biſhops of his Party, which render'd his Faith ſuſpected to the Catholicks [b]. But he was not long a Friend to *Acacius*; for the Differences which they had about the Prerogatives of their Sees, quickly broke them in pieces. The Council of *Nice* had given the Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, the firſt place among all the Biſhops of that Province, and yet left the Rites of the Church of *Cæſarea* entire, which was Metropolis to the Church of *Jeruſalem*. This Honour gave occaſion to the Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, to aſſume to himſelf ſome Privileges, and ſo *Maximus* of *Jeruſalem*, took upon him to Ordain Biſhops in *Paleſtine*, and to Aſſemble a Council of that Province. His Succeſſor, St. *Cyril*, deſiring to maintain himſelf in the Poſſeſſion of thoſe Privileges, was troubled by *Acacius* of *Cæſarea*, who would not endure that the Church of *Jeruſalem* ſhould aſſume to it ſelf a right which legally pertain'd to his own Church. To revenge himſelf for this Encroachment, he call'd a Council in the Year 356, wherein he depos'd St. *Cyril*, under pretence that he had Sold the Ornaments of the Church, and the Sacred Veſſels to relieve the Poor in time of Famine. He plac'd in his room, *Eutychius*, who probably was Biſhop of *Eleutheropolis*. St. *Cyril* appealed from the Sentence of this Synod, to a more numerous Council; but he was forced to retire to *Tarſus*, where he continued ſome time with *Silvanus*, Biſhop of that City, who received him very kindly, and gave him leave to Celebrate the Holy Myſteries, and to Preach in his Dioceſs. At this time, there was a Synod held at *Melitina*, compos'd of Biſhops of *Acacius*'s Party, where St. *Cyril* was preſent. He came afterwards to the Council of *Seleucia*, wherein he took part with *Baſil* of *Ancyra*, *Euſtathius*, *Sebaſtius*, and the other *Semi-Arian* Biſhops, who treated him as a lawful Biſhop, and gave him a Seat in the Council, in ſpite of all the Oppoſition that was made by *Acacius*: And *Acacius*, that he might the better Oppoſe his Adverſary, threw himſelf upon the Party of *Eudoxus*, and by this means, got St. *Cyril* depos'd anew in the Council of *Conſtantinople*. 'Twas about this time, that *Heremius* was ordain'd Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, becauſe probably *Eutychius*, who was already Biſhop of *Eleutheropolis*, would not leave his Church, to take the See of *Jeruſalem*. After *Heremius*, there was one named *Heraclius*, and to him Succeeded one *Hilarius*. But at laſt, St. *Cyril* was reſtored to his See, under the Emperour *Theodoſius*, after his Ordination had been approv'd by the Council of *Conſtantinople*, held in the Year 380 [c]. He died in the Year 386, and had *John* for his Succeſſor.

St. *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem.*

St. *Jerom* aſſures us, That St. *Cyril* compos'd his Catechetical Diſcourſes in his Youth: We have 18 of them extant, addreſs'd to the Catechumens, whereof ſome are quoted by *Theodoret* [d], by St. *John Damaſcen*, by *Cyparisſiota*; and there are 5 others, called *Myſtagogick Lectures*, for the Inſtruction of thoſe that are newly Baptized. *Cook*, *Rivet*, *Aubertin*, and other Calviniſtical Criticks, do all that they can, to prove theſe Catechetical Diſcourſes ſuppoſititious, becauſe they contain many things that diſpleaſe them [e], and deſtroy their Errors. But the Conjectures which they alledge to

[a] *After his Death.*] *Socrates*, *B.* II. *Ch.* 30. and *Sozomen*, *B.* IV. *Ch.* 19. ſays, That *Acacius* of *Cæſarea*, and *Patrophilus* of *Scythopolis*, turned out *Maximus*, to place St. *Cyril* in his room: But St. *Jerom* who ſpeaks of St. *Cyril*, after ſuch a manner as ſufficiently diſcovers, that he did not favour him, ſince he treats him as an *Arian*, tells us, That *Maximus* was dead, when he was Ordain'd. But he accuſes St. *Cyril* of perſecuting *Heraclius*, who was Ordain'd Biſhop by the Catholicks in the room of *Maximus*, and of reducing him to the rank of Presbyters. St. *Epiphanius*, *Ruffinus*, and *Theodoret*, ſpeak not a word of this *Heraclius*: But *Socrates* and *Sozomen*, place him as ſecond of the Biſhops whom the *Arians* ſet up in Oppoſition to St. *Cyril*. St. *Jerom* calls the firſt *Ireneus*, inſtead of *Eremius*.

[b] *His Faith ſuſpected to the Catholicks.*] *Ruffinus* and St. *Jerom*, obſerve, That he oftentimes chang'd his Faith and his Communion. As to his Communion, 'tis true; for at firſt, he held Communion with *Acacius*, afterwards he ſeparated from him; then he communicated with the Biſhops of his Party, at the Synod of *Melitina*; after this he forſook them, to joyn with *Baſil* of *Ancyra*, and the *Semi-Arians*; at laſt, he re-united himſelf to the Catholicks. But for all this, he did not change his Faith, for he always believed the Son to be like in Subſtance unto the Father, without condemning the Term *Conſubſtantial*. 'Twas *Acacius* who was ſo changeable in his Faith, for he ſometimes ſigned the Doctrine, the Words being like in ſubſtance, and ſometimes condemned this Doctrine, and approved the Error of the *Anomæans*; but *Meletius* re-united them all, and made them approve the Term *Conſubſtantial*. We muſt not believe St. *Jerom* about the Cauſe of St. *Cyril*, for he was addicted to *Paulinus* againſt *Meletius*, and againſt all thoſe of his Party.

[c] *The Council of* Conſtantinople, *held in the Year* 380.] This appears by the Letter from the Council of *Conſtantinople*, produced by *Theodoret*, wherein the Biſhops declare, That they had approved the Ordination of St. *Cyril*, becauſe it was performed according to form by the Biſhops of his Province.

[d] *By* Theodoret, *&c.*] This Father in his Second Dialogue, cites a long Paſſage taken out of the 4th. Catechetical Diſcourſe of St. *Cyril*, Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, which is word for word found in the 4th. Catechetical Diſcourſe to the Catechumens: St. *John Damaſcen*, relates alſo a Paſſage taken out of the 12th. in his *Orat.* 3. *de Imag.* Cyparisſiota, *Dec.* 6. cites the 10th. Catechetical Diſcourſe.

[e] *Many things that diſpleaſe them.*] The real Preſence, Tranſubſtantiation, the Sacrifice of the Maſs, the Ceremonies, Prayers for the Dead, the Exorciſms, Invocation of Saints, the Honour due to Relicks, the Celibacy of Prieſts, the Veneration of the Croſs, *&c.* are Opinions which the Calviniſts cannot endure, and they are mightily troubled to ſee them eſtabliſhed by an Author of the 4th. Age of the Church.

St. *Cyril of Jeruſalem.*

overthrow their Authority, are too ſlight [f], to call in queſtion the Truth; and the Intereſt which they have to oppoſe them, renders their Cenſure ſuſpected. Their endeavours are chiefly againſt the 5 Myſtagogical Catechiſms, which are not indeed cited by the Ancients, as the firſt Diſcourſes are. But the Agreement of the Stile [g] ſhows, that they are the ſame Authors; and the end of the 18th. Catechetical Diſcourſe [h], demonſtrates it clearly: For there he promiſes to compoſe 5 other Inſtructions after *Eaſter*, whereof he tells you the Subjects, which are very near a-kin to the Subjects of thoſe which we ſtill have. In ſhort, he cites the firſt in the laſt; and ſince the laſt are promiſed in the firſt, and theſe again quoted in the laſt, Who can doubt but they are all the ſame Author's [i]? And ſince they cannot deny, but the firſt which have gone under the Name of St. *Cyril*, ever ſince *Theodoret*'s time, are Genuine, they muſt by conſequence confeſs, that the 5 laſt belong to the ſame Author.

The Eighteen firſt Catechetical Inſtructions are addreſs'd to thoſe of the *Catechumens*, who are call'd the *Elect*, or the *Enlightned*; that is to ſay, thoſe that have paſs'd through all the other degrees of *Catechumens*, and are now inſtructed in order to receiving Baptiſm within a little time: For the Ancient Church did not give Baptiſm immediately to all thoſe who deſir'd it, but only to thoſe who had given ſigns of a ſincere Faith, and of the change of their Life, by a long Tryal, and by a courſe of Penance. So when an Infidel offer'd himſelf to be admitted among the number of Chriſtians, they begun with diſcovering to him in particular the blindneſs wherein he had hitherto been, but they did not permit him to enter into the Church to hear the Publick Exhortations. Afterwards when he was ſufficiently undeceiv'd of his old Errors, and deſir'd to be inſtructed in the Truth, he was permitted to enter into

[f] *The Conjectures which they alledge are too ſlight.*] They ſay, That there is a Greek Catalogue wherein they are attributed to *John* of *Jeruſalem*; but of what Authority is a Catalogue, the Antiquity whereof is not known? Can it be oppoſed to the Teſtimony of *Theodoret*, who cites thoſe Catechetical Inſtructions under the Name of St. *Cyril*, and to that of St. *Jerom*, who teſtifies, That this Father wrote one? *There is no probability*, ſays *Rivet*, *that the Care of Inſtructing the Catechumens ſhould be entruſted to a young Man.* Why not? If he was capable of it, as it appears St. *Cyril* was. If there was no probability of it, Why does St. *Jerom* aſſure us, that it was ſo? 'Tis ſaid, adds *Rivet*, *That they were ſpoken ex-tempore, and St.* Jerom *ſays, that he wrote them.* A pleaſant objection indeed! as if it were not known that Authors do often ſet down thoſe Diſcourſes afterwards in writing, which they ſpoke without premeditation at firſt: The ſame *Rivet* is of Opinion, that thoſe places which concern Celibacy, Virginity, Relicts, the Croſs of Jeſus Chriſt, *&c.* are added in theſe Catechetical Diſcourſes; what proof has he for this, but only that thoſe things do not pleaſe him? He accuſes St. *Cyril* of Blaſphemy, becauſe he ſays, *If the Virgin* Mary *were ſo much honoured for carrying Jeſus Chriſt the ſpace of nine Months, we ought yet more to honour Chriſtians for keeping their Virginity for very many years.* This thought is not exact, 'tis a little too blunt; but ſuch things did often eſcape the Fathers in their Sermons, and it is capable of a good Sence. Another Objection of *Rivet*'s is this: This Author ſays, That the Wood of the Croſs is *amongſt us to this Day.* Now theſe Words *to this Day* cannot agree, ſays he, to St. *Cyril*, who might be preſent at the finding of the Croſs. To which I anſwer, That the words, *to this Day*, reſpect the time which was already paſt, ſince the Paſſion of Jeſus Chriſt. To conclude, All theſe Catechetical Diſcourſes, have the Character of Antiquity; they are ſimple and natural, and explain the Doctrines of the Church after the ancient Way. The Author ſays at the beginning of his 6th. Catechetical Diſcourſe, That he wrote 70 Years after the beginning of the Hereſie of the *Manichees*: The Canon of the Sacred Books which he recites, is ancient; and the Creed which he makes uſe of, does not betray his Age: The manner in which he explains the Myſtery of the Trinity, ſhows, that he was a Catholick, but that he managed himſelf ſlily; for tho' he always confirms the Divinity of the Son and the Holy Spirit, he does not always make uſe of the Word *Conſubſtantial.* The two Arguments of *Rivet*, againſt the Myſtagogical Diſcourſes, are as weak as the former. *The Ancients*, ſays he, *do not diſtinguiſh theſe two kinds of Diſcourſes.* But neither do they ſay, that there was but one: St. *Jerom*, who is the only Perſon that ſpeaks of them all, ſays only, That St. *Cyril* wrote Catechetical Diſcourſes, without telling how many: The other Authors ſpeaks of thoſe which they had occaſion to quote. 2. He ſays, *That the laſt are ſhort, whereas the firſt are very long.* But this is no Argument why they ſhould not be all the ſame Author's. The three firſt to the *Illuminated*, are ſhorter than the laſt, and are not much longer than the Myſtagogical Diſcourſes. The time, and Matter that he writes about, makes any Author longer or ſhorter; and after *Eaſter*, the Inſtructions ought not to be ſo long. *Aubertin* adds, That *Prævotius* ſays he ſupplied many Letters and corrected many places. And what follows from thence? Is there any one Book to which the firſt Publiſhers have not done the ſame thing? They have added ſometimes half a word, or a whole one, or ſometimes ſome words which they thought neceſſary. But they cannot be ſuppos'd to add whole Periods, Pages and Books; and indeed if ye compare the Edition of *Prævotius*, with that of *Morellus*, which preceeded it, made by a Manuſcript of Monſieur *De Meſmes*, and with the Latin Verſions made from other Manuſcripts, you may ſee that the Differences among them are of very ſmall Conſequence, and that they neither alter the Sence nor the Doctrine of this Father.

[g] *But the Agreement of the Stile*, &c.] There is the ſame Stile, the ſame Method, the ſame Air of Writing. The Stile both of the one and the other is familiar and unaffected: He explains the Myſteries by Paſſages of Scripture, and moralizes them after the ſame manner in them all.

[h] *The end of the* 18th. *Catechetical Diſcourſe.*] *After* Eaſter, ſays he, *with the help of God, you ſhall hear other Catechetical Lectures*; First, *about what is done before Baptiſm.* This is the Subject of the Firſt Catechetical Diſcourſe. Secondly, *To explain how ye are purified from your Sins by the Baptiſm of Water.* That's the Subject of the Second. Thirdly, *How ye have received the Seal of the Holy Spirit.* That's the Subject of the Third. And Laſtly, *Concerning the Holy myſteries of the Altar.* That's the Subject of the Two laſt. But beſides; the Order which he promiſed to obſerve in ſpeaking of Holy Myſteries, is that which is obſerved in theſe two Catechetical Diſcourſes.

[i] *Who can doubt but they are all the ſame Author's.*] Since he cites the firſt Inſtructions in the laſt, and declares at the beginning of the firſt Catechetical Diſcourſe, That he delay'd to inſtruct them perfectly in Divine Myſteries, till they were baptiz'd; and toward the end of the ſame Diſcourſe, he ſays, That he had explained the Creed in the preceeding Diſcourſes.

the

St. *Cyril of Jeruſalem.*

the Church, but only to hear the Sermons, without being preſent, at any of the Prayers: This ſort of *Catechumens* were call'd *Hearers*, becauſe they heard the Inſtructions which were given in the Church. The Third Rank of *Catechumens* was, that of thoſe that were preſent at the Prayers, who were call'd the *Supplicants* or the *Proſtrati*, becauſe they were preſent at the Prayers of the Church till the Offertory, and they kneel'd and proſtrated themſelves on the Ground to receive the Bleſſing of the Biſhop. In the mean time they were inſtructed in the Doctrine of the Church, and their Behaviour and Actions were carefully inſpected, and when they found them diſpos'd to receive Baptiſm, they were permitted to deſire it, and to give in their Names, that they might be admitted to it. Thoſe who did ſo, were call'd *Competentes*, that is, *Competitors*; and if their Petition was admitted, they were call'd *Elect*; and then they were prepar'd to receive Baptiſm by Inſtructions, by Exorciſms, and by many Ceremonies. Theſe are all the Degrees that can be diſtinguiſh'd among the *Catechumens*: But commonly the Fathers without inſiſting on theſe Diſtinctions, call'd thoſe *Catechumens*, who were either *Hearers*, or *Partakers only* of the Prayers; and they gave the Name of *Competitors*, to thoſe who were in a Condition to receive Baptiſm. The laſt are they whom St. *Cyril* calls Φωτιζόμενοι, that is, *Enlightned*, becauſe they were already inſtructed in the Doctrine of the Church, and had given in their Names at the beginning of *Lent*, to be baptized at *Eaſter*, according to Cuſtom. 'Twas to ground them well in our Myſteries, and diſpoſe them to receive Baptiſm with Purity, that St. *Cyril* compos'd thoſe Inſtructions, as he himſelf teſtifies in his Preliminary Diſcourſe, in which he treats of thoſe Diſpoſitions that they ought to bring with them to Baptiſm, and of the Neceſſity of hearing Inſtruction. He exhorts them to purifie themſelves from their Sins, and to embrace a truly Chriſtian Life, if they would have Baptiſm profitable unto them. He admoniſhes them not to approach this Sacrament, if their Souls were ſtill polluted with heinous Sins, and they perſever'd ſtill in their wicked Deſigns and their ſinful Cuſtoms. He tells them that they deceiv'd themſelves, if they imagin'd that they ſhould receive the Fruit and Effects of Baptiſm while they continued in this ſtate. *If ye are ſtill*, ſays he, *of the ſame wicked diſpoſition of which ye have always been, in vain do ye think that ye ſhall receive the Grace of Baptiſm: Ye ſhall be waſh'd with thoſe Waters, but ye ſhall not receive the Holy Spirit. Therefore if any of you finds himſelf troubled with ſome ſecret Diſeaſe in his Mind, let him take a Remedy. Ye have yet time, the Church offers you a Penance of Four Days. Ye may during this time, retire to do Penance, and after that re-enter into the Rank where ye were*, To be baptiz'd at *Whitſuntide*. He adds, *That ſince they cannot receive Baptiſm but once only, (for none but Hereticks*, ſays he, *are Re-baptiz'd, becauſe the Baptiſm which they have received out of the Church is no Baptiſm) they muſt take good heed that they do not receive it in vain.* After this, he explains the Diſpoſition which they ought to have, that this Sacrament may be profitable to them. God hath ſaid, *I require nothing of you but a Good Heart: Say not ye, How is it that my Sins ſhall be forgiven me? I declare it unto you, It is by Faith and a good Diſpoſition. What is there more eaſily to be had? forſake then preſently your infamous Company, give over your obſcene Diſcourſe, avoid Covetouſneſs and the love of Riches, come and hear Inſtruction with diligence and delight, be careful to receive the Exorciſms, though ye have been already ſolemnly exorciſ'd. Nothing is more wholſom than this Ceremony; for as the Gold is purified by Fire, ſo the Soul is purified by Exorciſms.* He exhorts them afterwards to hear Inſtruction with Attention. He makes them underſtand that there is a great difference between Catechizing and Sermons; for if it happens that any one does not apply his Mind to a Sermon, or neglects to hear it, 'tis eaſie to recover that loſs, becauſe he may hear to Morrow the ſame thing; but when all the Myſteries which are neceſſary to be known for receiving Baptiſm are explain'd in their Order, by Catechizing, if perhaps you neglect to hear any one of them, you cannot return to it again; and there is ſuch an eſſential Connexion of all theſe Myſteries one with another, that if you do not underſtand any one of them, you are in danger of underſtanding nothing of all the reſt. He exhorts them, to ſay nothing to Infidels nor Catechumens of what they ſhall hear, to behave themſelves modeſtly when they come into the Church, before the Exorciſms are begun, and not to entertain themſelves with Profane News; but to read there ſome uſeful Book, to Sing or to Pray, and to conſider themſelves always as in the preſence of God, while they are there. He exhorts them to Pray always, that they may ſhun the ſnares of the Devil, and to watch continually over themſelves, leſt thay fall into Temptation. *Theſe are*, ſays he in the Concluſion, *the beſt Exhortations and Inſtructions which we can give you, that you may not Build upon Chaff, Hay or Stubble, leſt your Building be conſum'd when it ſhall paſs through the Fire. All that I can do, is to exhort you, 'tis your part to Labour, and God's to Perfect. Raiſe up your Minds, direct your Intentions, prepare your Hearts, it is for your Souls that you fight, and they are Eternal Treaſures which you hope for.*

The Firſt Lecture is alſo an Exhortation to thoſe that are to be baptized, to prepare themſelves by a Holy Life and by Good Works, that ſo they may receive the Grace of Baptiſm. It is compos'd upon a Leſſon taken out of the Firſt Chapter of *Iſaiah*, Verſe 16. which begins with theſe Words, *Waſh you, make you clean, put away the evil of your doings*, &c. He exhorts them wholly to put off the Old-man, ſincerely to renounce all Sin, and to ſpend in the Exerciſes of Piety the 40 Days that are appointed to Prepare them for Baptiſm.

The Second is concerning Sin and Penance. He teaches them, That Sin is committed voluntarily by the bad uſe we make of our Free-Will; That the Devil was the firſt Sinner, that afterwards he made the firſt Man ſin; That by the Sin of the firſt Man, all Men fell under Blindneſs and Death; That he who rais'd *Lazarus* rais'd our Souls, and deliver'd them from Sin by his Blood; That therefore we ought not to deſpair, whatſoever Sins we have committed, but to truſt to the Mercy of God, and to have recourſe to the Remedy of Repentance. He relates many Examples of God's Mercy towards the greateſt Sinners: He alledges alſo the Example of the Angels, to whom he thinks God pardon'd

many

St. *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem.*

many Faults. He adds towards the end, the Example of St. *Peter*, and concludes with theſe words; *Theſe are, my Brethren, the many Examples of Sinners whom God hath pardon'd, as ſoon as they repented. Do you alſo confeſs your Sins unto the Lord, and you ſhall obtain the Kingdom of Heaven, and enjoy the Heavenly Reward together with all the Saints in Jeſus Chriſt, to whom be Glory for ever and ever.*

The Third Lecture is concerning the Neceſſity of Baptiſm, and of Penance which ought to precede it. *You muſt prepare your ſelves*, ſays he, *by Purity of Conſcience; for you ought not to conſider the External Baptiſm, but the Spiritual Grace which is given with the Water, that is Sanctified by the Invocation of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghoſt. The Water waſhes the Body, but the Spirit ſanctifies the Soul, that we being purified, may become worthy to approach unto God. You cannot be perfect unleſs you be ſanctified by the Water and the Spirit. So, if any one be baptiz'd without having the Holy Spirit, he receives not the Grace of Baptiſm, and likewiſe if any one receive not Baptiſm, though his Converſation were never ſo well order'd, he ſhall not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven. This Diſcourſe is bold, but it is not mine but Jeſus Chriſt's, who has pronounc'd this Sentence, when he ſaid, Except a Man be born again of Water and the Holy Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.* He proves this Truth by the Example of *Cornelius*, then he ſhows the Neceſſity of Baptiſm by Water, and ſays, That none but Martyrs only can enjoy the Kingdom of Heaven without being baptized. [The Ancients generally believed that Martyrdom was that Baptiſm by Fire which *John Baptiſt* foretold, *Mat.* 3. 11. and that was the Cup which our Saviour foretold *Zebedee*'s Children that they ſhould drink, and the Baptiſm wherewith they were to be baptized.] He teaches, That ſince Jeſus Chriſt was baptized to ſanctifie the Waters of Baptiſm, we muſt deſcend into the Water to be ſanctified, and as the Holy Spirit did then viſibly appear, ſo now he deſcends likewiſe, though after an inviſible manner, upon thoſe that are baptized, if they be well prepared for it. In ſhort, he ſtill exhorts thoſe to whom he ſpeaks, to prepare themſelves in the remaining part of *Lent*, that ſo they may obtain by Baptiſm the Pardon of their Sins, and the Grace of the Holy Spirit.

St. *Cyril* begins in the Fourth Catechetical Diſcourſe, with the Explication of the Articles of our Faith. He ſays in his *Exordium*, 'That the worſhip of God conſiſts in two things, in the belief of 'thoſe Doctrines that Religion teaches us, and in the practice of Good Works; That Faith is unprofitable without Good Works, and that Good Works will prevail nothing without Faith. He obſerves, 'That the Articles of Faith are oppoſed by Pagans, Jews and Hereticks; and therefore it is neceſſary 'to propoſe it, and explain it to thoſe that enter into the Church'. He ſays, That before he explains them more largely, he will firſt give a Summary of them, and prays thoſe that are already inſtructed, to hear with Patience his Catechetical Diſcourſes. Afterwards he ſummarily explains the chief Doctrines of our Religion. He inſtructs them concerning the Divinity, 'That there is but one God 'only, the Creator of all things, who is every where preſent, who knows all things, who can do all things, 'who never changes, who will reward the Good and puniſh the Wicked, *&c.* He adds, That we muſt 'believe alſo in Jeſus Chriſt our Lord, the only Son of God, God begotten of God, like in all things 'to him who begat him, who was from all Eternity, who ſitteth now at his right hand and reigneth 'with him; That we muſt not believe, that the Son is of another Nature than the Father, nor confound the Perſons of the Father and the Son; That he is the *Word*, and the Word of God, but a 'Word ſubſiſting, which is nothing like to the word of Men; That this Word was truly and really 'united to the Humane Nature; That he aſſum'd real Fleſh from the Virgin; That he was truly Man, 'ſubject to Humane Infirmities, and to Death it ſelf; That he was crucified for our Sins; That he was 'buried in the Grave, and that he deſcended into Hell to deliver the juſt, who had been ſhut up 'there a long time with *Adam*; That he was truly riſen from the Dead; That being aſcended into 'Heaven, he was worſhipp'd by all the World, and that he ſhall come again to judge the Quick and 'the Dead, and to eſtabliſh an Eternal Kingdom. Concerning the Holy Spirit, he Teaches, That we 'ought to have the ſame Notions of him as of the Father and the Son: That he is One, Indiviſible and 'Almighty; That he knows all things; That he deſcended in the form of a Dove upon Jeſus Chriſt; 'That he ſpoke by the Prophets; That he Sanctifies the Soul in Baptiſm, and that he ought to be 'honoured as the Father and the Son, being one and the ſame Divinity. He exhorts his Auditors to 'hold faſt this Creed, and gives them Notice, That he will prove it in the following Diſcourſe by Teſtimonies of Scripture': *For*, ſays he, *we ought not to teach any thing concerning Divine Myſteries, but what we can confirm by the Teſtimonies of Scripture. Do not believe what I ſay, if I do not prove it by the Holy Scriptures.*

St. *Cyril*, after having inform'd thoſe whom he inſtructs, what they ought to believe concerning the Divinity, acquaints them with the Knowledge of their own Natures, teaching them that they are compos'd of Body and Soul; That the Soul is immortal, becauſe of Jeſus Chriſt who has given it Immortality; That it is free, and has the power of doing Good and Evil; That it did not Sin before it came into the World; That the Souls of Men and Women are of the ſame Nature; That the Body is the Work of God; That it is not Wicked by Nature; That when it meets with a holy Soul, it is the Temple of the Holy Spirit, and that we ought to be very watchful leſt we defile it by Uncleanneſs. He occaſionally takes Notice, 'That Virginity is the more perfect State, but that we ought not to 'blame Marriage; That Married Perſons may hope for Salvation, provided they uſe Marriage aright; 'That in Order to their living Holily in this ſtate, they muſt abſtain ſometimes from the uſe of Marriage to give themſelves unto Prayer, and that their Intention ſhould not be to ſatisfie a brutal Paſſion, but to have Children. He adds, That we ought not to condemn even thoſe that proceed 'to Second Marriages, and that this weakneſs ſhould be pardon'd in thoſe who ſtand in need of this 'Remedy to avoid Fornication'.

As

As to what concerns Abſtinence from Meat, St. *Cyril* ſays, 'That Chriſtians do abſtain during their 'Faſts from Fleſh and Wine; but that they have no averſation to thoſe things, as if they were in 'themſelves Abominable; That they do not abſtain but to Merit the more, by deſpiſing what is 'agreeable to our ſenſe, that they may enjoy the heavenly Feaſt. He abſolutely forbids the Eating of 'things Sacrificed to Idols, and things Strangled. As for Cloaths, he deſires that they may be modeſt, and ſuch as may ſerve not to adorn but to cover the Body, and defend it from the Injuries of the Weather. He ſpeaks afterwards of the Reſurrection, and brings Examples to ſhow that it is not impoſſible. The Holy Scripture is the laſt thing of which he treats in this Lecture: He ſays, That the Old Teſtament is part of the Holy Scripture, and exhorts them not to read the Apocryphal Books: He informs them, That there are but 22 Canonical Books of the Old Teſtament, and obſerves, That they have been tranſlated by the LXX. He believes that this Tranſlation was made by Inſpiration, and that the Seventy Interpreters being ſhut up in ſeparate Cells, all their Verſions were found to agree together. He recommends the Reading of the Canonical Books, and Meditation upon them; He reckons amongſt this Number in the Old Teſtament the Book of *Ruth*, that of *Eſther*, *Job* and *Baruch*; but he does not reckon thoſe other Books which are not in the Hebrew Canon. The Canonical Books of the New Teſtament are according to him, The Four Goſpels, the Acts of the Apoſtles, the Seven Canonical Epiſtles, and the Fourteen Epiſtles of St. *Paul*, which in his time and in his Country were at the End of the New Teſtament, after the Canonical Epiſtles. He ſays nothing of the Revelation. He condemns Judicial Aſtrology, Necromancy, Publick Spectacles, Games, Uſury, Covetouſneſs, the other Superſtitions of the Jews and Pagans, and the Aſſemblies of Hereticks.

St. *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem.*

In the Fifth Lecture, after he has proved by many Examples the Neceſſity, and Vertue of Faith, he ſays, *That we muſt continue in that Faith which we have received from the Church, and which is fortified with the Teſtimony of Holy Scripture. But*, ſays he, *becauſe Men cannot read the Scripture, ſome being hindred by their Ignorance, others by their Worldly Buſineſs; therefore all that we are oblig'd to believe is compriz'd in a few words. I pray you then to remember to fix it upon your Minds, and to be fully perſwaded that this is the only true Faith. Afterwards at your Leiſure ye may ſearch for the Proofs of it in the Holy Scripture. But at preſent do you acquieſce in the Doctrine which you have learn'd by Tradition, engrave it upon your Hearts, that you may perſevere in it with Piety: for if you remain in doubt and uncertainty, 'tis to be fear'd, that the Enemy will work your Perdition, and that Hereticks will overthrow that Doctrine which I have taught you.*

The Sixth is concerning the Monarchy, or the Unity of God, againſt Pagans and Hereticks. He deſcribes the Errors both of the one and the other, and more particularly enlarges upon the Hereſie of the *Manichees*, and gives an account of its Original, Progreſs and Impiety. He produces a Fragment of the Diſpute of *Archelaus* againſt the Heretick *Manes*. He obſerves, That Men cannot comprehend the Nature and Eſſence of God.

In the Seventh, he explains how the Name of Father agrees to God. He obſerves that he has only one Son by Nature, who is Jeſus Chriſt, and that Men are his Children by Adoption. He takes occaſion from hence to exhort his Hearers to live worthy of the Title of the Sons of God, and to honour him, though of his good Pleaſure he choſe them to be his Children. At the ſame time he admoniſhes them to have a Reverence for their Fathers and Mothers.

In the Eighth he ſhows, That God is Almighty becauſe he can do all things, and all things depend on his Power.

The Ninth is upon theſe words, *the Creator of all things viſible and inviſible.* There he ſhows what cauſe we have to admire the Greatneſs and Beauty of God's Works.

The Tenth is upon theſe Words, *in Jeſus Chriſt our only Lord.* He ſays, That in order to the Pious Adoration of the Father, we muſt adore the Son alſo. He explains all the Names that are given him. He maintains, That 'twas the Son who appear'd to *Adam* and *Moſes*. He makes Moral Remarks upon the Name of *Jeſus*, and that of *Chriſt*. He produces many Proofs concerning Jeſus Chriſt, and places in this number the Wood of the Croſs, *which*, ſays he, *is ſeen to this day amongſt us, and with thoſe who having taken of it here, have fill'd the whole World almoſt with it.*

The Eleventh is concerning the Divinity of the Word, and his Eternal Generation: There he refutes the Error of the *Arians*, and proves that the Word is of the ſame Nature with the Father; That he was from all Eternity, and that he made all things: There he calls St. *Peter* the Prince or the Chief of the Apoſtles, and the Sovereign Preacher of the Church.

The Twelfth is concerning the Incarnation, where he ſhews by many Teſtimonies of Scripture; That Jeſus Chriſt was made Man for the Salvation of Mankind. He quotes ſome of the Prophecies that foretold the Incarnation of Jeſus Chriſt; and ſhews, That the time of the Meſſias's coming, the place where he was Born, his Condition, and the manner of his coming into the World, were foretold; he praiſes Virginity, and obſerves, That thoſe who perform'd the Sacerdotal Office, obſerv'd Celibacy.

In the Thirteenth, he relates the Prophecies which concern the Death and Paſſion of Jeſus Chriſt. He recommends to the Faithful, the Signing themſelves with the Sign of the Croſs on their Forehead, in Eating and Drinking, at their going out and coming in, at their lying down, *&c.* He calls this Sign, the Terror of Devils, and the Mark of the Faithful. He ſays, That it drives away Devils; That it cures Diſeaſes; That it defeats Inchantments, and that at one Day it will appear in the Heavens when Jeſus Chriſt ſhall come to judge the World.

He proves in the Fourteenth, the Reſurrection and Aſcenſion of Jeſus Chriſt, where he commends the Piety of thoſe Emperours, who built the Church of the Reſurrection at *Jeruſalem*, where he was, and adorned it with Gold and Silver.

The

St. *Cyril of Jeruſalem.*

The Fifteenth is concerning the Second coming of Jeſus Chriſt, of the End of the World, and of Anti-Chriſt, who will come, ſays he, after the Deſtruction of the *Roman* Empire. He ſays many more particulars of him, which he endeavours to prove by Prophecies, but the explications he gives of them are not very Solid. He obſerves, That the Schiſms which he then ſaw in the Church, made him fear that the Reign of Anti-chriſt was not far off. After this he Diſcourſes of the laſt Judgment and of the Eternal Kingdom of Jeſus Chriſt. He refutes the Opinion of *Marcellus* of *Ancyra*, who had ſaid, That the Son ſhould not Reign any more after the Day of Judgment. He makes very curious Remarks upon the particle *Until*, and ſhows, that it is not always excluſive, as when it is ſaid, *That Death Reigned from* Adam *until* Moſes, where the meaning is not, That it did not Reign after *Moſes*.

The Sixteenth Lecture, is concerning the Holy Spirit. He obſerves, That we ought to take good heed, leſt we ſay any thing through Ignorance or Error, which is contrary to the Belief we ought to have concerning the Holy Spirit, becauſe 'tis written, That the Blaſphemies which are ſpoken againſt him, are unpardonable. Therefore he declares, That he will ſay nothing of the Holy Spirit, but what is ſaid of him in the Holy Scripture, and that he will not enquire by an indecent Curioſity after that which is not written. *'Tis the Holy Spirit*, ſays he, *who dictated the Holy Scripture: he hath ſaid of himſelf what he would have us to know, and what we are capable of knowing about him.* He begins with giving an Account of the Errors of Hereticks concerning the Holy Spirit, and afterwards recites what is ſaid of him in the Holy Scripture; he deſcribes his Effects, and attributes to him all the good Thoughts and good Actions of the Faithful.

He continues the ſame Subject in his 17th. Lecture, where he produces the Teſtimonies of our Lord concerning the Holy Spirit. He has exactly Collected in theſe two Catechetical Lectures, all that is ſaid of the Holy Spirit in the Old and New Teſtament. He teaches, That the Holy Spirit is not a Breath form'd by the Mouth of the Father and the Son, but that he is a Perſon ſubſiſtent of the ſame Nature with the Father and the Son. He calls St. *Peter*, the Prince of the Apoſtles, and the Porter of Heaven. He obſerves, That the Determination of the Council of *Jeruſalem*, was a General or Oecumenical Law, which all the Earth had, and did ſtill obſerve.

The Laſt of thoſe Lectures which are addreſs'd to the *Enlightned*, is of the Reſurrection, of the Church, and of Eternal Life. 'In the beginning he ſhows, That the hope of the Reſurrection is the 'Foundation of all good Actions, becauſe the expectation of this reward, excites Men to labour for 'it. 'Twas this that made him ſay, that the Faith of the Reſurrection is a great encouragement, 'and a very neceſſary Doctrine.' He brings for proof of the Reſurrection, the Juſtice of God, which requires, that Sinners which are not puniſh'd in this World ſhould be puniſh'd in another, and that the Righteous who are miſerable here below, ſhould be recompenc'd in another Life. He ſays, That all Men have naturally ſome Knowledge of the Reſurrection, and that upon this Account, they have a horror of thoſe who rob the Dead. He brings many Illuſtrations of it taken from the changes in Nature. He does not forget the Example of the *Phœnix*, for which he cites St. *Clement* for his Authority. He obſerves, That the Generation of Man, is no leſs wonderful than the Reſurrection, and that God who could Create the Univerſe of nothing, can eaſily raiſe a dead Man. After he has employ'd theſe Reaſons againſt the Pagans, he alledges againſt the Samaritans the wonderful Effects of the Divine Power related in the Old Teſtament, and proves the Reſurrection of the Dead by many paſſages of the Prophets. [This ſeems to be a miſtake; the Sadducees were the only Sect of the Jews that denyed a Reſurrection.] In ſpeaking of the dead Man, rais'd at the Sepulchre of *Eliſha*, he ſays, *That by this Example we may know, that we ought not only to honour the Souls of the Saints, but alſo to ſhow Reverence to the Relicts of their Bodies, ſince they have ſuch Power and Virtue.* The Second Part of this Inſtruction, is concerning the Catholick Church. He ſays, 'It is ſo called, becauſe it is ſpread 'over all the Earth; Becauſe it univerſally receives all the Articles of Faith; Becauſe it generally 'cures all Sins; and Laſtly, Becauſe it poſſeſſes all Graces, and all Virtues. He ſays, it is called the 'Church, becauſe it is an Aſſembly of the Faithful; That the Hereticks have alſo their Aſſemblies or 'their Churches; That to diſcern the one from the other, when you go to any place, you muſt not 'ask barely where is the Church, or the Houſe of the Lord, becauſe the Hereticks give this Name to 'their Temples; but you muſt ask where is the Catholick Church, becauſe this is a Name proper to 'this Holy Mother of all faithful Chriſtians, which is the Spouſe of Jeſus Chriſt. 'In ſhort, The laſt part of this Lecture, is of Eternal Life. 'Tis very Remarkable that in the Creed which St. *Cyril* uſed there is found *Life Everlaſting*, becauſe as we have obſerved in the Firſt Volume of our *Bibliotheca*, almoſt all the ancient Creeds, end with *the Reſurrection of the Fleſh*. St. Cyril adds to it *Baptiſm*, whereof he had already ſpoken, *the Catholick Church and Life Everlaſting*: He ſays upon the laſt Article, That the Eternal Life of Chriſtians is the Poſſeſſion of the moſt Holy Trinity. He concludes this Lecture with a Promiſe to his Auditors, that he would explain after *Eaſter*, the Sacred Myſteries which they were to receive upon the Chriſtian Altar, and with an Exhortation to rejoyce, becauſe the time of their Redemption, Salvation, and Regeneration approach'd.

The Five other Lectures which are call'd *Myſtagogical*, are addreſs'd by St. *Cyril* to the ſame Perſons after they had received the Grace of Baptiſm. The firſt is about the Vow which is made in Baptiſm to renounce the Devil, his Works and all his Pomps. He declares to his Auditors, the Importance of performing this Vow. He ſays, That the Works of the Devil are Sins, and that his Pomps are Shows, Plays and Profane Feaſts. There is in this firſt Lecture a Paſſage expreſly for Tranſubſtantiation: *For*, ſays he, *as the Bread and Wine of the Euchariſt, which are nothing before the Invocation of the moſt Holy Trinity, but Bread and Wine, become after this Invocation, the Body and Blood of Jeſus Chriſt. So thoſe Meats which ſerve for the Pomp of the Devil, though they be pure of their own Nature, be-*

come

come impure by the Invocation of Devils. [All theſe Paſſages are neceſſarily to be underſtood, according to thoſe Notions wherein the Chriſtians of that Age had been uſually Inſtructed.] St. *Cyril of Jeruſalem.*

In the Second, he treats of the Ceremonies and Effects of Baptiſm: He ſays, That the Catechumens after they were unclothed, were anointed from the Feet unto the Head, with exorciſed Oyl; That after this they were conducted to the Laver; That they were ask'd, if they believed in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit; That after they had made Profeſſion of this Faith, they were plunged three times into the Water, and that they retir'd out of it by degrees, at three times likewiſe. He teaches them, That the Baptiſm of Jeſus Chriſt, does not only remit Sins as that of *John* the Baptiſt did, but alſo fills the Soul with the Gifts of the Holy Spirit, and makes us the Children of God by Adoption.

The Third is of Holy Chriſm, wherewith the Faithful were anointed immediately after they came out of the Waters of Baptiſm. He declares to them, That we ought not to imagine this to be common Oyl. *For*, ſays he, *as the Bread of the Euchariſt after the Invocation of the Holy Spirit, is no more common Bread, but the Body of Jeſus Chriſt. So the Holy Chriſm after Conſecration, is no more common Oyl, but it is a Gift of the Holy Spirit, which has the Virtue to procure the preſence of the Divinity. So while the Forehead and other parts of the Body are anointed with this viſible Oyl, the Soul is ſanctified by this Holy and quickning Spirit.* He obſerves afterwards, That they anointed the Forehead, the Ears, the Noſtrils, and the Breaſt.

The Fourth Lecture is of the Body and Blood of Jeſus Chriſt; and the Fifth, of the Celebration of the Euchariſt. Theſe two Catechetical Lectures, are ſo clear, and ſo ſtrong, for eſtabliſhing the Doctrine and Diſcipline of the Church about the Euchariſt; That we cannot excuſe our ſelves from ſetting them down almoſt entire. Take then as follows the Tranſlation of them which has been Printed in the Office of the Holy Sacrament.

" The Doctrine of the bleſſed St. *Paul* alone, is ſufficient to give certain proofs of the Truth of the " Divine Myſteries, and the Church having judged you worthy to partake of them, ye are by this " means ſo cloſely united to Jeſus Chriſt, that ye are no more as one may ſay, but one and the ſame " Body and Blood with him. For this great Apoſtle ſays, in the place which we have already read, " That our Lord in the ſame Night wherein he was delivered up to his Enemies, having taken Bread " and given Thanks to God his Father, broke it and gave it to his Diſciples, ſaying to them, *Take* " *and Eat, This is my Body.* Afterwards he took the Cup, and having given Thanks, he ſaid unto " them, *Take and Drink, This is my Blood.* Seeing then, that he ſpeaking of the Bread, declared, " That it was his Body, Who ſhall ever dare to call in queſtion this Truth? And ſince that, he ſpeak- " ing of the Wine, has aſſured us ſo poſitively, That it was his Blood, Who can ever doubt of it? And " who ſhall dare to ſay, 'Tis not true that it was his Blood?

" Jeſus Chriſt being at a certain time in *Cana* of *Galilee*, changed there the Water into Wine by his " Will only; and ſhall we think, that it is not as worthy of Credit upon his own Word, that he " changed the Wine into his own Blood? If he being invited to a humane and earthly Marriage, " wrought there this Miracle, tho' no Perſon expected it from him there, ought not we much rather " to acknowledge, that he has given to the Children of the heavenly Spouſe, his Body to Eat, and " his Blood to Drink, that his Body and Blood may be nouriſhment to their Souls? For under the " ſpecies of Bread, he has given us his Body, and under the ſpecies of Wine, he has given us his Blood, " that ſo being made partakers of this Body and Blood, ye may become one Body and one Blood " with him. For by this means we become, as one may ſay, *Chriſtiferi*, that is to ſay, we carry Jeſus " Chriſt in our Body when we receive into our Mouth, and into our Stomach, his Body and his Blood: " And thus according to St. *Peter*, we are made partakers of the Divine Nature.

" Jeſus Chriſt ſpeaking at another time to the Jews, ſays to them, Unleſs ye Eat my Fleſh and " drink my Blood, ye ſhall have no Life in you. *But theſe groſs and Carnal Men not underſtanding* " *the Words ſpiritually, were offended with them, and withdrew from him, becauſe they imagined, that* " *he would make them eat humane Fleſh by morſels.* [Theſe Words do ſo fully explain St. *Cyril*'s Sence, that they need no Comment. If the Jews were offended becauſe they did not *ſpiritually underſtand* thoſe Words of Jeſus Chriſt, when he talked to them in the *6th.* of St. *John*; how much more according to this Father's way of Reaſoning, Would the Diſciples have been offended, if they had underſtood Jeſus Chriſt literally, when he Inſtituted the Sacrament of the Euchariſt?] " There were in the " Old Diſpenſation Loaves of Bread which were offer'd before God, and becauſe they pertain'd to " that Old Diſpenſation, they have ceas'd with it: But now in the New diſpenſation, there is Bread " from Heaven, and a Cup of Salvation, which Sanctifies Soul and Body. For as the Bread is the " Nouriſhment which is proper to the Body, ſo the Word is the Nouriſhment which is proper to the " Soul. Wherefore I conjure you, my Brethren, not to conſider them any more as common Bread " and Wine, ſince they are the Body and Blood of Jeſus Chriſt according to his Word. For tho' your " Senſe inform you, that 'tis not ſo, yet Faith ſhould perſwade and aſſure you, that 'tis ſo. Judge " not therefore of this Truth by your Taſte, but let Faith make you believe with an entire certainty, " that you have been made worthy to partake of the Body and Blood of Jeſus Chriſt.

" Let your Soul rejoyce in the Lord, being perſwaded of it as a thing moſt certain, that the Bread " which appears to our Eyes is not Bread, tho' our taſte do judge it to be ſo, but that it is the Body " of Jeſus Chriſt, and that the Wine which appears to our Eyes is not Wine, tho' our Senſe of Taſte " takes it for Wine, but that it is the Blood of Jeſus Chriſt.

" Ye have ſeen that a Deacon gives Water to waſh the Hands to the Prieſt that officiates, and to the " Prieſts that are about the Altar of God. Think you that this was done to cleanſe the Body? No, " not at all; For we do not uſe to be in ſuch a Condition, when we enter into the Church, as to ſtand

St. *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem.*

" in need of ſuch waſhing to make us clean; but this waſhing of the Hands ſignifies, that we ſhould " be clean from all our Sins; for the Hands ſignifying Actions, to waſh our Hands is nothing elſe but " to purifie our Works. Afterwards the Deacon having ſaid with a loud voice, *Embrace and kiſs* " *one another with a kiſs of Peace*, we do all mutually Salute with a holy Kiſs, becauſe it is the Token " of the perfect reconciliation of our Hearts, and of forgetting all the injuries that have been received. " After this, the Prieſt that officiates, ſays with a loud voice, *Lift up your Hearts*, becauſe in this tre- " mendous Moment chiefly, our Hearts ſhould be raiſed up to God, and not depreſs'd towards the " things of this World. Therefore the Prieſt requires all thoſe that are preſent at the Sacrifice, to " baniſh from their Minds at this time, all Thoughts of the World, and all the Cares of their Dome- " ſtick Affairs, that their Hearts may be in Heaven, in the preſence of God who hath teſtified ſo great " Love to Mankind. At theſe words of the Prieſt, ye Anſwer, *We lift up our Hearts unto the* " *Lord*; and ſo ye profeſs to do what he has ſaid. The Prieſt adds, *Let us give Thanks unto the Lord.* " And we ought indeed, to give thanks to him, that we, unworthy as we are of ſo rare and ſo excel- " lent a Gift, are honoured with the Participiation of it; that he of his Goodneſs has reconciled us " who were Enemies to himſelf, and that he deſigns to make us who have been ſo great Sinners, be- " come his Children by the Spirit of Adoption which he communicates to us. Ye anſwer at theſe words " of the Prieſt, *'Tis juſt and reaſonable to give Thanks unto him*: For when we give Thanks to God, " we do a thing that is juſt, and which we are obliged to do; but when God beſtows upon us ſo great " Bleſſings he does it not out of Juſtice, but out of pure Grace and Favour.

" Afterwards, we repeat the Sacred Hymn which the Seraphims ſing in Heaven, in honour of the " Three Perſons of the Trinity, that ſo by this moſt heavenly Song, we may communicate with the " ſublime Hoſt of Angels, and that being Sanctified more and more by theſe moſt Spiritual Hymns, " we may become the fitter to pray unto ſo Good and ſo Gracious a God, that he would ſend down the " Holy Spirit upon thoſe things that we offer unto him, and that he would make the Bread be- " come the Body of Jeſus Chriſt, and the Wine his Blood: For whatſoever receives the Impreſſion of " the Holy Spirit, is ſanctified and changed. [This ſhew's againſt thoſe who urge St. *Cyril*'s Words for Tranſubſtantiation, that he did not think the change of the Elements (whatever it is) depends ſolely upon the Prieſt's repeating the Words of Conſecration.] " Now when this Spiritual Sacrifice is " ended, and this unbloody Worſhip which is given to God by means of the Expiatory Victim is con- " cluded, Then we pray to him for the univerſal Peace of all the Churches, for the Tranquility of the " whole World, for Kings, for their Armies and their Allies, for the Sick and Afflicted, and in a word, " for all thoſe that need God's help. And we ſay unto God, Lord, we all pray unto thee, and offer " up this Sacrifice, that by commemorating thoſe who are dead before us, *viz.* the Patriarchs, Prophets, " Apoſtles and Martyrs, you may receive our Prayers Graciouſly, for the merit of their Prayers: Then " we pray for the Holy Fathers and the Biſhops that are dead, and in ſhort, for all thoſe that are de- " parted this Life in our Communion, believing that their Souls receive very great Relief, by the Pray- " ers that are offered for them in this holy and tremendous Sacrifice which is upon the Altar. This " I ſhall eaſily make you underſtand by an Example: For I know there are many who ſay, What " good can it do to a Soul which is departed out of this Life, whether with Sins or without them, to " remember it at this Sacrifice? But tell me, I pray you, If a King had ſent into baniſhment ſome Per- " ſons that had offended him, and their Friends and Relations ſhould preſent him with a Crown of " great Price to appeaſe his Anger, Don't you think, that upon their Account, the King would ſhow " ſome Favour to the guilty Perſons, and at leaſt mitigate their Pains? So do we addreſs our Prayers " to God for thoſe that are dead, tho' they were Sinners, not by preſenting to him a Crown, but by " offering up to him Jeſus Chriſt himſelf, who was ſacrificed for our Sins, that ſo he who is ſo Merciful " and Good, may become Gracious to them as well as to us. After this you ſay, *Our Father which art* " *in Heaven*, &c.

" When the Lord's Prayer is ended, the Prieſt ſays, *Holy things are for the Holy*; that is, The " things which are offered upon the Altar, being ſanctified by the deſcent of the Holy Spirit, are for " you that are Holy, by the Infuſion of the ſame Holy Spirit which has been given you; and thus it " is, that Holy things are for them that are Holy. Then ye anſwer, *Jeſus Chriſt alone is Holy*; *He* " *only is the Lord and Maſter.* And 'tis not without reaſon, that ye ſpeak after this manner, becauſe " indeed, there is none truly Holy, but he only who is ſo of himſelf, and by his own Nature; " and as for you, how Holy ſoever you be, you are not ſo by your own proper Nature, but only " by the participation of Holineſs, by the ſpiritual Exerciſes which you perform, and by the Prayers " which you addreſs to his Supream Majeſty. After this, you hear moſt heavenly and divine Muſick, in- " viting you to partake of the Sacred Myſteries, by chanting forth theſe words; *Taſte and ſee how* " *good the Lord is.* Think you now that you are requir'd to diſcern this by the Senſe of Taſte? No, " by no means; but by the Teſtimony of Faith which is certain, and leaves no doubt. For when you " take them, ye are not commanded to take the Bread and Wine, but to take the Body and Blood of " Jeſus Chriſt, which *they repreſent.* [One that believes with the Church of *Rome*, cannot ſay that the Bread and Wine repreſent the Body and Blood of Jeſus Chriſt.] " Now when you approach to Com- " municate, you muſt not come there with your Hands expanded, nor your Fingers open, but ſup- " porting your right Hand which is to contain ſo great a King, with your left; you receive the Body " of Jeſus Chriſt, into the hollow of this Hand, ſaying *Amen.* Then after you have taken Care to " Sanctifie your Eyes by the touch of ſo Holy and Venerable a Body, you Communicate of it by " eating it. But take heed that nothing of it falls aſide, conſidering the loſs of the leaſt crum, as if " you loſt ſome of your Members. If any one ſhould give you Ingots of Gold, What Care would " you take to watch them, that nothing of them ſhould be loſt? What Precaution then ought we

" to

St. *Cyril* of *Jerusalem.*

to use, to keep the least Crum of a thing that is infinitely more dear and precious than Gold and Diamonds, from falling down? After you have thus communicated of the Body of Jesus Christ, approach to the Cup of his Blood, not by stretching forth your hands, but by bowing your selves as it were to Adore him, and do him Homage, and then say, *Amen.* Then Sanctifie your selves by the Touch of the Blood of Jesus Christ which you receive, and while your Lips are wet, dry them with your hand, and carry it immediately to your Eyes, your Forehead, and your other Organs of sense, to consecrate them. In a word, while you wait for the last Prayer of the Priest, return thanks to God that he has made you worthy to partake of so great and so sublime Mysteries.

I shall not stay to make all the Reflections upon these Passages which have been already made by the most able Defenders of the Church, being perswaded that the Plainness of these words exceeds all that can be said, and that Men need only Eyes to convince them that St. *Cyril* taught the Real Presence, and to make them acknowledge, that the Ceremonies of the Mass are very ancient in the Church.

We have a Letter of St. *Cyril* to *Constantius*, upon the wonderful Apparition of a Luminous Cross, which was seen over the City of *Jerusalem*, mention'd by *Sozomen* in *Ch.* 4. of the 4th. Book of his History, where he also observes, That the Emperour was advertis'd of it by St. *Cyril.* In this Letter he gives great Commendations to the Emperour *Constantius*; he says, That the Cross of Jesus Christ was found in the time of the Emperour *Constantine*; he describes the Apparition of the Sign of the Cross, and concludes with glorifying the Consubstantial Trinity. *Rivet* rejects also this Letter as a Supposititious Writing, and gives no other Reason for his Opinion, but the great Praises which it gives to the Emperour *Constantius.* [*Nazianzen* commends *Constantius* in his Invectives against *Julian* in as high terms as 'tis possible, and yet they were never questioned.] But this is not a sufficient Proof, since we commonly speak so to Princes, and St. *Athanasius* and St. *Hilary* did not use to do otherwise, even after this Emperour had declar'd himself more openly against the Faith of the Church: For this Letter, if it is true, was written a little after St. *Cyril* was Bishop of *Jerusalem.*

We have also a Letter of the Presentation of Jesus Christ in the Temple, which goes under the Name of St. *Cyril* of *Jerusalem*, and nothing hinders us to attribute it to him. But we cannot say this of the Letter written in the Name of St. *Cyril* of *Jerusalem* to St. *Augustine*, concerning the Miracles of St. *Jerom.* Though this Letter was not so ridiculously written as it is, the Title alone would show that it is a gross imposture, since St. *Cyril* was dead before St. *Jerom.*

The Stile of St. *Cyril*'s Catechetick Lectures, is Simple and Natural. 'Tis easie to perceive that they were written in hast, and without much Premeditation. Though they do not dive deeply into the Mysteries, yet they explain them very clearly, and they contain much Learning. One may see there upon every Subject a most exact and exquisite Collection of Passages of Scripture. He sets down the Opinions of the Hereticks and refutes them solidly. He makes very judicious remarks, and explains many Passages of Scripture. I say nothing particularly of his Doctrine, because it is sufficiently explain'd in the Extracts, which we have taken out of his Lectures.

Joannes Grodecius was the first who translated and publish'd the Catechetical Discourses of St. *Cyril*, from a Greek Manuscript of Cardinal *Hosius*, the Pope's Legat at the Council of *Trent.* They were printed in the Year 1564. at *Antwerp* and at *Paris*; In the Year 1560. at *Vienna*, and in 1584 at *Paris.* The Original Greek appear'd quickly after the Latin Version, for *Morellus* printed the 11 first Catechetical Discourses, and the Five last in the Year 1564, from a Manuscript out of Monsieur *de Mesmes*'s Library: They were also printed with a Latin Translation in the same Year at *Cologn* 1564. But at last *Prevotius* having found the Greek of all the Catechetical Discourses of St. *Cyril* in the Manuscripts of the *Vatican* Library, he printed them at *Paris* by *Morellus* in the Year 1609. This Volume is in *Quarto*, and the Version of *Grodecius* in one Page, answering to the Greek Text in the other. 'Twas this Edition which was follow'd by that of *Paris* in the Year 1631.

The Letter concerning the Sign of the Cross, was printed apart by *Morellus*, and since joyn'd to the Catechetical Discourses of St. *Cyril.* The Oration concerning the Presentation of Jesus Christ, was printed at *Cologne* by *Birchmannus* in the Year 1598. These Discourses are all in the *Bibliothecæ Patrum.*

St. EPHREM *the* Syrian, *Deacon of* Edessa.

St. *Ephrem* the *Syrian*, Deacon of *Edessa.*

ST. *EPHREM* was of *Nisibis* a City of *Syria*, or of some place thereabout. He was Born under the Reign of *Constantine*, he embrac'd a Monastick Life from his most tender Youth, and became in a little time the Governor and Superior of many Monks. Coming often to *Edessa* to visit the Church of that City, he was there ordain'd Deacon. He came also as far as *Cæsarea* of *Cappadocia*, where he was known and very well receiv'd by St. *Basil*, who had a most particular esteem for him. 'Tis said, That this Saint taught him Greek, and that he conferr'd upon him the Order of Priesthood; but this Report is not very certain, since the Ancients assure us, that he dyed a Deacon. *Sozomen* tells us, That when he was chosen Bishop of a City, he feign'd himself to be Mad, lest they should carry him away by force, and ordain him against his Will. I shall say nothing here of his Piety, his Charity, his Humility, the Austerity of his Life, nor of his other Christian and Religious Vertues, no more than of his remarkable Actions and his Miracles, because those things do not concern my Subject. I shall only apply my self to speak of his Writings, which were so famous according to the Testimony of St. *Jerom*, that they were publickly read in some Churches after the Reading of the Holy

St. *Ephrem* the *Syrian*, Deacon of *Edeſſa*.

Books, and which were ſo numerous that the whole World was full of them. He wrote them in *Syriack*, and they were tranſlated into Greek in his own time. *Sozomen* obſerves, That though he had never ſtudied, yet he had ſo many Beauties in his Stile, and ſo many Sublime Thoughts, that the Tracts of his Eloquence might be diſcern'd even in the Greek Tranſlation: and St. *Jerom* aſſures us, That having read the Verſion of his Treatiſe concerning the Holy Spirit, he perceived in the Tranſlation the Fineneſs of his Sublime Genius: St. *Gregory Nyſſen* who wrote a Panegyrick upon this Father, inſiſts chiefly upon his Doctrine and Writings. He praiſes the Purity of his Faith, and the Averſation he had to the Hereſies of *Sabellius*, *Arius* and *Apollinarius*. He ſays, That he refuted the *Anomæans* and the *Novatians*; and all his Writings are full of ſolid and convincing Proofs. He adds, That he had read and meditated more than any Perſon upon the Old and New Teſtament, and that he had wrote Expoſitions upon all the Holy Scripture, from the Beginning of *Geneſis* to the End of the New Teſtament; That he had alſo compos'd many lively and Pathetical Exhortations; That Tears and Sighs were very common and familiar with him, as may be ſeen in his Writings. *For*, ſays he, *he does not only ſigh, when he ſpeaks of Morality and the Precepts of Life, but even in his Panegyricks; all his Diſcourſes are mixt with bemoaning and compaſſionate Expreſſions, which are able to move even the hardeſt Hearts. For who that is Proud*, adds he, *would not become the humbleſt of Men, by reading his Diſcourſe of Humility? Who would not be inflam'd with a Divine Fire, by reading his Treatiſe of Charity? Who would not wiſh to be chaſt in Heart and Spirit by reading the Praiſes he has given to Virginity? Who would not be frighted by hearing the Diſcourſe he has made upon the Laſt Judgment, wherein he has repreſented it ſo lively, that nothing can be added to it but the ſame thing? God gave him ſo Profound a Wiſdom, that though he had a wonderful facility of Speaking, yet he could not furniſh Expreſſions for the multitude of Thoughts that came into his mind. We have ſeen*, as the ſame Father ſtill goes on, *one of his Sermons, where he calls* Apollinarius *a Madman*. He tells a very pleaſant Story of a trick that St. *Ephrem* put upon this Heretick. He ſays, That the Heretick had written two Books, wherein were all the Reaſons and Paſſages of Scripture, that he made uſe of to defend his Error, and which he had committed to the Cuſtody of a Woman; That St. *Ephrem* pretending that he was of the ſame Judgment with *Apollinarius*, had borrowed them of this Woman, and that before he reſtor'd them, he glued all the Leaves faſt to one another: That this Woman ſeeing the Books bound up after the ſame manner, perceiv'd nothing of what was done, but gave them as they were to *Apollinarius*, to make uſe of them in a publick Conference which he was to have with a Catholick, and that then the Heretick not being able to open them, was forc'd to withdraw with ſhame. The quickneſs of St. *Ephrem*'s Wit appeared alſo in the Syriack Verſes which he made in his own Language, in imitation of *Hammonius* the Son of *Bardeſanes*, who had compos'd many Hymns which the Syrians Sung with Delight. St. *Ephrem* perceiving that this Author had cunningly interſpers'd in thoſe Prayers, ſome Errors of his Father, and of the Greek Philoſophers, fearing leſt the Chriſtians of *Syria*, might fall inſenſibly into theſe falſe Opinions, he endeavour'd with all his might to comprehend the Metre of theſe Verſes, and wrote other Books agreable to the Doctrine of the Church, as Hymns and the Encomiaſticks of the Saints, which were ſo well receiv'd by the *Syrians*, that they Sung them to the ſame Tunes with thoſe of *Hammonius*. 'Tis ſaid, That he compos'd almoſt 100000 Verſes of this Nature. *Sozomen* ſays alſo, That he wrote the Life of St. *Julianus*. To conclude, *Photius* in Volume 197 of his *Bibliotheca*, obſerves that he had read 50 Sermons of this Father.

It appears by what we have already ſaid, That *Ephrem* wrote Commentaries upon all the Bible, Treatiſes of Controverſie againſt many Hereticks, a Book of the Holy Spirit, a great many Diſcourſes and Inſtructions to the People, and to his Monks, ſome Panegyricks, many Treatiſes of Morality, and a great number of Hymns to be Sung in the Church: That all his Writings were compoſed in Syriack, and that the greateſt part of them were tranſlated into Greek while he was living. We have none of his Commentaries upon Scripture, nor his Treatiſes of Controverſie; but we have a great number of Diſcourſes of Moral Precepts, and of Hymns which have been tranſlated into Greek, and publiſh'd by *Voſſius* towards the end of the laſt Age, under St. *Ephrem*'s Name. Some Criticks, to whom the Books concerning a Monaſtick Life are not agreeable, have pretended that all thoſe Books are Suppoſititious. Notwithſtanding 'tis very probable, that the greateſt part of them are truly St. *Ephrem*'s, becauſe all the Characters that the Ancients give of the Writings of St. *Ephrem*, agree to theſe; ſo that 'tis eaſie to know them. 1. The Treatiſes of St. *Ephrem* were full of Figures and Ornaments, but yet without Fineneſs and Art; now theſe are all fill'd with Exclamations, Interrogations, Compariſons, Antitheſes and other Figures, which are groſly enough employ'd and without choice. 2. He had much Vivacity and Fire, which theſe are all full of. 3. St. *Ephrem* related many Paſſages of Scripture, and theſe Writings are oftentimes nothing elſe but a Collection. 4. St. *Gregory Nyſſen* ſays, That they were mix'd with bemoaning Expreſſions, with Sighs and Tears; That he ſpoke continually of Weeping even in his Panegyricks: This is properly the Character of the greateſt part of the Diſcourſes publiſh'd by *Voſſius*. 5. The ſame Father ſays, That he wrote Diſcourſes of Humility, Charity, in Praiſe of Virginity, and of the laſt Judgment. There are Diſcourſes upon all theſe Subjects amongſt thoſe that were publiſh'd by *Voſſius*, and have the ſame Character which this Father obſerv'd in St. *Ephrem*'s Books; that is to ſay, that they are pathetical and moving. 6. He wrote many Hymns upon divers Subjects, and there are among the Books which go under his Name, many Pieces written in Verſe, and of a Poetical Stile. 7. His Teſtament which is related in this Edition, is the ſame with that which is quoted by St. *Gregory Nyſſen*, who produces two paſſages out of it, which are word for word in that which was publiſh'd by *Voſſius*. 8. We have among theſe Books, The Life of *Julianus* cited by *Sozomen*, *B.* III. of his Hiſtory, *Ch.* 14. In fine, The 49 Sermons of St. *Ephrem*, whereof *Photius* made an Extract, are found in theſe Works of St. *Ephrem*. The ſame *Photius* quotes a Diſcourſe

of

of Humility divided into a 100 Chapters, which is in the second Tome, a Discourse upon the same Vertue, which is in the first Tome, and a Treatise of Vertues and Vices to the *Metebian* Monks, which is also in the first Volume, and which contains the same Matters in the same Order. These Reasons plainly show, that the greatest part of the Books, which at present go under St. *Ephrem*'s Name, are the same with *Gregory Nyssen*, *Theodoret*, *Sozomen* and *Photius*, attributed to this Saint. Now what probability is there, that they should take the Works of another Author for those of St. *Ephrem*? St. *Gregory Nyssen*, could not be deceiv'd herein, who liv'd at the same time. What probability is there, that *Photius*, who was a very able Critick, and who distinguishes our St. *Ephrem* from the Patriarch of *Antioch*, who mentions the Works of the one and the other, in two different places of his *Bibliotheca*; What probability is there, I say, that he should quote a false *Ephrem* for a true one?

St. *Ephrem* the *Syrian*, Deacon of *Edessa*.

'Tis objected 1. That there is not found in his Works that Fire and Loftiness which are mention'd by St. *Jerom* and *Sozomen*, and that they seem to be rather Pious than Learned, according to the Judgment of Cardinal *Bellarmin*. I answer, That tho' there were not found in a Latin Version of the Works of any Author made from another Greek Version, all that Beauty and Loftiness which they had in their Original Language, we should not wonder at it: But those who object this, do not rightly apprehend the Sence of St. *Jerom* and *Sozomen*, and have neither a very nice Relish, nor a very right Judgment in this matter. For first of all, St. *Jerom* and *Sozomen*, tacitely confess, That the Translation of the Works of St. *Ephrem* made them lose some part of their Loftiness; but they only observe, That one might perceive some strokes of his Vivacity and Eloquence, even in the Translation it self. 2dly. St. *Jerom* says the same of the Book of the Holy Spirit, and not of the others. Now it may so happen, that this sublime Reasoning of St. *Ephrem*, appear'd more in his Dogmatical Books, than in his Discourses of Devotion, and in his Edifying Exhortations; such as all those are which are now extant. 3dly, 'Tis not true, that no Vein of Eloquence is to be discerned in them. The learned *Photius* did not think so. *On the contrary, we may admire,* says he, *in the Exhortations of this holy Man,* (which are a part of this Book which we now have) *the force wherewith he perswades, his agreeable manner of expressing things, and the Pathetical Phrases that he makes use of. It is no wonder, that his Stile and his Figures, resemble those Homilies which are made off hand, and without premeditation: Neither must we throw this fault upon the Author, but upon the Interpreter, because those that are learned in the Syriack Tongue, know that they excel in abundance of Words, and in Figures of Rhetorick; so that 'tis hard to say, whether it be from their Language, or from his own Invention, that the strength and elevation of his Discourse proceeds. Moreover, we ought not in reading to look only upon the meanness of the Words, but to consider what Advantage and Profit may be reaped from the things that he has written.* [Mr. *Du Pin*, seems to have forgot that he had named Cardinal *Bellarmin* just before.] This Reflection of *Photius*, who was a better Critick in this kind, than *Rivet* and the other Criticks of his way, informs us, that several strokes of the Elevation and Quickness of his Spirit, might be discerned in the Version of St. *Ephrem*'s Discourses, and that one might there perceive the Genius of the Syriack Tongue; and that whatever meanness there may be in his Stile, it ought to be attributed to the Interpreter, and not to the Author.

'Tis objected also, That those Treatises were written by an Author who understood Greek, since he cites St. *Irenæus*, *Ch.* 8. of the Treatise *of Vertue*, and the Life of St. *Anthony* written in Greek by St. *Athanasius*, in *Ch.* 10. of the Treatise upon these words, *Take heed to your selves:* Now St. *Ephrem* did not understand Greek, say they, and by consequence these Treatises are none of his.

'Tis easie to answer this objection. 1. 'Tis not certain that St. *Ephrem* did not understand Greek: on the contrary, 'tis probable that a Man who was often among People that spoke Greek did understand their Language, tho' he was not able enough to write in that Tongue. 2. That though he did not understand Greek, yet he might get the Books of St. *Irenæus*, translated into Syriack; and 'tis probable, that for the use of the Monks of his Country, he procur'd a Syriack Version of the Life of St. *Anthony*, who was look'd upon as the Rule of all the Monks in the East.

3dly. They object to us the little Credit that ought to be given to those that have publish'd his Books: They say, We have them not, but as they come through the hands of the Modern Greeks, who are too much given to Cheat; and that the Latin Versions were made by *Ambrosius Camaldulensis*, and *Vossius Tungrensis*, who were Persons devoted to the Interests of the Court of *Rome*.

But why is it sufficient thus to alledge general and uncertain Reasons for rejecting any Books? If this be sufficient, What is there that we shall not doubt of? The Protestants will have Reason to reject all the Books of the Fathers, which have been publish'd by Catholicks, and Catholicks will have reason to reject all those that have been publish'd by the Protestants. Where shall we be then? This therefore is not the way: But we must suppose that both the one and the other have publish'd the Books which they found in the Manuscripts that fell into their hands; for there is no probability that one Man should be so impudent as to forge many Pieces, and pretend that he found them in Manuscripts; and tho' some Persons should be found capable of doing this, yet 'twere impossible, but their Imposture must be quickly discover'd. They must therefore have other Proofs, besides these general Accusations, to reject any Books as suppositious. But besides, when it is said that we have none of St. *Ephrem*'s Writings, but through the hands of the Modern Greeks, that's a mistake. They were translated while he was alive, as appears by what we have already said. And whereas *Ambrosius Camaldulensis* and *Vossius*, are accus'd of being Impostors, 'tis easie to justifie them by the ancient Greek Manuscripts which are to be found in Libraries.

Lastly, Some places of the Books of this Father are produc'd, which seem to be mean and unworthy of him. 'Tis said, that there is nothing more ridiculous, than what he introduces the damn'd speaking, *We salute you, O Saints, we salute you, O Apostles,* &c. They add, that there are contradictions

dictions in them, for in his Confeſſions, he accuſes himſelf of many Sins, and in his Teſtament he makes himſelf Innocent.

St. *Ephrem* the *Syrian*, Deacon of *Edeſſa*.

To anſwer this Objection in a word, I might ſay, That 'tis a very hard matter to avoid, but ſome weak Thoughts will be found in ſo great a Number of Books of Piety and Devotion. That if one would compare theſe Books with thoſe of our Age, which are of the ſame kind, they might ſee that the latter are infinitely more fill'd with falſe Thoughts, than thoſe of St. *Ephrem*. But the places which *Rivet* has choſe to oppoſe to us, are very weak Proofs. The wicked do not ſalute the Saints in the Treatiſe of Hell Torments; on the contrary, they bid them eternally adieu, after they had heard the Sentence of Condemnation: Neither is there any Contradiction between his Teſtament and his Confeſſions. He confeſſes both in the one and the other place with much humility, that he had ſpent his Life in Sin and Vanity. 'Tis true, that he ſays in his Teſtament, that he had not reproach'd any body, and that he had no quarrel with any of the Faithful; but then he ſays nothing contrary to this in his Confeſſions, and though he ſhould have ſaid it, yet he might ſpeak ſo in humility, as many pious Perſons do in this kind of Confeſſions, wherein they ſpeak oftentimes in the Perſon of another.

I ſhall now draw up a Catalogue, with an Account of the Subjects of St. *Ephrem*'s Works, which are divided into three Tomes.

The 1*ſt*. Diſcourſe of the firſt Tome, is of the Dignity of the Prieſthood, which he exalts as high as it can be exalted. Towards the latter End, he ſpeaks againſt thoſe who intrude into the Prieſtly Office, without being worthy of it, and without being call'd to it. He obſerves, that the Sacerdotal Dignity is conferr'd by impoſition of Hands.

The 2*d*. is an Anſwer to one of his Monks, who had ask'd him, who they were that might uſe that Liberty which St. *Paul* gives to Marry, rather than to Burn. He anſwers, That it concerns only thoſe who are not bound, and who live in the World, but not thoſe who have renounced the World, and embrac'd a Religious Life.

The 3*d*. is concerning the Softneſs of *Eli* the High-Prieſt, who would not chaſtiſe his Sons.

In the 4*th*. he exhorts Chriſtians to celebrate the Feſtivals, and to approach the Holy Myſteries with Purity.

The 5*th*. is concerning Charity towards our Neighbour.

The 6*th*. is concerning the uſefulneſs of Singing Pſalms. There he condemns idle Songs and Dancing.

The 7*th*. is of the Value and Neceſſity of Prayer.

The 8*th*. is of Love of the Poor, and of Alms.

The 9*th*. of Faſting.

The 10*th*. explains that Paſſage in the Goſpel, *There ſhall be two Men in the field, the one ſhall be taken, and the other left*. He is of Opinion, that the Juſt are thoſe who ſhall be taken, and the Wicked thoſe who ſhall be left. He ſeems to explain Hell Fire, Myſtically.

The 11*th*. is concerning the Miſeries of this Life.

The 12*th*. is of the inequality of Happineſs. He obſerves, that tho' all the Happy enjoy the ſame happineſs, yet there are different degrees of it. He aſſures his Auditory, *That there is no middle between Hell and the Kingdom of Heaven*. [Here then by our Author's own Confeſſion, is a poſitive Proof, that an Eminent Father of the Fourth Century, disbelieved a middle State, which not only deſtroys Purgatory, but alſo the Neceſſity of praying to Saints.]

The 13*th*. is alſo of Bleſſedneſs.

The 14*th*. of the Contempt we ought to have of the Riches and Pleaſures of this World.

The 15*th*. is againſt thoſe who every day do Penance, and always relapſe into the ſame Sins.

After theſe Diſcourſes follows a Treatiſe divided into many Chapters, concerning Vertues and Vices. In the Preface he ſhows great Humility in debaſing himſelf below thoſe that had pray'd him to Inſtruct them. Afterwards he diſcovers to them the good Effects of the Fear of God, of the Love of our Neighbour, of Meekneſs, Patience, Sincerity, Obedience, Hope and Continence; and the bad Effects of the contrary Vices.

After theſe Inſtructions, follow 91 Maxims of Piety, and 96 Advices concerning a Spiritual Life, directed to a young Monk.

The 16*th*. Diſcourſe is againſt thoſe who forſake a Monaſtical Life after they have once embrac'd it, to return into the World.

The 17*th*. is concerning perfect Self-denial, and concerning the Peace of Mind, which every one ſhould have in Solitude.

The 18*th*. is of the Sighing of a Soul under Temptation, and of the Tears of Repentance.

The 19*th*. is of the Fear of Death.

The 20*th*. is an humbling Diſcourſe, wherein he acknowledges himſelf guilty of many Faults, and prays his Brethren to implore the Divine Mercy for him.

The 21*ſt*. is an Exhortation to Chriſtian Vigilance.

The 22*d*. is an Exhortation to the Practice of good Works.

The 23*d*. is concerning the Grace of Jeſus Chriſt. He exhorts thoſe to whom he addreſſes himſelf, to follow the attractives of Divine Grace, if they would attain to perfection.

The 24*th*. is concerning Faith, or rather concerning Truſt in the Providence of God.

The 25*th*. is againſt thoſe who ſay, that Earthquakes are cauſed by the Concuſſions of the Earth, and not by the Providence of God. This diſcovers that the Author of thoſe Diſcourſes had not much Learning, ſince it may be truly ſaid, that Earthquakes proceed from natural Cauſes, tho' they are order'd by the Providence of God.

The

St. *Ephrem the Syrian*, Deacon of *Edessa*.

The 26*th.* is against the Superstitions of the Pagans. There he relates, that when the Plague was at *Constantinople*, a Physician nam'd *Domnus*, being desirous to preserve himself by the Superstitions of the Pagans, was seiz'd with the Plague and died, tho' he dwelt in a high place where there was very good Air; that one of his Companions nam'd *Macedonius*, seeing his lamentable Death, quitted the Pagan Religion, and became a Monk. After this, he brings many Passages of Scripture, to prove that the Plague, and those other Calamities wherewith Men are afflicted, are the Effects of God's Vengeance, and that we must make our Application to him, to preserve us from them. He observes, that God sends these Miseries upon Men, to bring them to the knowledge of themselves, and to Repentance.

The 27*th.* is against Pride and a good Opinion of one's self.

The 28*th.* is against those who having enter'd into Monasteries, are guilty of Vices, and particularly of Ambition, Laziness, and Disobedience. At the latter end, he exhorts his Brethren to discharge all the Offices of a Religious Life.

The 29*th.* is against Detraction.

The 30*th.* is upon those Subjects which Christians ought to lament.

The 31*st.* is against Plays and Shows. There he blames those who after they have been present at Divine Offices, go to Dancing, and Sing idle Songs. *To Day*, says he, *they are United to Jesus Christ, and to Morrow they Dishonour him, they Deny him; to Day they are Christians, and to Morrow Pagans; to Day they have Piety, and to Morrow they are Impious; to Day they are Faithful, and the Disciples of Jesus Christ, and to Morrow they are Apostates and the Enemies of God; to Day they hear the Word of Jesus Christ, and to Morrow they apply themselves to hear the Voices and Instruments of Musick, which sing or play profane Songs.*

The 32*d.* is against the Unchast.

The 33*d.* is of that Charity wherewith we should reprove our Brethren that are falleh into any Sin.

The 34*th.* is against Curiosity, and of shunning the occasions of Sin.

The 35*th.* is against Lewd Women.

The 36*th.* is of the means of avoiding the Sin of the Flesh.

The 37*th.* is of the Praise of Charity.

The 38*th.* is of the Preservation of this Vertue, and of the Unhappiness of those that lose it.

The 39*th.* is a Description of that unhappy State to which a Man is reduc'd by Concupiscence. He prays the Lord to give him Grace to preserve him from Shipwracks, amidst the Storms of this Life. He requests of him, That his Heart and his Mouth, may be a pure Temple and without Stain, by the Heavenly Grace; and that it may make his Tongue and Lips to move continually, in Singing forth the Praises of God. This Discourse is one of the Noblest and most Beautiful of them all.

The Four following Discourses are concerning Compunction, or the Remorse we ought to have for offending God. In the 1*st.* he says, That the Grace of God is always ready to enter into our Hearts, whenever they are dispos'd to receive it, or when our evil Thoughts do not put a Bar to it; That in the mean-time, it touches our Soul by the Sweetness of its Light, and makes it return to it self, and seek after the Light; That the Grace of God does never wholly forsake us, and that without Grace, we cannot Repent.

In the 2*d.* he shows, That we ought not to Despair, and that every one may obtain Pardon of his Sin, provided his Heart be pierced with a sincere Sorrow for his Offence against God, and that he change his course of Life.

In the 3*d.* he shows, That we ought to bewail this Life, and to rejoyce at Death.

The 4*th.* is also of the Sorrow we ought to have, and the Tears we ought to shed in this Life.

The 44*th.* and 45*th.* Discourses are about Penance.

The 46*th.* is about Repentance and Conversion.

The 47*th.* is of Penance and Patience.

The 48*th.* is of Patience under the Crosses, and Adversities of this Life.

The 49*th.* is of Constancy and Compunction.

In the 50*th.* he exhorts to Perseverance and Watchfulness, from the dread of the Last Judgment, and the Pains of Hell. He says, That we must always pray, even while we labour with our Hands, we must continually resist Temptation, read the Holy Scripture with Attention and Preparation, and live in Silence and Tranquility: He enlarges particularly, on the Praises of this last Exercise.

After these Discourses, follow several Sentences, call'd the *Beatitudes of St.* Ephrem, in which he recommends above all things, Christian Vigilance to his Brethren.

After these Beatitudes, follow Questions and Answers upon several Subjects, as about the Renunciation promis'd in Baptism; about the Last Judgment; about the different Punishments of the Damned.

This is follow'd with a Treatise of remembring Death, wherein he lays open the Vanity of Riches.

The Second discourse of Death, is attributed to St. *Basil*, and is of a different Stile from St. *Ephrem*'s Discourses.

The following Treatises are of the Resurrection of the Last Judgment, and the things which shall happen when Anti-Christ shall come; and of the Apparition of the Cross at the time of Christ's second Coming. This Relation is ended with Lamentations and Prayers, which are attributed to St. *Ephrem*.

The Second Tome contains the Life of St. *Ephrem*, written by *Simeon Metaphrastes*, choice Sentences drawn from the Books of St. *Ephrem*; a Discourse of St. *Ephrem* about his Conversion; a Spiritual Song concerning the praise of Learning and Wisdom; an Epistle to a Monk about Patience; four Exhortations to a young Monk concerning a Monastick Life; six Chapters of Vertues, necessary to a Monk; twelve Chapters upon these words, *Take heed to your selves*; fifty Exhortations to the young Monks, wherein

St. *Ephrem* the *Syrian*, Deacon of *Edeſſa*.

wherein he exhorts them to Humility, Obedience, Watchfulneſs, to Labour, Devotion, Meekneſs, Patience, to Charity, Reading, Prayer, Temperance, and the Practice of the other Monaſtical Vertues.

The 49*th*. is of the Excellencies of a Monaſtick Life above the Secular. Then follow 100 Maxims, Apophthegms, or Examples of the means for acquiring and preſerving Humility, and the other Monaſtick Vertues; a diſcourſe againſt Covetous Monks; another of the Perfection of a Monk; a Treatiſe of Spiritual Arms, of the Spiritual Combate; an Inſtructive Exhortation about an Aſcetick Life; another Exhortation to Repentance from the ſecond coming of Jeſus Chriſt; nineteen Advertiſements of the Abbot *Ammon*, and the Apophthegms of the ancient Fathers, wherein he ſpeaks of St. *Benedict*.

The Third Tome is divided into three Parts. The I. contains a Treatiſe compos'd in imitation of the Book of *Proverbs*, which is a Collection of Sentences and Maxims for a Spiritual and Monaſtick Life, a Treatiſe of a Religious Life, a Treatiſe of Repentance [or Penance;] a Diſcourſe of the Compunction of the Heart; Another Diſcourſe wherein St. *Ephrem* accuſes himſelf of his Faults, and asks Forgiveneſs; A Diſcourſe of the Reſurrection, of Judgment, and the Pains of the Impious, with an humble Prayer to God. The II. Part contains Panegyricks upon Juſt and Holy Men, whom he propoſes as Examples and Paterns of Vertue: The 1ſt. is upon *Noah*, where he ſpeaks of Continence; The 2d. is upon *Abraham* and *Iſaac*, where he exhorts to Obedience; The 3d. upon *Lot*, and againſt falſe Confidence; The 4th. in Praiſe of the Patriarch *Joſeph*; The 5th. upon *Daniel*, againſt thoſe that ſay, *The times are Evil, we cannot ſave our ſelves*; The 6th. upon *Jonah* and the Repentance of the *Ninevites*; The 7th. upon *Elijah* and the Widow of *Sarepta*; The 9th. upon the Precious Stone that's mention'd in the Goſpel; The 10th. againſt thoſe that ſearch into the Greatneſs of the Divine Nature; The 11th. a Diſcourſe upon our Saviour's Transfiguration; The 12th. of the Paſſion of Jeſus Chriſt; The 13th. the Lamentation of the Virgin upon the Paſſion of her Son; The 14th. upon the Croſs of Jeſus Chriſt, where he ſpeaks of the manner of celebrating Feſtivals among Chriſtians, of the Vertues of the Croſs of Jeſus Chriſt, and the Uſefulneſs of the ſign of the Croſs; The 15th. is of the Praiſes of the Virgin, after which follows a Prayer to the Virgin; The 16th. on the Woman that was a Sinner; The 17th. is a Diſcourſe of St. *Chryſoſtom* about the ſame Woman and a Phariſee; The 18th. is a Panegyrick upon St. *Baſil*, which is publiſh'd in Greek by *Cotelerius*, in the laſt Volume of his *Monumenta Eccleſiæ Græcæ*; The 19th. is in Praiſe of the Forty Martyrs; The 20th. is upon all the Martyrs in the World who have ſuffer'd for Jeſus Chriſt; The 21ſt. is upon the ſame ſubject; The 22d. is upon *Abramius*; The 23d. is upon *Julianus* the Hermit; The 24th is upon the Holy Fathers that died in his own time; The 25th. is upon the ſame Subject: Two Hymns upon the ſame Subject; A Diſcourſe of the Happineſs of thoſe that died in Chriſt, and of the Vanity of this World, of the Uncertainty of Life, and the different kinds of Death. The *Laſt* Monument of St. *Ephrem* is his Teſtament cited by St. *Gregory Nyſſen*, which is properly an Exhortation of this Father, upon his Death-Bed, addreſs'd to his Monks; He deſires them to remember him in their Prayers; He forbids them to keep his Garments as Relicks; He deſires that they would Bury him after a plain manner, and without any Pomp; He conjures them to offer the Sacrifice of the Maſs for him, and enlarges alſo upon the Uſefulneſs of Prayers for the Dead, and upon the Vertue of Sacrifice to blot out Sins: Laſtly, he gives them many wholeſom Advices, and heaps Bleſſings upon his chief Diſciples that were preſent at his Death, which happen'd under the Reign of *Valens*, in the Year 378, on the Firſt Day of *February*.

The firſt that publiſh'd any of the Books of this Father was *Ambroſius Camaldulenſis*, who tranſlated ſome of them into Latin, which were printed at *Breſcia* in 1490. at *Strasburg* in 1509. and at *Cologne* in 1547. Afterwards *Gerard Voſſius*, or *Volkens* of *Borchloon* in *Germany*, ſearch'd out all the Works of this Father, and tranſlated and publiſh'd them in Three Tomes. The Firſt, is dedicated to *Sixtus* the 5th. in 1581; The Second dedicated to *Clement* the 8th. in 1593, and the laſt in 1598. Theſe three Tomes were printed in one Volume at *Cologne* in 1603, and at *Antwerp* in 1619. *Ecchellenſis* publiſh'd at *Rome* in 1645, a Song of the Virgin and the Wiſemen attributed to St. *Ephrem*, tranſlated from the Syriack. *Cotelerius* publiſh'd the Greek of the Panegyrick upon St. *Baſil*, made by St. *Ephrem*, in his laſt Volume of the Monuments of the Greek Church, printed at *Paris* in 1686. 'Twere to be wiſh'd that ſome body would publiſh the Greek Verſions of all the Books of St. *Ephrem*, which are to be found in Libraries; as alſo the Syriack Text of ſome of his Books.

DAMASUS, *Biſhop of* Rome.

Damaſus, Biſhop of *Rome*.

After the Death of Pope *Liberius*, which happen'd in the Year 369, the See of *Rome* being Vacant for ſome time, by reaſon of the Caballing of thoſe that pretended to fill it, *Damaſus* at laſt was choſen by the greater part of the Clergy and People, and Ordain'd by the Biſhops. But on the other ſide, *Urſinus* or rather *Urſicinus*, who was his Competitor for the Popedom, got himſelf Ordain'd by ſome other Biſhops in the Church of *Sicinius*. This Conteſt caus'd a great Diviſion in the City of *Rome*, and ſtirr'd up ſo great a Sedition there as could hardly be appeas'd. The two Parties came from Words to Blows, and a great many Chriſtians were kill'd in the Churches of *Rome* upon this Quarrel. The Governour of *Rome* call'd *Prætextatus*, being deſirous to allay the heat of this Contention, ſent *Urſicinus* into Baniſhment by the Emperor's Order; But his Baniſhment did not perfectly appeaſe the Quarrel; for the Partizan's of *Urſicinus* Aſſembled ſtill in the Churches of which they were poſſeſs'd, without ever communicating with *Damaſus*; and even when the Emperour had order'd that their Churches ſhould be taken from them, they ſtill kept up their Aſſemblies without the City,

City, ſo that it was neceſſary at laſt to drive them quite out of *Rome*. And yet all this did not hinder *Urſicinus* from having his ſecret Aſſociates in *Italy* and at *Rome*. The Biſhop of *Puteoli* call'd *Florentius*, and the Biſhop of *Parma*, were moſt zealous for his Intereſts. They were condemn'd in a Council held at *Rome* in the Year 372, and afterwards baniſh'd by the Authority of the Emperour. However they found means to return into their own Country, and ſtirr'd up new troubles there. They got Pope *Damaſus* to be accus'd by one *Iſaac* a Jew. This Accuſation was examin'd in a Council of Biſhops held at *Rome* in the Year 378, which declar'd *Damaſus* innocent of the Crime that was laid to his Charge. This Council wrote a Letter to the Emperour *Gratian*, praying him to take ſome Order for the Peace of the Church of *Rome*. The Emperour wrote to them, that *Urſicinus* was detain'd at *Cologne*, that he had given Order to baniſh *Iſaac* into a Corner of *Spain*, and to force the Biſhops of *Puteoli* and *Parma*, out of their Country. This did not hinder *Urſicinus* from returning into *Italy* in the Year 381, where he ſtirr'd up new Tumults, and endeavour'd to pre-engage the Emperour: But the Biſhops of *Italy* being aſſembled in a Council at *Aquileia*, in the Year 381, wrote ſo ſmartly to him, that he baniſh'd *Urſicinus* for ever, and left *Damaſus* in peaceable Poſſeſſion of the See of *Rome*, in which he continued until the Year 384. St. *Jerom* places him among the Eccleſiaſtical Writers, becauſe of the many ſhort Tracts which he wrote in Heroick Verſe, to which may be added ſome Letters of his writing: But there are many other Letters which go under his Name, that are ſuppoſititious. I ſhall firſt ſet down thoſe of which there can be no doubt.

Damaſus Biſhop of *Rome*.

The Two Letters of *Damaſus*, directed to St. *Jerom*, are amongſt the Works of this Father. In the firſt, he exhorts this Saint to write to him; and to oblige him by fixing a Subject, he propoſes to him ſome Difficulties about the Holy Scripture. He obſerves in this Letter, That he took no pleaſure in reading the Books of *Lactantius*, becauſe they were too long, and were not fill'd with the Doctrines of Religion: In the ſecond Letter, he deſires to tell him the meaning of *Hoſanna to the Son of David*. But there is another Letter attributed to *Damaſus*, and written to St. *Jerom*, with the Anſwer of this Father, that is not to be placed in the ſame rank; for the Stile of theſe Two Letters is very different from that of *Damaſus* and St. *Jerom*, and they contain many Impertinencies and Follies in the Judgment of *Bellarmine* and *Baronius*. 'Tis ſaid in the Firſt, That St. *Jerom* was Ordained by *Alexander*; and 'tis certain, that *Paulinus* Ordained him. In the Second, 'tis ſuppos'd, That St. *Jerom* exhorted *Damaſus* to Order the *Gloria Patri* to be ſung at the End of all the Pſalms, as was ordain'd by the Council of *Nice*, and as it was practis'd in the Eaſt: But if *Caſſian* is to be believed, this was not practis'd in the Eaſt.

The 3*d*. Letter of *Damaſus* is written in the Name of this Pope and other the Weſtern Biſhops, aſſembled at *Rome*, in the Year 370, concerning the Condemnation of *Auxentius*, to the Biſhops of *Illyricum*. It is related by *Theodoret* alſo, in *Ch*. 22. *B*. II. of his *Hiſt*. and by *Sozomen*, *Ch*. 23. of *B*. VI. and it is in Latin in the Collection of *Holſtenius*. Theſe Biſhops do here confirm the Faith of the *Nicene* Council, and declare, that *Auxentius* was condemn'd by the Biſhops of *France*, becauſe of his Hereſie. They obſerve, That the Deciſion of the Council of *Ariminum* could not prejudice the Decrees of the Council of *Nice*, becauſe neither the Biſhop of *Rome*, whoſe Judgment was chiefly to be waited for, nor *Vincentius* of *Capua*, nor many others, had ever conſented to it. They ſay at the End of this Letter, That thoſe who taught another Doctrine, ſhould quickly be turn'd out of their Biſhopricks. They exhort the Biſhops of *Illyricum* to Defend the Faith of the *Nicene* Council, with Boldneſs and Conſtancy.

The Letter of *Damaſus* to *Paulinus*, about the Cauſe of *Vitalis*, is alſo Genuine, and has a reſpect to Hiſtory, and to what St. *Gregory Nazianzen*, ſays in his Letter to *Cledonius*, that *Vitalis* the Diſciple of *Apollinarius*, coming to *Rome*, ſurpriz'd *Damaſus*, but that afterwards, this Pope had condemn'd him. The Letter of which we now ſpeak, was written ſome time after *Vitalis* departed from *Rome*, about the Year 373. It acquaints *Paulinus*, "That he had written to him by this *Vitalis*, leaving him "to manage all things; That he had alſo ſent him word of the ſame thing before, by the Prieſt *Pe*- "*tronius*; but that he was a little troubled when *Vitalis* was ready to depart; That to take from him "all kind of Scruple, leſt too great Precaution ſhould hinder thoſe from being receiv'd into the Church, "who had a mind to return, he had ſent to him a Confeſſion of Faith, not ſo much for his own ſake, "as for theirs who deſired to be re-united to the Church of *Rome*, and embrace its Communion that "they might Sign it." Wherefore, adds he, if *Vitalis* will joyn himſelf to us, you muſt oblige him to Sign the *Nicene* Creed, and to profeſs that he believes, That Jeſus Chriſt took a Body, a Soul, a Mind, and in a Word, a Nature in every thing like to ours, Sin only, and Concupiſcence, excepted; and to Anathematize thoſe that ſhould ſay, that the Word was inſtead of a Soul in the Perſon of Jeſus Chriſt, or ſhould dare to affirm, That there were two Sons of God in Jeſus Chriſt, and deny, that he was the ſame Son of God before and after his Incarnation. He ſays, That he could freely receive thoſe that ſhould Sign this Letter, provided they had before approv'd the Eccleſiaſtical Canons, and the Faith of the Council of *Nice*. He concludes with telling *Paulinus*, That he doubted not but he had Power to propoſe the ſame things to thoſe that were willing to be reſtor'd, and that he had written to him only for this End; that his Conſent and Example might render him more Bold and Free to do it.

'Twas probably at the ſame time, and perhaps in conſequence of this Letter, that *Damaſus* ſent to *Paulinus*, the Anathematiſms that are ſet down in Greek by *Theodoret*, *Ch*. 11. of the V*th*. *B*. of his Hiſtory, and in Latin by *Holſtenius*. They eſtabliſh the Faith of the Church concerning the Myſteries of the Trinity and the Incarnation, by condemning the contrary Errors. There is one of them againſt the Tranſlation of Biſhops. *Vitalis* having refuſed to Sign the Declarations which *Damaſus* would have him to Sign, this Pope aſſembled a Council at *Rome*, in the Year 375, where *Peter* of

Damaſus, Biſhop of *Rome*.

Alexandria was preſent, in which he condemned the Heretick *Apollinarius* and his Followers. The Opinion of *Valeſius* is not without Reaſon, who thinks that the Decrees which are in the Collection of *Holſtenius*, and which are to be found in the Second Volume of the Additions to *Labbeé*'s Edition of the Councils, *P.* 893, 894, and 895. are Part of the Deciſions of this Council, and that they were really made againſt the Error of *Apollinarius*. Theſe Decrees are Sign'd by *Meletius* of *Antioch*, by *Euſebius* of *Samoſata*, by *Pelegius* of *Laodicea*, by *Diodorus* of *Tarſus*, by *Eulogius* of *Edeſſa*, by *Zeno* of *Tyre*, by *Bematius* of *Mallus*, and by 146 other Biſhops of the Eaſt, whoſe Names are ſaid, to be in the Authentical Manuſcript of the *Vatican*. Theſe Subſcriptions make it very probable, that theſe Decrees are a Part of this Tome of the Weſtern Biſhops, which was Sign'd in the Year 378, in a Council at *Antioch*, whereof mention is made in the fifth Canon of the Council of *Conſtantinople*, and in a Letter of the Council of *Conſtantinople*, produced by *Theodoret*. In ſhort, the Biſhops of the Eaſt having deſir'd *Damaſus* to condemn *Timothy* a Diſciple of *Apollinarius*, received this Anſwer, That he was condemned long ago by a Council at *Rome*, in the preſence of *Peter* of *Alexandria*. This Letter is recited by *Theodoret*, *Ch.* 10. of the *Vth. B.* of his Hiſtory. It was written about the Year 378. In the preamble of this Letter, he extols the Greatneſs of the See of *Rome*, and ſpeaks of its Preheminence above others.

Theſe are the only Genuine Letters of *Damaſus*, that are extant; all the reſt that go under his Name, are forg'd by *Iſidorus Mercator*. They have not the Stile of *Damaſus*, and contain many things which plainly diſcover their Forgery. The letter that goes under the Name of *Aurelius* Biſhop of *Carthage* to *Damaſus*, as well as the Anſwer of this Pope, bear the Names of the Conſuls, *Gratianus* the third time, *Equitius* the firſt. Now this Conſulſhip happen'd in the Year 374, and *Aurelius* was yet a Deacon when St. *Auſtin* return'd from *Milan* to *Catharge* in 385, and he was not Ordain'd Biſhop, till 389. 'Tis plain therefore that this Letter could not be written by *Aurelius*. The Letter of the Council of *Africk* to *Damaſus*, is taken out of thoſe of *Sergius* and *Martin*, and eſtabliſhes a Doctrine contrary to that which the *Africans* practiſed in the Caſe of Appeals. The Letter to *Stephen* who is call'd Archbiſhop of the Concil of *Mauritania*, is taken out of the Letters of *Innocentius*, St. *Leo*, *Anaſtaſius*, *Sergius*, *Martin* I. *&c.* 'Tis ſaid to have been written under the Conſulſhip of *Stilicho*, who was not Couſul till 16 Years after the Death of *Damaſus*. The Letter concerning the Suffragans, quotes the Canons according to the Verſion of *Dionyſius Exiguus*. There is alſo a Canon of the Council of *Chalcedon*, and ſome Paſſages of the Letters of *Siricius*, *innocentius*, *Zoſimus*, *Celeſtinus*, St. *Leo*, &c. The Letter to the Biſhops of *Italy*, is taken out of St. *Leo*, St. *Gregory*, *Martin* I. and *Adrian* I. the Falſhood of it is found out by the Note of the Conſulſhip. Laſtly, There are in *Ivo Carnutenſis* and *Gratian*, ſome Decrees attributed to *Damaſus*; but one cannot be aſſur'd of their Antiquity, upon the Credit of theſe Authors.

There are beſides, above 40 Epigrams, Inſcriptions or Epitaphs in Verſe, which go under the Name of *Damaſus*, and are produced by *Baronius* and *Gruter*, and Collected together by *Sarrazanius*, who has made long Commentaries upon theſe Pieces. 'Tis not very certain, that all theſe belong to *Damaſus*, but 'tis no great matter who is the Author of them, for they contain nothing Remarkable. I ſhall not here ſtay to prove that the Book of the Lives of the Popes, entituled the *Pontifical of* Damaſus, is none of his, becauſe 'tis certain by the Confeſſion of all the World, that it was compos'd long after the Death of this Pope.

The Works of *Damaſus* were Printed at *Rome*, in the Year 1639. by the Care of *Ubaldinus*, who Dedicated them to Pope *Urban*, VIII. And *Billaine*, Printed another Edition of his Works at *Paris*, according to that at *Rome*, in the Year 1672. [His Poems, as Dr. *Cave* aſſures us from *Olearius*'s *Abacus Patrologicus*, were Printed at *Leipſick*, by *Andreas Rivinus*, in 8vo. 1652.]

St. BASIL.

St. *Baſil*.

ST. *BASIL* was of *Cæſarea* in *Cappadocia*, and was born about the Year 328. His Father was call'd *Baſil*, and his Mother *Emmelia*; who were both Chriſtians. He was Educated in Chriſtian Piety, by his Grand-Mother *Macrina*; and his Father taught him the Rudiments of Learning. He began his Studies at *Cæſarea*, in *Paleſtine*, from whence he went to *Conſtantinople*, to hear the Famous Orator *Libanius*, and at laſt he went to *Athens* to perfect his Studies. There he found *Gregory Nazianzen*, which whom he contracted a moſt intimate Friendſhip. After he had been at *Athens* ſome time, he returned into his own Country, about the Year 355, and departed from thence ſoon after to take a Journey into *Egypt* and *Libya*, and viſit the famous Monaſteries in that Country. He found the Life of theſe Aſcericks ſo perfect, that he reſolv'd to follow their Example; and when he return'd into his own Country, tho' his Biſhop *Dianius* Ordain'd him Reader, he retir'd into a ſolitary Place in the Province of *Pontus*, near the *Monaſtery* of St. *Macrinus*, where he led a Religious Life. His Brethren *Peter* and *Naucratius*, and many others of his Frinds, came to ſee him in this Place, and embrac'd the ſame way of living. He made Rules for them, and ſo became the firſt Founder of a Monaſtick Life in *Pontus* and *Cappadocia*.

Dianius, Biſhop of *Cæſarea* in *Cappadocia*, was one of the Enemies to St. *Athanaſius*. He had approv'd the Creeds of *Antioch*, of *Sardica*, and *Ariminum*, made by the *Semi-Arians*. This oblig'd St. *Baſil* to ſeparate from his Communion. He was not reconcil'd to him, till this Biſhop declar'd on his Death-Bed, that he had always in his Heart believ'd the *Nicene* Creed, and 'twas through ſimplicity that he had Sign'd that of *Conſtantinople*.

After

After the Death of *Dianius*, *Eusebius* was chosen Bishop of *Cæsarea* in *Cappodocia*: He conferred the Order of Priesthood on St. *Basil*, who retir'd soon after into his Solitude because he had some difference with his Bishop, who was Jealous of him. But he was reconcil'd to him Three Years after, and acquir'd so great a Reputation, that after the Death of *Eusebius*, he was chosen Bishop of *Cæsarea*, towards the End of the Year 369. He was no sooner promored to this Dignity, but he was persecuted by the Emperour *Valens*, who sollicited him by *Modestus* the Prætorian Præfect to Communicate with *Eudoxus*, and to embrace the Doctrine of the *Arians*. But in vain did he use Threatnings, for St. *Basil* answer'd him with a surprizing firmness of Mind, and would never yield to the Will of the Emperour. This Constancy so much astonish'd the Emperour *Valens*, that when he came himself to *Cæsarea*, he durst not undertake any thing against St. *Basil*, but was present on the Day of *Epiphany* in the Year 371, at the Publick Prayers of the Church of *Cæsarea*, and offer'd Gifts which were received by the Hand of St. *Basil*. He return'd thither once afterward, and had a long Conference with St. *Basil* about the Doctrine of the Church. But some time after, this Emperour being push'd on by the *Arians*, resolv'd to turn him out of *Cæsarea*. 'Tis said, That at the same time when he dictated this Order, his Son fell Sick, and that his Sickness made him change his Resolution; That he sent also for St. *Basil* and at his Arival, the Emperour's Son was almost recover'd; but being afterwards baptized by the *Arians*, he relaps'd into his Sickness and Died. After his Death, *Valens* would yet have sent St. *Basil*, into Banishment, but was hindered, as is reported, because when he would have sign'd the Order the Pen broke three times. This Prodigy made the Emperour give over the Prosecution of this Design. St. *Basil*

But St. *Basil* did not only maintain the Faith with a wonderfull Constancy, but he also endeavour'd to procure Peace to the Church. The East and West were then divided about the Cause of *Meletius* and *Paulinus*, who were both at the same time Bishops of *Antioch*. *Paulinus* communicated with St. *Athanasius*, and was supported by the Western Bishops. *Meletius* was not of their Communion, but was a very good Catholick. He was lawfully ordain'd Bishop of *Antioch*, and was acknowledg'd as such by all the Eastern Bishops. There wanted nothing but his Reconciliation with St. *Athanasius*, to make him be acknowledg'd by all the Western Bishops also; for the Western Bishops blindly follow'd the Judgment of this Bishop. Wherefore St. *Basil* us'd all his Endeavours to reconcile him to St. *Athanasius* and *Damasus*. He also pray'd *Meletius* to yield to Peace. He oblig'd him to send the Deacon *Dorotheus* to St *Athanasius*, who went into the West as far as *Rome*, but he could not compass his Design of restoring Peace. He return'd thither also a second time with a Letter of St. *Basil*, and he could obtain nothing but a Deputation of some Priests, to comfort the Eastern Bishops, who were tormented with the Persecution of *Valens*. St. *Basil* seeing that the Western Bishops would not make Peace with *Meletius*, wrote many Letters to them, wherein he Complains of their Behaviour. But howsoever it came to pass, he could not compass this Peace between the East and the West, which was not concluded till Nine Months after his Death.

In the mean time, while St. *Basil* labour'd with so much zeal for the Peace of the whole Church, his own Province was broken in pieces by Dissentions, which occasion'd him much Trouble and Sorrow. The Emperour having divided *Cappadocia* into two Provinces, *Anthimus* Bishop of *Tyana*, the Metropolis of that Part, that was Newly erected into a Province, pretended that he ought to be the Metropolitan of that New Province, and that he ought to Ordain Bishops for the Cities that depended upon it; and that he ought not to depend upon the Metropolis of *Cæsarea*, no more than the Bishops of the Cities of that New Province. St. *Basil* did not contest this right with *Anthimus* in the least; but they were at difference concerning the Extent of this New Province. *Anthimus* extended the Limits of it further than he ought; and St. *Basil* oppos'd his Attempts. They differ'd chiefly about one little City call'd *Sasima*, which lay upon a great Road. *Anthimus* pretended that it depended upon his Jurisdiction; and St. *Basil* to keep it to himself, erected it into a Bishoprick, and gave it to his Friend St. *Gregory Nazianzen*. But *Anthimus* was already in Possession: which oblig'd St. *Gregory*, being a Lover of Peace, to withdraw from the place, in which he could take no Pleasure; and he was very Angry with his Friend for making use of him to mantain his own Quarrel.

St. *Basil* had also another Dispute with *Theodotus* Bishop of *Nicopolis*. *Meletius* and this Bishop were invited to come to a Synod which was to be held at *Phargama*, near *Nicopolis*. He wrote to *Eusebius* of *Samosata* to be there, and sent his Letter by *Eustathius* of *Sebastia*. The good Correspondence which St. *Basil* had then with this last, render'd him odious to *Theodotus*, and the other Bishops who desir'd no more to have him at their Synod. When St. *Basil* knew this Matter, he held a Conference with *Eustathius* of *Sebastia*: In which he found that he spoke like a Catholick, and he caus'd him to sign an Orthodox Confession of Faith. After he had us'd this Precaution, he came to find out *Meletius* and *Theodotus*, and told them what he had done. *Theodotus* told him, That *Eustathius* had since deny'd what he had then approv'd. St. *Basil* answer'd, That he could not believe him so inconstant; but notwithstanding to try him yet anew, he would offer him a very large Confession of Faith, which if he refused to Sign, he would then separate from his Communion. *Meletius* and *Theodotus*, approv'd of this Proposal, and the last invited St. *Basil* to come to *Nicopolis*; but when he was there, he would not permit him to be at the Prayers of the Church, nor Communicate with him at all. St. *Basil* seeing himself thus affronted without Reason retir'd from *Nicopolis*, and came to *Satala*, where he Ordain'd a Bishop at the desire of the Inhabitants. From thence he went to find out *Eustathius*, and made him Sign a Confession of Faith, to which he annex'd that of the *Nicene* Creed. St. *Gregory Nyssen* sided against his Brother St. *Basil*, as appears by the Letters 256, and 259, of this Saint; where he accuses him of troubling the Peace of the Church, and of laying Snares for him. Some time after, *Eustathius* of *Sebastia*, who, upon St. *Basil*'s account, was engag'd in a Quarrel with *Theodotus*, declar'd himself openly against St *Basil*, joyn'd the *Eudoxians*. oppos'd

St. *Baſil*

the Faith of the Council of *Nice*, and the Divinity of the Holy Spirit. St. *Baſil* underſtanding this, reconciles himſelf to *Theodotus*, and wrote many Letters againſt *Euſtathius*.

Theſe are the principal Circumſtances of St. *Baſil*'s Life, and the affairs which took up the greateſt part of his time while he was Biſhop. The other Circumſtances which are of leſs conſequence may be learn'd from his Letters. St. *Baſil* died upon the Firſt of *January*, in the Year 379.

The Letters of St. *Baſil* are the moſt learned and the moſt curious of all his Books, and perhaps of all Eccleſiaſtical Antiquity. They are written with an unimitable Purity, Majeſty and Eloquence, and contain an infinite number of things. There one may ſee all the Hiſtory of his time, deſcribed to the Life, the different Characters of Men's Tempers, the contrary Intereſts of each Party, and the Motives which acted both ſides, and the Intrigues which they made uſe of for carrying on of their Deſigns. The State of the Eaſtern and Weſtern Churches is there deſcribed, in lively and natural Colours. He handles an infinite number of Queſtions of Doctrine, of Diſcipline and of Morality; which he decides with much Learning and Prudence. There one may find many Letters of Conſolation or Exhortation, which are very Edifying and Pathetical, and even thoſe which are only Complemental are full of Wit, and of very ſolid and uſefull Thoughts. They are indeed at preſent in ſo great Confuſion, that 'tis not an eaſie thing to read them in order with Delight, and ſo ill tranſlated, that they are almoſt wholly diſguiſed, and can hardly be known by thoſe that underſtand the Beauty of the Original Language. I have begun a Tranſlation of them in Latin and French, which I may perhaps Publiſh ſome time or other with Notes. In the mean time, I ſhall now make ſome Extracts out of them, according to my uſual Method. But to make them more uſeful, I have rank'd the Letters according to the Order of Time. If they are ſet according to the Subject Matter, they may be divided into Hiſtorical and Doctrinal; Letters of Diſcipline, Apologetical Letters, Letters of Inſtruction or Morality, Letters of Conſolation, and Letters of Civility: But I thought it more proper to follow in the Body of our Book the Order of Time; which I have examined as exactly as I could. They ſhall be divided then into Two Claſſes: The Firſt, ſhall Comprehend the Letters that were written in his Solitude, before he was Biſhop: And the Second, which will contain far the greater Number, ſhall conſiſt of thoſe which were written after he was Biſhop, which I ſhall diſpoſe in their Order of Time from Year to Year, as near as I can.

The Firſt of the Letters written by St. *Baſil* in his Solitude, is the 19th. directed to St. *Gregory Nazianzen*; wherein he acquaints him with the Reſolution he had taken up to live retiredly, and deſcribes the place which he had choſen for his Retreat, very Pleaſantly, and very Elegantly. This Letter was written in the Beginning of the year 358.

St. *Gregory* having received this Letter, did not approve of the Habitation which his Friend had choſen, and from the Deſcription which he had given of it, he imagin'd that it was a very Melancholy and Frightful place. He ſignified alſo his Thoughts of it in his 7th. Letter to him, and rallies pleaſantly upon the Deſcription he had ſent of it. Wherefore St. *Baſil* having a mind to draw him to himſelf by ſome more powerful Motive, repreſents to him in his 2d. Letter, which is commonly put the 1ſt. the Manner of Life which he had embraced.

He complains at firſt, That he could not yet reap all the Profit from his Retirement which he could have wiſh'd; which Unhappineſs he attributes to the Habits that he had contracted while he liv'd in the World; from which he could not yet diſengage himſelf: And he deſires him to believe, that he deſcribes in his Letter the manner after which he ſhould live, and not that in which he did live at preſent. After this he repreſents the Miſeries of a Secular Life, and the Delights of Solitude. He ſhews how profitable this Retreat is, provided one's Mind be not too much faſtned to the World, after he is parted from it. He gives an account of the Exerciſes of ſo Happy a State; which conſiſt in Prayer, in labouring with our Hands, in Reading and Meditation upon the Holy Scripture; and gives Rules concerning the Diſcourſe, the Habits, the Eating and Behaviour of a Monk. This Letter was written in the Year 358.

There are alſo ſome other Letters of St. *Baſil* which are very near upon the ſame Subject, and were written probably about the ſame time. The four firſt, which are not rank'd in the other Claſſis, are of this Number.

The Firſt, is adreſs'd to one *Chilon*; who having renounc'd the World, had written to St. *Baſil*, to deſire ſome Advice of him, how he ſhould behave himſelf; which is done in this Letter. He exhorts him to perſevere in his Reſolution: He Counſels him not to Aſpire at firſt to the higheſt Perfection of a Religious Life, but to aſcend to it by degrees. He particularly recommends to him to abide in Solitude, without going out of it upon any pretence whatſoever, though it were even to be preſent at the Inſtructions of the Biſhops in the Publick Aſſemblies of the Church.

After this Letter, follows a ſhort, but very Inſtructive Exhortation to Young Monks; which contains in few words many Precepts of a Religious Life.

The Second Letter, is to a Monk who had abandon'd his Solitary ſtate, to return into the World, that he might put himſelf in a way of Trade. He deplores his Fall, and Exhorts him to acknowledge it, and to do Pennance for his fault.

The Third, is to a Monk of *Jeruſalem*, who had given a horrible Scandal by carrying away a Virgin conſecrated to Jeſus Chriſt. He ſets before his Eyes the Happineſs of that ſtate from which he was fallen, and the Miſery of that to which he was reduc'd by his Crime. He charges him very ſharply for his Enormity and covers him with Confuſion for his Infamous Action. Nevertheleſs, he concludes with Exhorting him from the Conſideration of Death and of Judgment, to beg Pardon of his Fault, to Turn and Repent,

The

The fourth of theſe Letters is addreſs'd to a Virgin, who being conſecrated to God by a Vow of Virginity, had ſuffer'd her ſelf to be corrupted by a Miſerable Man. He repreſents to her the Enormity of her Crime. He endeavours to terrifie her by the Fear of Judgment and of Hell, and gives her hopes, that ſhe ſhall obtain Mercy, if ſhe will Change her Life and Repent.

The 411. Letter, ought to be joyn'd to this. It contains many Precepts of a Monaſtick Life; which, for the moſt part, are drawn out of the Scripture.

The 165. Letter to *Euſtathius* the Philoſopher, was written ſome time after St. *Baſil*'s Retirement. He acquaints him, That ſince his return from *Athens*, he had ſearch'd for him in all places, but could not meet with him; which Unhappineſs he Attributes to the Providence of God, and not to Fortune.

The 166. to one nam'd *Julianus*, ſeems to have been written about the ſame time. He ſays, That 'tis in a Man's Power to lead a happy and quiet Life, by governing his Paſſions, and ſubmitting his Mind to all Events that can happen. *Neither Loſs of Goods*, ſays he, *nor Sickneſs of Body, nor any other troubleſome Accidents of this Life can hurt a Vertuous Man, while he deſigns to walk in the Ways of God, and Meditates upon another Life, who ſubmits to all the Troubles and Croſſes of this World. For thoſe who are wholly taken up with the Cares of this Life, are like thoſe Carnivorous Birds who ſtoop down to the Earth with the Beaſts, though they have Wings to fly in the Air.*

The 167. Letter to *Diodorus* a Prieſt of *Antioch*, was alſo written about the ſame time. In it he commends the Two Books which this Author had ſent him. He ſays, That the Second was very acceptable to him, not only becauſe of its Brevity, but becauſe of the Many Thoughts, Arguments and Anſwers which it contain'd in a very good Method. He commends the plainneſs of its Stile, which is agreeable, ſays he, to the Profeſſion of a Chriſtian, who ought much rather to write for the Publick Good, than acquire Glory to himſelf. As to the Firſt Book, which was compos'd by way of Dialogue he ſays, That though it was more adorn'd with Figures, and had greater Variety of Matter; yet he found it tedious to read, and difficult to underſtand. He takes notice, That the Calumnies of Hereticks, and the Defences of the Catholicks are very uſeleſs, and interrupt the Thread of his Diſcourſe.

To this we may joyn the 168. Letter to *Eunomius*, wherein he rallies this Heretick, who boaſted of underſtanding all things, by putting to him many difficult Queſtions about things Natural, to which 'twas impoſſible to Anſwer.

The 41. and 42. Letters to *Maximus* the Philoſopher, who is, in all probability the ſame that got himſelf Ordain'd Archbiſhop of *Conſtantinople*, were alſo written by St. *Baſil*, when he was in his Solitude.

The 1ſt. is concerning the Opinions of *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria*. He accuſes him of Writing ſome things in his Books, which ſeemed to be the Seeds of the Error of the *Anomæans*: yet he confeſſes that he did it not deſignedly; but that in diſputing againſt the Hereſy of *Sabellius*, he had too much inclin'd to the oppoſite Error, and in proving the Deſtinction of the Perſons, he ſeem'd to admit a Difference of Nature between the Three Divine Perſons. After this St. *Baſil* explains his own Judgement concerning the Trinity. He does not condemn the Opinion of thoſe who ſay That the Word is like to God the Father in Subſtance; nor even of thoſe who ſay ſimply, That he is like to his Father, Provided they add, That he is in nothing unlike to him; becauſe this Sence falls in with their Opinion who call him *Conſubſtantial*. He adds, That this laſt term is leſs capable of an ill ſence. He condemns the Biſhops of the Council of *Conſtantinople*, who contented themſelves with declaring, That the Son was the Image of the Father, without adding, That he was in nothing unlike. At laſt, St. *Baſil* invites *Maximus* to come and ſee him, and directly charges him with having too great an Affection for the City and the Grandeur of this World. This Letter was written after the Council of *Conſtantinople* in 360.

In the 2d. Letter to the ſame Philoſopher, he commends him, and recommends to him the love of Vertue.

The 2d, 3d, and 33d. Letters addreſs'd to St. *Gregory*, who was gone to *Nazianzum*, were much about the ſame time.

In the 2d. he obſerves, That no words are capable of expreſſing our Thoughts of God, and Admoniſhes St. *Gregory* to uſe all his Eloquence in the Defence of the Truth.

In the 3d. Letter, he pleaſantly rebukes St. *Gregory*, for writing none but Laconick Letters to him; that is to ſay, ſuch as were ſhort and conciſe.

'Tis plain, That the Letters of St. *Baſil* to the Emperour *Julian*, if they are Genuine, were written by this Saint in his Retirement, ſince the Death of *Julian* happened before he came out of his Solitude. He had known this Prince at *Athens*, where they had Studied together under *Libanius*. After he was return'd to his own Country, he received a very obliging Letter from this Prince, who had not yet forſaken the Chriſtian Religion. This Letter is the 206. But after he had renounc'd Chriſtianity, he did no longer treat St. *Baſil* after the ſame manner: but on the contrary, he wrote a Proud Letter to him, and commanded him to ſend him 1000*l.* of Gold for reſtoring of the Temples. This Letter is the 207th. among thoſe of St. *Baſil*, to which is ſubjoyn'd the Anſwer that *Julian* made when he had read the Book of *Apollinarius*, *I have read it, underſtood it, and condemn'd it.* But it appears, that thoſe words were added to the reſt of the Letter, to which they have no reference at all. The two following Letters contain the Anſwer of St. *Baſil* of this Letter to *Julian*; yet they are not two Anſwers, nor two different Letters, but one and the ſame Anſwer, of which ſome have made two. *Cotelerius* hath publiſh'd a little while ago the whole entire and in one Letter only, from a Manuſcript of the King's Library. It is in his Second Volume of the *Monuments of the Greek Church*. This Sentence

St. *Baſil.* tence which is put at the beginning of the Firſt, *You did not underſtand what you read, for if you had underſtood it, you would never have condemn'd it*, was added after the writing of this Letter, as that was which is at the end of *Julian*'s Letter. I doubt alſo, whether the Anſwer that is attributed to St. *Baſil*, be truly his; and I know not but it may be written by ſome other Perſon, who would make a trial how he could Anſwer *Julian*'s Letter to this Father: and indeed, the Stile of this Letter is not ſo Elegant as that of the Letters of St. *Baſil*. He writes to *Julian*, That he is horribly vex'd, when he thinks that he is cloathed with the Royal Purple, and that his infamous Head is adorn'd with a Crown. Is it credible that St. *Baſil* ſhould write to an Emperor with ſo little reſpect, and ſhould treat him as a ridiculous, ſenſeleſs and impertinent Perſon, as the Author of this Letter does? In ſhort, There is at the end of this Letter, an Inference drawn from an Opinion of *Julian*'s, which is extremely wide, and has ſcarce any ſence, and not according to the Genius of St. *Baſil*, who is nice and exact in his thoughts, and moderate in his Expreſſions.

As to the 205. Letter addreſs'd to the ſame Emperour, 'tis evident that it is Suppoſititious. The Title of it is, To Julian *the Apoſtate*. Would St. *Baſil* ever have directed a Letter to him with this Inſcription? 2. The Stile of this Letter is very different from that of St. *Baſil*. 3. this Letter is nothing but a Confeſſion of Faith. Now to what purpoſe ſhould St. *Baſil* ſend a Confeſſion of Faith to *Julian*? 4. He adds to this Confeſſion of Faith, the Invocation of Saints, and Worſhip of Images. Who ever heard that theſe Points were put into the Confeſſions of Faith of the Firſt Ages? 5. He ſays, That he Honours and Adores the Images of the Saints, becauſe it is an Apoſtolical Tradition. Would St. *Baſil* have ſpoken thus? and is it not plain that this Letter is the Work of ſome *Greek*, who liv'd after the Seventh Council?

The Six Letters publiſh'd by *Hæſchelius*, which are the 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, being written to different Perſons, were alſo compos'd by St. *Baſil* while he was in his Solitude. They contain nothing remarkable.

The 141 Letter of St. *Baſil* was written in the Year 363. after the Difference which he had with his own Biſhop. The Inhabitants of *Cæſarea* complain'd that he had retir'd after his Ordination, and recall'd him with very importunate Letters. St. *Baſil* wrote to them, to thank them for their Goodneſs to him, and to give them an account of the Cauſe of his Retiring. He admoniſhes them not to ſuffer themſelves to be ſurpriſed by the Artifices of Hereticks; and for a Preſervative againſt them, he explains the Faith of the Church concerning the Trinity, and anſwers ſome Objections which they alledg'd. He blames thoſe that ſaid only, the Son of God was like his Father without adding any thing for Explication.

The 4th. Letter to St. *Gregory*, is the laſt of thoſe which St. *Baſil* wrote in his Retirement before he was Biſhop. It is directed to St. *Gregory Nazianzen*; wherein he Exhorts him to be very careful to procure the Choice of a Biſhop, in the room of *Euſebius* Biſhop of *Cæſarea* in *Cappadocia*, lately Dead, who might be worthy to fill that Biſhoprick. St. *Gregory* had reſolved to come himſelf to *Cæſarea*; but for fear leſt the giving of his Suffrage in favour of St. *Baſil* ſhould render him ſuſpected, he contented himſelf with ſending Two Letters written in his Father's Name; whereof one was addreſs'd to the Church of *Cæſarea*, and the other to the Council Aſſembled in that City, wherein he recommended St. *Baſil* as moſt worthy to Succeed in the room of *Euſebius*. Some Authors attribute this Letter of St. *Baſil* which we have already mention'd to *Euſebius* of *Samoſata*: And indeed, it is not very probable, that St. *Baſil* ſhould ſo openly pray St. *Gregory* to do that which look'd ſo like ſolliciting that himſelf might be made Biſhop.

We ſhould joyn to this the Two Letters of St. *Baſil* to *Apollinarius*, which were publiſh'd by *Cotelerius*, if they were Genuine; but they are Forg'd by the *Apollinarians*, ſince St. *Baſil* himſelf teſtifies in the 59, 79, and 82 Letters, That he never wrote concerning the Faith to *Apollinarius*; and that the Letters which were publiſhed under his Name, were Suppoſititious: which plainly ſhows, That the Two Letters, which go under St. *Baſil*'s Name, and are addreſs'd to *Apollinarius*, which Treat of the Myſtery of the Holy Trinity, and which ſuppoſe that St. *Baſil* and *Apollinarius* held a great Correſpondence by Letters, are Forg'd, as well as thoſe of *Apollinarius* to St. *Baſil*, which contain Errors not only about the Incarnation, but alſo about the Trinity.

The Second Claſs of St. *Baſil*'s Letters, ought to be of thoſe which were written after he was Biſhop of *Cæſarea*; Theſe are far more numerous and more conſiderable. The Firſt, are thoſe which he wrote for the Reconciliation of *Meletius* with St. *Athanaſius* and the weſtern Biſhops.

To compaſs this deſign, he wrote about the End of the Year 369. the 56. Letter to *Meletius* to diſpoſe him to enter upon a Treaty about it. He did not openly acquaint him with his Deſign, leſt he ſhould be diſcovered; but he ſignified to him, that he deſired that he might ſee him to treat about an Affair of great Importance; but being detain'd by his Brethren, he ſent *Theophraſtus* to communicate it to him. The Secrecy which he obſerves in this Letter, plainly diſcovers that this was the Firſt which he wrote about this Negotiation.

'Tis probable, that about the ſame time, to conciliate the favour of St. *Athanaſius*, who had written to him immediately after his Promotion he wrote an Anſwer to him by Letter 47. wherein he gives him an Account of the ſhare that he had in the Perſecution which the Governour of *Libya* raiſed againſt this Holy Paſtor; and he acquaints him, That all the Faithful of his Church, look'd upon this Governor as an Excommunicate Perſon: That they would have no Correſpondence with him; becauſe 'tis fit, that the Powers who will uſe Violence, ſhould find themſelves unanimouſly condemn'd by all the Churches.

Meletius having ſignified to St. *Baſil*, that he would willingly hearken to an Accommodation; this Father wrote to St. *Athanaſius* at the Beginning of the Year 379, the 48. Letter; wherein he exhorts

horts him to procure the Peace and Union of the Eastern and Western Churches, and prays him to begin with receiving the Church of *Antioch*. He supports this Proposal in Three Letters, which in the common Edition are 49, 50, and 51. The 50th. was written at the desire of *Dorotheus* the Deacon, whom *Meletius* sent to Negotiate this Affair. In it, he gives great Commendation of *Meletius*, and says, That all the other Parties which are in the Church of *Antioch* ought to re-unite to him and to those who adhered to him, as to the principal Body of the Church of *Antioch*; whereof the rest are but separate Members. He assures him, That the West wish'd for his Re-union, as well as the East; as appeared by the Letters brought from the West by *Silvanus*. He conjures him afterwards to use his usual Prudence for procuring the Peace of all the Churches. In Letter 51. he exhorts St. *Athanasius* to write a Letter of Communion to all the Eastern Bishops; and prays him to send it, either by some Persons in his own Name, or even by the Deacon *Dorotheus*. He assures him That the Bishops are Orthodox, and that they desire to be Re-united to him; and he promises them, That he will not deliver his Letter, till he has received their Answers, and those Assurances that he shall desire. St. *Basil*.

St *Athanasius* having received these Letters, would not write at all, but he sent one of his Priests call'd *Peter*, to dispose their Minds to Peace. This Priest was very well received by St *Basil*, and he perform'd his Message as well as he could. But this Affair being of too great Consequence to be so easily determined; St. *Basil* thought it necessary to write to Pope *Damasus*. Having taken up this Resolution, he sent the Deacon *Dorotheus* to *Meletius*, by whom he wrote the 57 Letter, wherein he tells him his Design which he had of sending this Deacon to *Rome*, and of desiring some Deputies out of *Italy*. He prays him, if he thought it convenient, to give him necessary Instructions, and to write a Letter in his own Name, and in the Name of all the Bishops of his Communion, and to direct it to the western Bishops. He writes at the end of this Letter, That the Affairs of the Church were in the same State; That the Civil Powers would not meddle with them, to restore those that were banish'd; That *Euvippus* an *Arian* Bishop was come, but that he had done nothing yet in Publick, though he had threatned to fetch the Bishops of his Party from *Tetrapolis* and *Cilicia*, to Condemn the Orthodox.

Meletius sent back *Dorotheus*, and thought it necessary for him to go into the West. 'Tis not certainly known, whether he wrote at that time to the Bishops of the West, but 'tis certain that St. *Basil* then address'd his 220 Letter to *Damasus*. It has no Superscription, but 'tis easy to see that 'twas address'd to the Bishop of *Rome*. He begins with showing the Advantage which that Bishop had to restore the ancient Union between the Eastern and Western Churches: After this, he describes the unhappy State to which the Persecution of the *Arians* had reduc'd the Churches of the East. He represents to *Damasus*, That he might give them Ease and Comfort, by writing and sending Deputies to them, to re-establish Peace and Union in the Church. He remonstrates to him, that what he desir'd, was not extraordinary, since it had been the practice of the Saints, and particularly of the Church of *Rome*. He observes to him, That St. *Dionysius* had formerly Comforted the Church of *Cæsarea* by his Letters and that he had sent some of his Brethren to deliver Christians from Captivity; That now there was more Reason to complain of the Misery of the Church, since not only the Captivity of the Body, but that of the Soul also was to be fear'd. St. *Basil*, gave this Letter to *Dorotheus*, to carry into the West, and he sent this Deacon to St. *Athanasius*, to conferr with him about the means of procuring Peace, that so after he had met with him, he might Embark from *Alexandria*, to go into *Italy*. He charg'd him also with a Letter for St. *Athanasius*, which is the 52. And tho' in it, he says, That he referr'd himself wholly to the Prudence of St. *Athanasius* as to the Management of this Affair, yet he says, That his Advice should be to write to the Bishop of *Rome*, and to pray him, since there was no probability of calling a Synod, that he would send by his own Authority, Deputies into the East. He observes, That he must chuse such Persons as were able to endure the Fatigues of Travelling, and who had much Meekness and Moderation to Correct the Eagerness and Passionate Heats of some of the Bishops of the East: And in fine, who could speak at a fit Season, and accommodate themselves to the Times. He would have them carry with them the Acts of the Council of *Ariminum*, and an Account of the Transactions in the West, that they may be null'd; That they should come by Sea, without letting any body know of it; That at first they should address themselves to those of his own Communion, before they were pre-engaged by the Associates of *Paulinus*, the Enemies of Peace: and, in short, That they should condemn the Heresy of *Marcellus* of *Ancyra*. This Letter is the 52. At the end, he conjures St. *Athanasius* to send forthwith the Deacon *Dorotheus* into the West; that so the Business might be done the next Year, which was 371. He advertises him also, That he must take care to recommend to the Deputies from the West, that they be very Cautious lest they encrease Divisions instead of allaying them, and that they preferr to all things the Good of Peace; and that they do not maintain a Schism in the Church of *Antioch*, out of Affection to some particular Persons.

The desire of Peace, and the Fear that St. *Basil* had of bringing Persecution upon the Church, oblig'd him to be very cautious in his Discourse. Wherefore, though he profess'd to Believe and to defend the Divinity of the Holy Spirit; yet he said nothing of it unless he was oblig'd. And therefore when he was in an Assembly of Bishops held in the Year 370. at the Feast of St. *Eupsichius*, in the City of *Cæsarea*, he discoursed largely of the Divinity of the Father and the Son, and said nothing almost of the Holy Spirit. Whereupon a Religious Person who was present at this Assembly, accus'd St. *Basil* of betraying the Truth by a Cowardice unworthy of a Bishop, and publish'd this Accusation at a Feast where he was present, some time after. St. *Gregory Nazianzen*, who was one of the Guests at this Feast, endeavoured in vain to defend his Friend; for all the Company blam'd him,

St. *Baſil.* him, and at laſt St. *Gregory* himſelf was offended with his Conduct, and wrote to him his Judgment about it in Letter 26. St. *Baſil* having received this Letter by *Hellenius*, was a little offended with it, and anſwerd him in Letter 33, That he was ſurprized, that he ſhould ſo lightly give credit to a Calumniator. He ſignifies a great Contempt of theſe kind of Accuſations. He invites St. *Gregory* to come and ſee him, and ſays, That what was quickly to come to paſs, would ſerve for his Juſtification before all the World; becauſe it might be foreſeen, that he muſt ſuffer for the defence of the Truth, and perhaps ſhould be forc'd away from his Church and his Country. Which diſcovers that this Letter was written before the Perſecution of *Valens*, in the Year 370.

This Emperour had a Deſign to divide the Province of *Cappadocia* into two. St. *Baſil* thought that it was his Duty to defend the Rights of his People, and his Church. For this Reaſon, he wrote to a great Man of his Country called *Martinianus*, the 376 Letter, to pray him to go to Court and hinder this Diviſion. This Letter was written in the Year 370, as well as the 362, which was plainly written upon the ſame Occaſion. The 309 Letter wherein he declares, That he continued unſhaken, though he had been attack'd by the moſt powerful at Court, referrs to the Solicitations which the Prefect *Modeſtus* had us'd to him this Year 370, by Order of the Emperour *Valens*. 'Tis probable, that the Letter 409, wherein he thanks an Eaſtern Biſhop call'd *Innocentius*, for what he had written to him, is alſo of the ſame Year; for 'tis likely that this Biſhop wrote to him a little after his Ordination, and that St. *Baſil* took no long time to Anſwer him.

The Deacon *Dorotheus*, departed in the Year 371, but his Journey had not all the Succeſs, that might have been hop'd for. However, the Weſtern Biſhops wrote a Letter to the Biſhops of the Eaſt, which was ſent to them by St. *Athanaſius*, but the Contents are not known. It appears alſo by the Letters of St. *Baſil*, That there came from the Weſt a Deacon nam'd *Sabinus*, who carried the Letters of the Biſhops of *Illyricum*, *Italy*, and *Gaul*.

The Eaſtern Biſhops anſwer'd the Letter of thoſe of the Weſt, which they received by St. *Athanaſius*, and that which was brought them by *Sabinus*: There Anſwers are the Letters 61, and 69. In Letter 61, after they have teſtified their Joy, that they had, when they underſtood that the Weſtern Biſhops, were all at preſent United in one and the ſame Doctrine, they deſire of them help and relief in their Miſeries, which they deſcribe in a moſt lively and natural manner. Our miſeries ſay they, "are known to you, though we ſhould not write them, being publiſh'd over all the Earth. The Do-"ctrine of our Fathers is deſpis'd; The Tradition of the Apoſtles is overthrown; The new Inventions "of ſome particular Perſons prevail in the Churches; They treat Religion as Sophiſters, not as Di-"vines: The Wiſdom of this World Domineers, and the Glory of the Croſs is abhorr'd; The true "Paſtors are driven away, and ravening Wolves are entred into their places, who tear the Flock of "Chriſt in pieces; The Churches are abandon'd; the Deſarts are fill'd with deſolate Chriſtians; The "Old Men ſigh when they compare the times paſt with the preſent, and the Young Men find them-"ſelves miſerable, becauſe they never ſaw the Good things of which they are now deſtitute. Theſe "things ought to affect thoſe who have any love for Jeſus Chriſt and his Church: But what we have "ſaid of them, is very far ſhort of the Truth; wherefore, if you have any Charity for us, if you be "of the ſame Mind, if you have any Bowels of Pity, come ſpeedily to our help; Arm your ſelves with "Zeal for Piety, and deliver us from this Raging Tempeſt". At the end of this Letter, they make a ſhort Confeſſion of their Faith; wherein they acknowledge that the Holy Spirit is ador'd together with the Father and the Son: And they conclude with the Approbation of what the Weſtern Biſhops had done in Conformity to the Canons.

The ſecond Letter upon the ſame Subject, is written in the Name of *Meletius*, *Euſebius* of *Samoſata*, St. *Baſil*, and many other Eaſtern Biſhops, to the Biſhops of *Italy* and *Gaul*, that is the 69th. among thoſe of St. *Baſil*. There they give a Deſcription of their Miſeries yet more large, and more moving than the former, and conjure the Weſtern Biſhops to help them and bring them relief; and to ſend to them ſpeedily a great number of Deputies, who may take their ſeats in a Synod, hoping by this means, that they may reſtore the Faith of the Council of *Nice*, deſtroy Hereſy, and re-unite the Orthodox; who at preſent are divided in Communion, though they hold one and the ſame Doctrine. They compare the ſtate of the Churches of the Eaſt, to that of *Jeruſalem*, during the Siege of *Veſpaſian*; and they ſay, That as the *Jews* ruin'd themſelves then by their Inteſtine Seditions, while the Enemies Army reduced them to the laſt Extremity; ſo their Churches were now brought to Deſolation, not only by the War of the Hereticks, who openly attack'd them; but alſo by the Diviſions of the Orthodox: that if they deſire Aſſiſtance of the Biſhops of the Weſt, it was for this particular Reaſon, That Peace might be reſtor'd; and in this, they ſay, conſiſted the Relief of their Churches. They conclude their Letter with ſaying, That they commend and approve the Confeſſion of Faith that was made by thoſe of the Weſt, and that they conſented to all that they had lawfully and canonically determin'd in their Synodical Epiſtle. Theſe two Letters were ſent by *Sabinus*, who they ſay, is a Witneſs of all that they affirm.

St. *Baſil* wrote particularly by the ſame *Sabinus* to *Valerianus* Biſhop of *Illyricum*, or rather of *Aquileia*, the Letter 324; wherein he thanks him for the Charity he had teſtified in the Letter he had written, and Prays him to aſſiſt with his Prayers the Eaſtern Churches, that were afflicted with Hereſy and Schiſm. Theſe are all the Letters of St. *Baſil* written in this Year 371, concerning the Union of the Eaſt and the Weſt.

The Letters which he wrote in favour of *Euſtathius* of *Sebaſtea*, againſt *Theodotus* of *Nicopolis*, are alſo of this Year 371; becauſe he was at Difference with the former in the Year 372.

The Firſt Letter written upon this Subject is the 26th. addreſs'd to *Euſebius* of *Samoſata*: He acquaints him, That *Meletius* and *Theodotus* of *Nicopolis*, invited him to be preſent towards the Middle

Middle of *June*, at a Synod which was to be held at *Phargama*: he prays St. *Eusebius* to be present there: He sent him this Letter by *Eustathius* of *Sebastea*, and tells him, That he waited for an Answer. St. *Basil*.

Eusebius came not to this Synod, but *Eustathius* was present there, and St. *Basil*, before he did Communicate with him, would have assurance of his Doctrine; and having had two Conferences with him, he made him agree to the Doctrine of the Church. Being thus perswaded that he was Orthodox, he joyn'd his Prayers with those of this Bishop, to thank God, who had given them Grace to think and speak after the same manner. The Design of St. *Basil* was to have a Confession of Faith drawn up by *Theodotus*, or those of his Party, which *Eustathius* should Sign: But *Theodotus* without enquiring into the Conduct of St. *Basil*, refused to admit him to his Synod, because he had communicated with *Eustathius*. St. *Basil* being to go into *Armenia*, passed by a Country House of *Meletius* called *Getasa*, where *Theodotus* was present; and after a free Conference between them, it was agreed, That if St. *Basil* could make *Eustathius* sign a Confession of Faith, which plainly contain'd the Doctrine of the Church, he should then continue in his Communion; but on the contrary, he should separate from him, if he refus'd to sign that Confession. *Meletius* and his Priest *Diodorus*, having approved this Proposal, it was also agreed to by *Theodotus*, who invited St. *Basil* to go with him to *Nicopolis*: But when he was arrived there, he would not communicate with him contrary to his Word which he pass'd to him; which obliged St. *Basil* to withdraw, and to go to *Satala*, there to regulate some Affairs of *Armenia*, and Ordain some Bishops. He wrote from thence to Count *Terentius* the 187 Letter; wherein he gives him an account of those Transactions which had passed. Letter 78, is the Confession of Faith which St. *Basil* caused *Eustathius* of *Sebastea* to sign at this time. It contains the *Nicene* Creed, and rejects the Error of *Sabellius* and *Marcellus* of *Ancyra*. He speaks also of those Differences in Letter 364, to *Atarbius*.

He wrote also a little while after, the Letter 239. to *Eusebius* of *Samosata*; whom he acquaints with the disgraceful manner wherein he was treated by *Theodotus*. He says, That he had also a Conference with *Eustathius*, and that he found him very Catholick. He complains, That the Bishops of the second *Cappadocia*, lately advanced into a Province, refused to have any Correspondence with him. He rallies his Brother *Gregory*, and says, It were to be wished that he had a Bishoprick that would agree to his Mind; That he is so zealous and watchful, that he could Govern all the Churches of the World; That he was not only capable of Great Things, but that he gave weight to Small Matters, and made Affairs of no importance, pass for Matters of the greatest Consequence, by his manner of treating of them. He complains of a Bishop nam'd *Palmatius*, whom *Maximus* had made use of to persecute the Church. He invites *Eusebius* to come and see him, giving him notice that his Presence was necessary to regulate the Affairs of *Cappadocia*.

He invites him also by Letter 256, to be present at the Feast of St. *Eupsichius*, which was the 7th. of *September*, to Ordain Bishops and to give him Advice about the Cause which his Brother *Gregory Nyssen* had undertaken against him in the Assembly which was held at *Ancyra*.

Probably *Eusebius* of *Samosata* came not to this Synod of *Cæsarea*, but he sent thither a Bishop nam'd *Sabinus*, whose Presence comforted St. *Basil* under the Afflictions which he had met with at *Nicopolis*, as he acquaints *Eusebius* by Letter 253; where he excuses the too great Zeal which *Theodotus* had testified for the observation of the Canons. He says in this Letter, That he passionately wished to see and embrace *Eusebius*. The Letters 252, 255, 260, were almost at the same time.

The 254th. is to the same Person, and in the same Year; but it was written before that which we just now mentioned, and at the Beginning of the Year. He writes to him, That *Demophilus* was upon the Throne of *Constantinople*, and that he was a Hypocrite; and yet that he had reunited the two Parties; and that some Neighbouring Bishops were joyn'd with him. He deplores the miserable state of the Eastern Churches; and says, That God only knows when their Condition may be better.

We have already seen that St. *Basil* went this Year to *Satala*, to regulate the Affairs of this Church, and that he Ordained a Bishop there, at the desire of the Inhabitants. He recommends him to them in Letters 296, and 183; and in 185 he writes to the Church of the *Parnassians*, upon the Death of their Bishop; and in 186, he does with much Eloquence and Christian Charity comfort the Widow of the Prætor *Anatheus*, upon the Death of her Husband. This Letter may pass for a perfect Pattern of true Christian Consolation.

Athanasius Bishop of *Ancyra*, dying in the Year 372, it follows that the Letter 53 of St. *Basil* which is address'd to him, was at least in the Year 371. He complains in this Letter of the Conduct of this Bishop, who accused him of teaching Errors in his Writings, or subscribing to those of others. The Complaint of this Bishop, made St. *Basil* apprehend that some Heretick had prefix'd his Name to his Works. He declares, That he had written against the *Anomæans*, and against those that say, The Holy Spirit is a Creature.

The following Letter is written to the Father of this Bishop, praying him to admonish his Son charitably, not to defame his Colleague without reason.

'Tis credible that the Letter 381, address'd to the Suffragans, was also written in the same Year with the preceeding Letters, and probably soon after St. *Basil* was a Bishop. He complains in this Letter, That some neglected to observe the Canons, and to follow the Discipline of the Church in the Ordination of Ministers exactly: He observes, that formerly none were chosen, but those whose Probity was well known, and of whom the Priests and Deacons gave a good Testimony to the Suffragans; and that neither were these Ordained until the Bishops of the Dioceſs were first advertised of it: He complains, That now the Suffragans did not write to the Bishops; and that they also permitted

St. Baſil. mitted the Prieſts and Deacons to chooſe whom they pleas'd, without enquiring into their Behaviour. *From whence it comes to paſs*, ſays he, *that there are many Miniſters, and but very few who are worthy of their Miniſtery.* To avoid this Abuſe, he Ordains, That there ſhould be preſently ſent to him a Liſt of all the Miniſters that are in the Villages containing the Names of thoſe which have been admitted, and an account of the Life which they lead; That they ſhould be reduc'd to the Condition of Lay-men, who ſhould be found incapable, and thoſe who had been admitted by Prieſts ſince the time of the firſt Prohibition; and that for the future, none ſhould be admitted but thoſe whoſe Life and Converſation had been well examin'd. In fine, he declares, That thoſe who ſhould be admitted into the Clergy, without his Approbation, ſhould be thruſt down to the ſtation of the Laity again.

The 392 to *Amphilochius*, was written before he was made Biſhop of *Iconium*, and by conſequence towards the End of 371, or the beginning of 372. 'Tis written in the Name of *Heraclides*, an ancient Friend of *Amphilochius*. It acquaints him with the Life which he leads under the Conduct of St. *Baſil*, and invites him to come and ſtay with them.

The 319 to *Innocentius* may be alſo about the ſame time. He refuſes to charge himſelf with the Care of the Eaſtern Churches, which this Biſhop would have him to do.

'Twas probably in the ſame Year that St. *Baſil* undertook to build a Church and a Hoſpital in *Ceſarea*. Some would have hindred the going on of this Work; whereupon he writes to *Elias* Governor of the Province in Letter 372; praying him for leave to proceed in his Buildings. The 373, was written to the ſame Perſon in favour of a Receiver, who had neglected to ſend an Account of his Receipts. In the 305, which is to ſome Receiver-General, St. *Baſil* determines, That an Oath ſhould not be exacted from the Collectors of Taxes; becauſe theſe kind of Oaths bring no great Profit to the Receivers, and accuſtom Men to make falſe Oaths. In the 304. he writes to the ſame Perſon, That the Monks ought to be exempted from paying of Tribute.

In the Beginning of the Year 372, St. *Baſil* having found out the Frauds of *Euſtathius* of *Sebaſtea*, ſeparated from him, and re-united himſelf to *Theodotus*. This Separation was begun by two Friends of *Euſtathius*, call'd *Baſil* and *Euphronius*, who were ſent to St. *Baſil*, as Spyes upon him. Theſe two Perſons having created ſome trouble to this Saint, he wrote about it to *Euſtathius*, and pray'd him to put a ſtop to the Diſorder which they caus'd in his Dioceſs. This Letter is the 307, which I believe was written to *Euſtathius* of *Sebaſtea*, though ſome think that it was addreſs'd to another *Euſtathius* Biſhop of *Himeria*, to whom the preceeding Letter is addreſs'd. Some time after, *Euſtathius* being invited to a Council held by St. *Baſil*, not only refus'd to come thither himſelf, but hindred all thoſe of his Party from going, and declared himſelf in his Diſcourſes, and in his Letters, againſt St. *Baſil*. He had alſo the Inſolence to write him a Letter, wherein he declar'd, That he had withdrawn from his Communion, and publiſh'd a Writing or Manifeſto againſt him; wherein he accuſes him of the Error of *Apollinarius*. St. *Baſil* underſtanding theſe things, acknowledg'd, but too late, that he had too eaſily given Credit to one of the greateſt Cheats in the World. He began to commend the Prudence of *Theodotus* of *Nicopolis*; and to reconcile himſelf perfectly to him, he wrote the Letter 196, wherein he gives him a faithful account of all that we have ſaid, and teſtifies the regret he had for truſting to this Impoſtor. He obſerves, That he had publiſh'd a Confeſſion of Faith, which was perfectly agreeable to the Opinions of *Arius*, and accuſes him of re-ordaining Biſhops.

A Biſhop of *Cilicia* nam'd *Theophilus*, joyn'd himſelf with *Euſtathius*, againſt St. *Baſil*. 'Tis to him that Letter 310. is addreſs'd; wherein St. *Baſil* acquaints him, That though he had great Cauſe of Grief upon his account, yet he would not ceaſe always to remember him.

The Letter 81. to *Euſtathius* the Phyſician, was written upon the Separation of *Euſtathius* of *Sebaſtea*: for therein he teſtifies what Trouble he endur'd for the Separation of thoſe who had withdrawn from his Communion; but yet he was oblig'd rather to ſuffer their Diviſion from him, than do any thing againſt the Truth and againſt his own Conſcience; becauſe there was nothing more dear to him than the Faith, and Hope in Jeſus Chriſt.

In Letter 82. to *Petrophilus*, who had objected this Separation to him; He ſhows him, That his Enemies were the Cauſes of this Diviſion, and juſtifies himſelf from two Accuſations which *Euſtathius* had form'd againſt him; Whereof the Firſt was, That he had formerly written to *Apollinarius*: And the Second, That he had received *Diodorus* into his Communion. With reference to *Apollinarius*, he confeſſes, That he had formerly written one Letter only to him; but he ſays, That he did not then believe him to be in an Error; That he could not be reſponſible for his Faults; And That he had not read his Writings. As to *Diodorus*, he confeſſes that he received him into his Communion, as a good Catholick, being Educated by *Silvanus* of *Tarſus*, and who could be charg'd with nothing. He vindicates himſelf alſo from the Crimes that were imputed to him in a Writing addreſs'd to *Dazizus*; and at laſt, he accuſes *Euſtathius* of *Sebaſtea*, and deſcribes his Life in ſuch a manner as is very much to his diſadvantage. *Patrophilus* having received this Letter, ſent St. *Baſil* word that he would not ſeparate from him. St. *Baſil* thanks him in Letter 85, and admoniſhes him, That for keeping Peace, we muſt make choice of ſuch Perſons with whom we may be United; and that we are oblig'd to break with ſome Perſons with whom Peace cannot be had.

But St. *Baſil* did not only defend himſelf by Letters written to his Friends; but he wrote alſo a very ſmart Letter upon the ſame Subject to *Euſtathius*, which is the 79. There he gives an Account of his Conduct and his Doctrine, during the whole time of his Life: He ſhews him, That he could not be accus'd without Injuſtice, for having written almoſt Twenty Years ago to *Apollinarius*: He takes *Euſtathius* himſelf for a Witneſs of his Faith, and asks him, If he could accuſe him of promoting any Error in the Conference which he had with him. He accuſes him of being the Diſciple of

Arius

Arius and *Aetius*. At last, he observes, That the true Cause wherefore he had made this Separation, was not because of the Letter which St. *Basil* wrote to *Apollinarius*, as is pretended; but because his Communion might be prejudicial to those who would acquire Favour and Authority. St. *Basil*.

'Twas at the beginning of this Year, that St. *Basil* wrote to his Brother *Gregory Nyssen*, upon a Complaint that he had against him. He acquaints him in Letter 44, That he was surpriſed, that there were three Letters written to him, under the Name of his Uncle *Gregory*, which were none of his. He gives him to understand, That he would come and see him, and the Bishops his Friends, provided they would receive him Honourably. The 45 and 46, are to his Uncle *Gregory*, upon the same Difference.

The Letter 43, goes under the Name of St. *Basil*, and is addreſs'd to the same St. *Gregory Nyssen*, in the Editions of St. *Basil*: But 'tis in the Second Volume of St. *Gregory Nyssen*, under the Name of that Father, and is addreſs'd to their Brother *Peter*; and indeed, it has more of the Stile of St. *Gregory*, than of St. *Basil*. The Author of it explains with much Subtilty, the Difference between the words *Hypostasis*, and *Essence*: and shows, That *Essence* signifies that which is common to the Three Divine Persons; and *Hypostasis*, that which is peculiar to each Person.

The Letter 262, to *Eusebius* of *Samosata*, was written before Easter, in the Year 372. It contains excuses for not writing to him so often as he would. St. *Basil* fell sick about Easter, and was afflicted with a Fever, which tormented him till Winter, as appears by the Letters 257 and 258, written at the same time, to *Eusebius* of *Samosata*, and by 270, 271, to *Antiochus*.

This same Year the Persecution of the *Arians* was begun anew more fiercely than ever. St. *Basil* speaks of this persecution in his Letter 5. to *Eusebius*, wherein he acquaints him, That 'twas rais'd against the Catholicks of the Church of *Tarsus*, which was the Centre of Unity to *Isauria*, *Cilicia*, and *Cappadocia*; That the Church was ruin'd by desperate Persons, and that all things went on from bad to worse, while the Catholicks were amus'd, and did nothing but look on.

Eusebius answer'd him, That they must write again to the Bishops of the West, to desire of them some Relief. St. *Basil* wrote also about it to *Meletius*, without whose Advice, he would undertake nothing. This Letter is the 58, wherein he complains, that *Anthimus*, Bishop of *Tyana*, would have Ordain'd one *Faustus*, in the room of a Bishop whom St. *Basil* had Ordain'd in *Armenia*. He sent this Letter by *Sanctissimus*, whom he charg'd also with a Letter to *Theodotus*, wherein he complains of the Ordination of *Faustus*. This Letter is the 195. Afterwards, he gave to the same Person, three Letters: The First for the Priests of *Antioch*; the Second for the Monks of that City; and the Last for *Pelagius* of *Laodicea*. These Letters are the 199, 200, and 312. There is also a Letter upon the Ordination of *Faustus*, addreſs'd to *Poemenius*, Bishop of *Satala*, which is the 313.

A little while after, he wrote to *Meletius* the Letter 59, wherein having defended himself from the Accusation of *Eustathius*, who accus'd him of the Errors of *Apollinarius*; he says, That he had receiv'd Information, that it was resolv'd at Court, to deliver him up to the Fury of his Enemies; but that this Order was suspended for some time.

He earnestly prays *Meletius* to answer the Letter which he had written to him by *Sanctissimus*, and to send him a Letter for the Bishops of the West, Sign'd by those who were united with him in Communion and Judgment. He signifies that the Western Bishops must be advertis'd not to receive into their Communion indifferently, all those that come from the East.

The Letter 273, to the Priest *Antiochus*, who was Nephew to *Eusebius* of *Samosata*, which Father *Combefis* believes to be directed also to *Meletius*, is upon the same Subject. He prays him to Order, together with the Deacon *Dorotheus*, what must be done for a Re-union with the West. He Counsels him to dictate the Letter himself, that was to be sent thither. He says, That he had written some time ago to the Bishops of *Illyricum*, of *Gaul*, and *Italy*, by the Deacon *Sabinus*; but he adds, That it would be convenient to send one into the West, in the Name of a Synod of the East. As to what concerns *Athanasius*, he says, That he is very well inclin'd to Peace; but he can do nothing, unless Letters of Communion be sent to him: Moreover, That he does ardently desire the Reunion, and will do all that's possible for him to procure it. This Letter was written before Easter. He signifies, that he waited for his Answer.

'Twas at this Time, and upon this Occasion, that Letter 70 of St. *Basil*, was written, addreſs'd to the Western Bishops, wherein he prays them to inform their Emperour of the Miseries which the Orthodox suffer'd in the East, and to send them Deputies. This Letter was to be carried by a Priest nam'd *Dorotheus*.

While Matters were thus order'd in the East, St. *Basil*, who was now recovering, as appears by the Sixth Letter to *Eusebius* of *Samosata*, fell sick again in Winter, He speaks of this Sickness in his Seventh Letter, and excuses himself for not visiting St. *Eusebius* from the sharpness of the Winter, and the Death of his Mother. He deplores in his Letter, the unhappy State of the Church, and says, That some would have plac'd *Arians* at *Ancyra* and *Neocæsarea*, in the room of the Orthodox, but that at last they had left the Churches in tranquility.

In the mean time, *Evagrius*, a Priest of *Antioch* being return'd from the West, brought a Letter, which he would have obliged the Eastern Bishops to Sign; saying, That those which they had written before, were not approved in the West. St. *Basil* having received Advice of this, wrote to *Eusebius* of *Samosata* by his Eighth Letter. There he speaks against *Eustathius* of *Sebastea*, and enquires if he was to be present at the Ordination of a Bishop for the City of *Iconium*, which had formerly depended upon his Metropolis, but did not now since the Division of *Cappadocia*.

He wrote also at the same time to this *Evagrius*, who was come from the West, and who had written to him, that he was suspected, because of his Communion with *Meletius*. St. *Basil* answer'd him

St Baſil.

him by Letter 342, That he was very little troubled at what the World thought of him, but that he would labour hard for Peace; and Exhorts *Evagrius* to do the ſame. He ſignifies to him, That he was troubled to underſtand by *Dorotheus*, That he would not Communicate with *Meletius*'s Party. He declares to him, That as things now ſtand he could not ſend any body into the Weſt.

He writes the ſame Account of the Journey to *Rome*, to that *Dorotheus*, whom he had charg'd with Letter 70. He could not forbear taking Notice, How angry he was with the Pope, and ſaying, That his Brother *Gregory*, was not a proper Perſon to be deputed into the Weſt, becauſe he was too ſimple to have any thing to do with a Proud Man, and one exalted in Dignity, who by conſequence would hardly have patience to hear him ſpeak the Truth. This Letter is the 150. The Prieſt went to *Rome*, however, as appears by Letter 321.

In the mean time, *Euſebius* of *Samoſata*, who paſſionately deſir'd the Peace of the Church, beleiving that St. *Baſil* neglected to labour in it, wrote a Letter to him, wherein he complains of two Things: Firſt, That he had not come to ſee him: Secondly, That he had abandon'd, as one may ſay, the Church to its Enemies, by his Sloathfulneſs and Negligence. St. *Baſil* anſwer'd him, by Letter 262, That he could not come to ſee him, becauſe of his Sickneſs, and that the thing which hindred his Good Succeſs, was not the want of Care; but becauſe the Biſhops did not agree among themſelves, about Matters of Conſequence, and he alone could not regulate Affairs, ſince the Canons did not allow one Biſhop alone, to make Regulations of this Nature.

The Letter 265, is almoſt upon the ſame Subject. He wrote to him, That he ardently deſir'd Peace, but then it muſt be a real one. He adviſes him to take heed of thoſe that ſeem to be Catholicks, and yet are not. He declares to him, That he would never Communicate with thoſe who did not receive the *Nicene* Faith, or who believ'd that the Holy Spirit was a Creature, becauſe he was not willing to approach the Altar, with a Heart full of Diſſimulation and Hypocriſy, that for this Reaſon, he had withdrawn from the Communion of *Euvippus*; That they ought to be treated with all mildneſs, who had not receiv'd this Faith; That we ſhould invite them to own it, and ſhow great Charity and Moderation to them: but that we ought never to be Trimmers, nor remain Neuters in Matters of Faith.

About the End of this Year, The Church of *Antioch* being afflicted with a rough Perſecution, he wrote Letter 60, to comfort it. He propoſes the *Nicene* Creed, as the Rule of Faith. He ſays, That the Divinity of the Holy Spirit was not there expreſly determin'd, becauſe it was not then directly oppos'd but that we ought to condemn all thoſe who admit a Creature in the Trinity.

The Letter 62, to the Church of *Neocæſarea*, is alſo of the ſame Nature; he Comforts it upon the Death of its Biſhop. It was written before the foregoing Letter, and at the beginning of the Year. There are ſome other Letters of St. *Baſil*, which probably were written the ſame Year 372, that have not ſo much reference to Hiſtory.

We may place in this Number, the Letters 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, and 279, to the Governour *Modeſtus*, who began to be his Friend about this time. He prays him in this laſt, to preſerve the Exemptions of Prieſts and Deacons.

We may place alſo in this time, the Letter 86, to *Boſphorus*, wherein St. *Baſil* gives an Account of the Difference which he had with his Predeceſſor, *Dianius*, Biſhop of *Cæſarea*. He ſays, That he had not anathematis'd him, but that he was extremely troubled, when he underſtood, that this Biſhop had Sign'd the Creed of *Conſtantinople*; and that for this Cauſe, he ſeparated from him, but that he returned to his Communion before he died, when he declar'd, That he had Signed this Creed by Surprize, and without knowing any evil by it.

There is another Letter, wherein he ſpeaks of this Biſhop *Boſphorus*. It is Letter 300, addreſs'd to the Nuns. There he confutes thoſe who accuſed him of not receiving the *Nicene* Creed. He approves it, and yet confeſſes, that there are Catholicks who do not allow of the Word *Conſubſtantial*, becauſe they believe that it has an ill Sence. He ſays, That they ought to be pardon'd, becauſe this Term did very much diſpleaſe the Biſhops, who condemned *Paulus Samoſatenus*. He explains the good Sence of this Word, and the diſtinction of *Hypoſtaſes*. Laſtly, He proves the Divinity and Equality of the Father and the Son.

St. *Peter* of *Alexandria*, having Succeeded St. *Athanaſius*, in the Year 373, St. *Baſil* did not fail to write to him immediately after his Promotion to the Biſhoprick. This Letter is the 320. He Congratulates his Exaltation, and exhorts him to follow the Footſteps of St. *Athanaſius*.

Soon after this, *Peter* was forced away, and the Church of *Alexandria* was perſecuted moſt violently by the *Arians*. Immediately, St. *Baſil* comforts them in a Letter, wherein he deplores their Miſery. This Letter is the 71.

Amphilochius was Ordained Biſhop of *Iconium* at the end of the Year 372, as appears by the Eighth Letter of St. *Baſil*. 'Twas therefore towards the End of the laſt Year, or rather at the Beginning of this, that St. *Baſil* congratulated him by Letter 393, and 'twas certainly in 373, that he invited him by Letter 344, to the Feaſt of St. *Euphichius*, which was *September* the 5th.

The 395, to the ſame, is alſo of the ſame Year. He acquaints him, That he had finiſh'd the Book of the Holy Spirit.

The Letter 363, to *Euſebius* of *Samoſata*, was written before Eaſter of the ſame Year, during the ſharp Winter-Seaſon. St. *Baſil* acquaints him, That he was dangerouſly Sick.

Towards the End of this Year, St. *Euſebius* of *Samoſata*, was baniſh'd into *Thrace*, and St. *Baſil* wrote to him the Letters 9, and 251. to Comfort him in his baniſhment; and the Letter 269, to his Nephew *Antiochus*, who accompanied his Uncle. The Clergy of *Samoſata*, being troubled by the *Arians*, and by the Diviſion of ſome particular Perſons, he Comforts them, and Exhorts them to Peace

Peace by Letter 280, and praiſes the Senate of that City, by Letter 294. He wrote alſo to *Otreus*, Biſhop of *Melitine*, the Letter 316, where he ſpeaks of the Baniſhment of *Euſebius*.

St. *Baſil.*

It was towards the End of this Year, that St. *Baſil* wrote to the Biſhops of the Sea-Coaſts, and of the Iſles, the Letter 77, wherein he complains, that they had ſent no body to him for Relief in their Miſeries, and prays them to ſend their Deputies and Letters of Communion. 'Twas alſo about the ſame time, that he wrote the Letter 322, upon the ſame Subject to *Elpides*. We may place alſo in the ſame time, the Letter 87, which he wrote to a Heretical Woman call'd *Simplicia*, who concerned her ſelf to make Remonſtrances to him. He tells her with ſome warmth, That it doth not belong to her to judge: That he expected his judgment from God. He adds, That he ſhould not want Witneſſes to juſtify his Conduct, and that he would not make uſe of Slaves or Eunuchs, whoſe Teſtimony ought not to be taken. He gives a dreadful Character of the Eunuchs of his time.

We cannot find a Year wherein we can better place, than in this, the Letter 184 to *Palladius*, and to *Innocentius*, Prieſts and Monks. He informs them, That he is a lover of Peace. He prays God to reſtrain the Authors of Diviſion, and recommends himſelf to their Prayers.

St. *Baſil* being recovered of his Sickneſs, which had tormented him during the two Winters of the Years 373 and 374, went into *Piſidia* and *Iſauria*, to regulate the Affairs of thoſe Countries, as it appears by Letter 272. It was before this Journey that he wrote to *Amphilochius*, the Letter 396, wherein he acquaints him with his Diſeaſe, and prays him to delay their meeting for ſome Days; ſo it was alſo in the ſame Winter, that he wrote the firſt Canonical Letter to *Amphilochius*, which he could not ſend to him becauſe of his Sickneſs; and St. *Amphilochius* having ſent to him ſome more Queſtions, wherein he deſired to be informed, St. *Baſil* anſwered him by the Second, written in the beginning of the Year 374. The laſt of theſe Letters was probably written towards the end of this Year, after St. *Gregory* was retir'd from *Nazianzum*. We ſhall ſpeak ſeverally of theſe Letters.

The Affairs which he had in *Piſidia*, concerned the Churches of *Iſaurus* or *Iſauria*, which had been diſmembred from their own Province, to be joyned to the Churches of *Piſidia* and *Lycaonia*. St. *Amphilochius*, who was Biſhop of *Iconium*, the Metropolis of *Lycaonia*, had written about it to St. *Baſil*, and prayed him to come thither. This Saint, before he went into that Country, acquainted him by Letter 406, That he did well to take Care of theſe Churches; but yet he did not approve of the Deſign which he had of ſharing them amongſt many Biſhops, leſt the Dignity of a Biſhop ſhould thereby become contemptible. He ſays, That it would be better to chuſe one man worthy of a Biſhoprick, who might take ſome Prieſts to his Aſſiſtance, than thus to divide a ſmall Territory into many Biſhopricks. He adviſes him to place Pariſh Prieſts in the Towns where there had formerly been Biſhops, before any Biſhop was Ordain'd, leſt if there ſhould be one Ordain'd before, he would not approve of this Regulation. In fine, he admoniſhes him to confine the Church of *Iſauria* within its own Bounds. He adds, That the Affairs of the Church of *Nyſſa* are in the ſame Condition, and that ſome of his Enemies were gone to Court. He ſubjoyns a Queſtion of Doctrine about the Opinion of *Philo*, who affirms, That Manna had all ſorts of Taſtes. He ſays, That this Opinion was grounded only upon a Jewiſh Tradition. He advertiſes *Amphilochius*, that *Sympius* had ſent him a Letter of Communion, and that he had anſwer'd him. This Letter is probably the 398, directed to *Amphilochius*, but it could not be addreſs'd to him, ſince it appears by this Letter that he to whom St. *Baſil* wrote, had been at difference with him, and was reconciled ſome time before, ſince he thanks him for his Reconciliation.

In all probability it was about this Affair of *Iſauria*, and ſome others of the like Nature, that St. *Baſil* went into *Piſidia* and *Iſauria*; and in the beginning of the Year 375, from *Piſidia* he went to *Pontus*, a Canton whereof called *Dazimona*, was furiouſly troubled by *Euſtathius* of *Sebaſtea*, who had perſwaded many Biſhops to ſeparate from the Communion of St. *Baſil*. This Saint thought to have found one of his Friends call'd *Hilary*, in that Country, but he was gone. He ſignifies in Letter 370, how much he was troubled, that he could not find him. He acquaints him alſo, That the *Anomæans* and *Semi-Arians* hated him, and loaded him with Calumnies, becauſe of ſome Writings that were falſly attributed to him. In his return he went to ſee his ancient place of retirement, near *Neocæſarea*, were his Brother *Peter* dwelt. The Inhabitants of *Neocæſarea*, believing that he was come to concern himſelf about their Affairs, conceiv'd an Averſion to him, and accus'd him of many things. To refute their Calumnies and undeceive them, he wrote to them three Letters upon this Occaſion.

The firſt, which is the 63, is addreſs'd to the Clergy. He ſays, That they were to blame, to accuſe him of Error, who themſelves propagated thoſe things which were aſſerted by none but *Sabellius* and *Marcellus* of *Ancyra*; That they could have but two Pretences for the Averſion they had teſtified againſt him; Firſt, The changing of the way of ſinging of Pſalms; and Secondly, The Affection which he had for thoſe that profeſs'd a Monaſtick Life. As to the laſt Accuſation, he ſays, That it was very much to his Advantage, that they had this Opinion of him, ſince there were Monks in *Egypt*, in *Paleſtine*, and in *Meſopotamia*; and Monaſteries of Nuns in all Places. As to the ſinging of the Prayers of the Church, he maintains, That in that he follow'd the ancient Cuſtom of the Church; That on the great Feſtivals the People came before Day into the Church; That after Prayer they ſtood up to ſing in two Chorus's, which anſwered one another; That thus the Night was ſpent in ſinging and praying; That at break of Day all the Faithful rehears'd the Penitential Pſalms. He maintains, That this Cuſtom took place in *Egypt*, in *Libya*, in *Phœnicia*, in *Paleſtine*, in *Syria*. As to what they objected to him, That this was not in uſe in the time of St. *Gregory Thaumaturgus*, he anſwers them, That the Letanies or the Prayers which the Faithful uſed at *Neocæſarea*, were no more in uſe in his time, than this Cuſtom. He adds that tho' he did not condemn them, yet he thought it more

convenient

St. *Baſil.* convenient to ask God's Pardon of Sins, by uſing the Words of the Holy Scripture, than employing thoſe of Men's deviſing. He maintains alſo, That it cannot be proved, that the ſinging of Pſalms was not uſed in St. *Gregory*'s time. He blames them, becauſe they themſelves did not obſerve what this great Man did. He tells them, That he pray'd with his head uncovered; That he did not ſwear at all; That he did not reproach his Neighbour; That he did not bear Envy againſt him; That he was neither proud nor quarrelſome, *&c.* whereby he tacitly objects theſe Faults to thoſe of *Neocæſarea*. Towards the latter end, he admoniſhes them to lay aſide thoſe Innovations that had crept in amongſt them, to admit the three Hypoſtaſes in God, not to deny the Name of Jeſus Chriſt, and not to miſinterpret the Expreſſions of St. *Gregory*.

The 64 is directed to the moſt Learned of this Church of *Neocæſarea*. There he deſcribes the Occaſion and Cauſe which obliged him to come near *Neocæſarea*. He accuſes them of *Sabellianiſm*, becauſe they admitted but one Hypoſtaſis. He anſwers what they had ſaid in a Letter addreſs'd to *Anthimus*, wherein they alledg'd a Paſſage of St. *Gregory Thaumaturgus*, who ſays, *That the Father and the Son were Two by Conception, but One in Subſtance*. He maintains, That this Father did not ſay this, as an Article of Faith; That this Expreſſion eſcap'd him in the heat of Diſputation, and that he never intended to explain his Doctrine about the Myſtery of the Trinity exactly, in a Treatiſe which was made for the Inſtruction of an Infidel. At Laſt he aſſerts, that 'tis not ſufficient to ſay, That there are Three Divine Perſons, unleſs it be added, that each of them has a particular Subſiſtence by it ſelf.

The Letter 75 is addreſs'd to all the Faithful of *Neocæſarea*, whom he treats with more mildneſs. He complains of them, that having given Credit to the Calumnies which were publiſh'd againſt him, they had ſeparated from his Communion. He repreſents to them, That he was Educated by his Grand-Mother *Macrina*, who had been amongſt them, and had been Inſtructed in the Doctrine of St. *Gregory* of *Neocæſarea*, and that ſince that time, he had never Patroniz'd the *Arians*; That he had Letters from St. *Athanaſius*, wherein he ſaid, That thoſe ſhould be receiv'd into Communion, who returned from their Error. St. *Baſil* adds, That he Communicated with all the Orthodox Churches, and ſo thoſe that would not Communicate with him, were ſeparated from the Church. In ſhort, He does not refuſe to be judged by a Synod. He would even ſubmit himſelf to their Judgment, but upon Condition that they ſhould not lightly believe, but examine the Accuſations that were form'd againſt him, and his Defences. There is in this Letter a very fine Sentence againſt Calumny. The 20th. Letter to *Euſtathius* the Phyſician, was alſo written by St. *Baſil* about the ſame time, to vindicate himſelf againſt thoſe that accuſed him of teaching, That there were Three Gods, becauſe he admitted Three Hypoſtaſes. He juſtifies this Doctrine, and proves the Divinity of the Holy Spirit. This Letter in ſome Manuſcripts is attributed to St. *Gregory Nyſſen*, and 'tis found among his Works; but 'tis rather St. *Baſil*'s, than St. *Gregory Nyſſen*'s, for it agrees better to him; the Stile is more like his, and the Doctrine is different from that of St. *Gregory*; ſince the Author of this Letter maintains, That the Soul of *Samuel* did really come from the Inviſible State to ſpeak unto *Saul*; and St. *Gregory* expreſly teaches the contrary in his Book of the *Witch of* Endor. In the 382, written to *Olympas*, he complains, that his Enemies had written againſt him, and had imputed to him the Error and the Writings of *Apollinarius*. He confeſſes, That this Man was a Heretick. A Biſhop nam'd *Eulancius* had taken Part againſt him with thoſe of *Neocæſarea*; but he came to himſelf at laſt, and wrote to St. *Baſil*, whom he thanks by Letter 281. He defends himſelf alſo from the Calumnies of *Euſtathius*, in Letter 346 to *Genethlius*.

St. *Baſil* being returned to *Cæſarea*, received there Letters from the Eaſt, wherein they acquaint him, that *Paulinus*'s Party had received a Letter from the Weſt, which confirmed to him the Biſhoprick of *Antioch*. This Letter ſo raiſed the Spirits of thoſe of that Party, that they would have forced every body elſe to Sign a Confeſſion of Faith, that they might be re-united with them. They did alſo ſhake Count *Terentius*, who had formerly been of *Meletius*'s ſide, and would have oblig'd him to Conſent to this Union. St. *Baſil* being inform'd of this News, wrote immediately to him the Letter 349, to perſuade him not to abandon *Meletius*. He ſays, That thoſe of the Weſt were ignorant of the State of the Eaſtern Churches, and that they knew not the Reaſons which St. *Athanaſius* had to Communicate with *Paulinus*. He declares, That he accuſes no Man; That he deſires nothing but Peace; That he congratulates thoſe who had brought theſe Letters from *Rome*; but that he could not forſake *Meletius* and his Church, to joyn with a Party that had caus'd the Schiſm. Laſtly, He refutes the Opinion of thoſe of that Side, who admitted but One Hypoſtaſis in the Trinity.

He ſent an Account immediately to *Antiochus*, who was at *Samoſata*, of all that had been done ſince the beginning of this Year, and a Relation of what he had learn'd from *Antioch*: This Letter is the 272. About the ſame time, the Prieſt *Dorotheus*, who was gone into the Weſt, contrary to the counſel of St. *Baſil*, return'd into the Eaſt, very much diſſatisfied with the manner of Treatment that he had met with from *Damaſus*; who reckon'd *Meletius* and *Euſebius* of *Samoſata* among the *Arians*. *Peter* of *Alexandria* who was then at *Rome*, wrote about it to St. *Baſil*, ſignifying to him, That he was troubled that he had received no News from the Eaſt, and that *Dorotheus* had not ſatisfied the Biſhops of the Weſt. St. *Baſil* anſwer'd him by Letter 321, wherein having excuſed himſelf for not writing to him before, he complains of the Conduct of *Damaſus*, excuſes *Dorotheus*, and juſtifies *Meletius* and *Euſebius* of *Samoſata*. Some time after St. *Baſil* adviſes St. *Amphilochius* by Letter 403, to ſend a Man of Gravity and Judgment into *Lycia*, to inquire into the Inclinations of the Biſhops of that Country; becauſe he was aſſur'd, that they were for the moſt part Orthodox, and deſired nothing more than a re-union with them. He names to him thoſe whom he certainly knew to be Catholicks, to be firſt conſulted. He thanks God that *Aſia* was purg'd from the poiſon of Hereſy,

and

and exhorts *Amphilochius* to take care of his Church. The Letters 402, and 403, to the ſame *Amphilochius*, are written in the ſame Year, before the 5th. of *September*.

St. *Baſil.*

About the End of this Year, *Demoſthenes*, Lieutenant to the Pretorian Prefect, renew'd the Perſecution againſt the Churches of *Aſia*. He caus'd a little Council to be aſſembled at *Ancyra*, wherein he procur'd *Hipſius* to be turn'd out, and *Ecdicius* the *Arian* to be Ordain'd in his room.

Demoſthenes came afterwards to *Nyſſa*, to force away from thence St. *Gregory*, whom he would have Arreſted, under pretence that he waſted the Church's Money. St. *Baſil* thought himſelf oblig'd on this occaſion to write for his Brother to *Demoſthenes* in the Name of all the Biſhops of his Province. He gives him to underſtand, That if he would treat about the Money, the Treaſurers were ready to give him an Account of it; but if he accuſed him of Eccleſiaſtical Matters, that he himſelf would examine it, and that he ſhould not ſend his Brother to be judg'd out of his own Country. He wrote alſo the Letter 358. to *Abyrcius*, wherein he prays him to aſſiſt his Brother. This happen'd about *Chriſtmas* in the Year 374; for St. *Amphilochius* having ſent Preſents to St. *Baſil* at the time of this Feſtival, St. *Baſil* thanks him by Letter 404, and tells him, That his Brother was forced to fly.

Demoſthenes was not ſatisfied with forcing away St. *Gregory Nyſſen* upon the Accuſation of a profligate Perſon, but called a Synod of the Biſhops of *Galatia* and *Pontus* at *Nyſſa*; wherein he got a Biſhop ordain'd in the room of St. *Gregory*. From thence the ſame Biſhops went to *Sebaſtea*, to place one of their own Party at *Nicopolis* in the room of *Theodotus*, who was dead. They choſe one *Fronto*, but the *Nicopolitans* would not receive him. This happened in the beginning of the Year 375; and St. *Baſil* wrote an Account of it to *Euſebius* of *Samoſata* by the Letters 264, and 10. In this laſt Letter he complains of the Pride of the Biſhops of the Weſt, and ſays, That their Faith was ſuſpected by him, ſince they acted as they had done formerly, with reference to *Marcellus* of *Ancyra*. In the Letter 405 to St. *Amphilochius*, he deſcribes and deplores the Miſery of the Churches, and ſays, That *Aſclepius* was kill'd becauſe he would not communicate with Hereticks. And he does the ſame in the Letter 348. to *Elpidius*. He ſpeaks alſo of the Unhappy State of the Church in Letter 266. In Letter 297 written to thoſe of *Chalcis*, he exhorts them to continue firm and conſtant in the time of Perſecution; He tells them, That it was violent in the Eaſt, and that it threatned *Cappadocia*, The Letters 298, and 299, to thoſe of *Berœa*, are upon the ſame ſubject, as well as 303; wherein he comforts the Monks that ſuffer'd for the Faith. He ſays, That their Sufferings ſhall not be leſs recompenced than thoſe of the Ancient Martyrs. We muſt joyn to theſe the 326, and 327, addreſs'd to *Barſus* Biſhop of *Edeſſa*; who was Baniſhed, and the 306 to *Euſtathius* of *Himmeria*.

He wrote at the ſame time the 72 againſt *Euſtathius* of *Sebaſtea*, addreſs'd to the *Edeſſenians*. There he deſcribes the lightneſs and changes of this Heretick; and there he ſpeaks of a pretended Council held at *Ancyra* at the end of the Year 374.

The 73 is written againſt the ſame Perſon and at the ſame time; for there he obſerves, That it was now Three Years ſince he was accus'd by *Euſtathius*. He ſays, That he was unjuſtly blam'd upon the Account of the Errors of a Perſon [*Apollinarius*] to whom he never wrote but once, and that it was now Twenty Years ſince he did it; That thoſe who accus'd him, did it to pleaſe the Powers, to whom they are, and always have been devoted; That the true Reaſon why *Euſtathius* and thoſe of his Party were offended with him, was not becauſe he refus'd to receive their Suffragans, as they pretended but becauſe they would pleaſe *Euzoius*; That they were joyn'd to the *Eudoxians*, and called the Orthodox *Homo-ouſians*, though they had formerly made Profeſſion of this Faith, and had alſo preſented it to the Synod of *Tyana*. Laſtly, That they had deſtroy'd the Churches which they had invaded. He concludes this Letter with a Profeſſion of Faith, which rejects the Errors of *Arius* and *Sabellius*.

The Letters 190, 191, 192, are written to the People and Clergy of *Nicopolis*, to comfort and exhort them in the Perſecution which they ſuffer'd during this Year 375, after the Death of their Biſhop. In the laſt he declares to them, That they ought not to acknowledge him for their Biſhop, whom the *Arians* had Ordain'd among them, though he calls himſelf Catholick, which he cannot be, being Ordain'd by the Hands of profane Perſons, for the Deſtruction of the Faith: That this was his Opinion, which, if they would hold Communion with him, they ſhould follow; "Which he had writ-"ten to them, ſays he, not that he diſtruſted them, but to remove the doubt of ſome, and that if any "Perſon ſhould get himſelf Ordain'd Prieſt by this Biſhop, he ſhould have no hope to continue for "the future in this Dignity.

Poemius, Biſhop of *Satala*, went after this to viſit the Church of *Nicopolis*, about the end of this Year, or the beginning of the next, and confirm'd them in the Reſolution of taking a Biſhop, and Counſell'd them to chuſe *Euphronius*, Biſhop of *Colonia*. St. *Baſil* approved of this Choice by Letter 193, and admoniſh'd them not to irritate thoſe of *Colonia*, who were mightily troubled for the loſs of their Biſhop. Theſe he comforted by the Letters 290, 291, wherein, after having praiſed the Zeal and Affection they had for their Biſhop, he ſhows them, that this Tranſlation was neceſſary for the good of the Church, and exhorts them not to Conteſt the Matter with the Church of *Nicopolis*, ſince that Church was their Metropolis, and what reſpected it concern'd them alſo. In the Letter 164 he exhorts the *Nicopolitans*, continually to adhere and ſubmit to the Biſhop which had been lately ſent them.

While the Eaſtern Churches were toſt with theſe Tempeſts, thoſe of the Weſt being at laſt mov'd with ſome Compaſſion for them, ſent Prieſts to Comfort them, and to Teſtify, that they did Sympathize with them in their Sorrows. St. *Epiphanius*, Biſhop of *Cyprus*, who perhaps had ſeen the 77th. Letter of St. *Baſil*, did the ſame. St. *Baſil* thanks the former by Letter 74, which is written in the Name

St. *Baſil.* Name of all the Eaſtern Biſhops, and he continues ſtill to deſire their Aſſiſtance, not ſo much againſt the *Arians*, as againſt thoſe who under Sheep's cloathing were Ravenous Wolves, and rent the Flock of Chriſt in pieces without Puniſhment. He accuſes Three Perſons in particular. *Euſtathius* of *Sebaſtea* is the Firſt; and to render him Odious, he deſcribes all his Life, and ſays, That he was inſtructed by *Arius*, and was one of his moſt wicked Diſciples at *Alexandria*; That being returned to *Cæſarea*, and ſeeing himſelf condemn'd by his Biſhop *Hermogenes*, he had Sign'd an Orthodox Confeſſion of Faith, and afterwards was Ordain'd Prieſt; but then after the Death of *Hermogenes*, he went to *Conſtantinople*, where he again made Profeſſion of *Arianiſm* under *Euſebius*; That being driven out of this City, he returned into his own Country, where he was forc'd to retire; That ſoon after he was made Biſhop purely by Chance, and then he preſently condemn'd the *Nicene* Creed in the Council of *Ancyra*; That the Party whom he joyn'd with at *Seleucia*, was known to all Men; That at *Conſtantinople* he Conſented to the Creed of the Hereticks; That at laſt being gone into the Weſt, he carried from *Liberius* Communicatory Letters to the Synod of *Tyana*, by means whereof he was reſtor'd; That it was not known what *Liberius* had obliged him to Sign; but preſently after he became the Patron of the Hereticks, who oppoſed the Divinity of the Holy Spirit, and perſecuted the Orthodox. The Second whom St. *Baſil* accus'd to the Weſtern Biſhops, was *Apollinarius*, whom he ſpared more than he had done *Euſtathius*; yet he ſays, That he had very much troubled the Churches, becauſe he had ſo great a Facility of Writing, that he had fill'd the World with his Books; That in ſo great a Number of Writings, ſome Errors could not but creep in; That what he had written of Theology, was not founded upon Scripture, but upon humane Reaſoning; That he had written Fabulous Things of the Reſurrection; That he had ſo perplex'd the Doctrine of the Incarnation, that few of his Acquaintance have retained the Form of ancient Doctrine; but on the contrary, almoſt all of them have buſied themſelves with uſeleſs and contentious Queſtions. Laſtly, *Paulinus* was very much eſteem'd by thoſe of the Weſt; yet St. *Baſil* ſpares him not, for he is the Third Perſon whom he accuſes in this Letter. He leaves it to the Biſhops of the Weſt to judge, whether his Ordination was lawful or no: But he adds, That that which vexed the moſt part of the Eaſtern Biſhops againſt him, was his following the Error of *Marcellus* of *Ancyra*, whereby he maintain'd, That the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, were but One Hypoſtaſis. He deſires Aſſiſtance of thoſe of the Weſt againſt thoſe who followed theſe Three Men, and prays them to ſend Letters, wherein they might declare, That thoſe who are of their Party ought not to be received into Communion, untill they have renounc'd their Errors. He concludes with ſaying, That it were to be wiſh'd, that the Eaſtern and Weſtern Biſhops could Aſſemble together to Conſult about thoſe things: But ſince the preſent juncture of Affairs would not permit them to do it, and a Buſineſs of this Nature would not admit any longer delay, they were content to ſend ſome of their Brethren to their Weſtern Brethren, to inform them of that which could not be put into a Letter, and to invite them to aſſiſt the Churches of Jeſus Chriſt. Father *Combefis* ſays, That it is obſerved in ſome Manuſcripts, that this Letter was never ſent; but we ought not to give much Credit to thoſe kind of Obſervations made by Tranſcribers.

The Letter 325 to St. *Epiphanius*, is alſo written to thank him, that he had ſent ſome Prieſts to Viſit and Comfort the Churches of the Eaſt: He ſignifies to him, That he deſerv'd ſo much the more acknowledgment, becauſe it was a rare thing to find Biſhops at that time, who had Compaſſion on their Brethren. And becauſe St. *Epiphanius* had written to him, That he was troubled for the Difference which was riſen in a certain Country which he calls *Eleona*, St. *Baſil* anſwers in this Letter, That he had Reaſon to wiſh that this Breach were healed; but that he would not have ſuch People made uſe of, who were fit for nothing but to embroil Matters, becauſe they were not acted by the Love of God. ('Tis probable that he ſpeaks of *Paulinus*'s Party.) He adds, That there had been already ſent into that Country, *Palladius*, a Prieſt of *Cæſarea*, and *Innocentius*, a Prieſt of *Rome*, to ſatisfy the Demands of thoſe of this Country, and determine their Differences, which were probably about the Incarnation; That they had been told, that nothing muſt be added to the *Nicene* Creed, but the Doxology of the Holy Spirit; That he would add nothing about the Incarnation, becauſe thoſe Queſtions tranſcended the Capacity of his Underſtanding. He ſets it down for a Maxim, That when once Men depart from the Simplicity of Faith, by reaſoning about it, then there is no end of the Diſpute, and all the Queſtions which they handle, ſerve for no other uſe, but to trouble the Minds of the humble. Afterwards he exhorts St. *Epiphanius* to joyn with *Meletius*, and aſſures him, That St. *Athanaſius* intended to do it, and that their Union was retarded only by the Malicious Counſel of ſome particular Perſons. He confeſſes, That he did not Communicate with thoſe that were after *Meletius*, that's to ſay, with *Paulinus*, and thoſe of his Party, not becauſe he thought them unworthy of his Communion, but becauſe they condemned *Meletius*, in whom there was nothing to be reprehended. He praiſes St. *Epiphanius*, becauſe he acknowledged Three Hypoſtaſes. He exhorts him to cauſe his Brethren of *Antioch* to confeſs the ſame thing, if they had not already acknowledged it. He prays him to procure the Peace of that Church, by re-uniting the Two Parties. Laſt of all, He ſpeaks to him about the Errors of a Sect of Hereticks, call'd *Maguſæans*, concerning which St. *Epiphanius* had deſired of him ſome Account.

The Letter 55 to St. *Ambroſe*, was at the ſame time, and probably was ſent by the Deputies, who carried Letter 74 into the Weſt. He writes to him, That he had known of a long time his Judgment Learning and Vertue; That he bleſs'd God for drawing from the Court, a Man Illuſtrious for his Wiſdom, his Dignity and Eloquence, to charge him with the Government of Chriſt's Flock. He exhorts him wholly to extinguiſh the remainders of *Arianiſm*, if there was any in his Dioceſs, and prays him to continue the Friendſhip which they had begun. Theſe Letters are written at the Beginning of the Year 376. 'Twas in this Year alſo, that he wrote the Letter 293 to *Eulogius*, and to the other

other Biſhops of *Egypt* that were baniſh'd into *Paleſtine*: 'Tis againſt *Apollinarius* and *Marcellus* of *Ancyra*, whom he charges with the ſame Errors which he had ſpoken of in Letter 74.

The Letter 295 to the Monks, might alſo be at the ſame time, as well as the Letters 337,338,339, to *Aſcolius* of *Theſſalonica*.

The Letter 182 written alſo in the Name of the Churches of the Eaſt to the Weſtern Biſhops, was in the Year 377, or 378. For the Eaſtern Biſhops who deſcribe there in a moſt Elegant manner, the Perſecution which they ſuffered, obſerve that it had laſted 13 Years: But it could not begin before the end of the Year 364. or till 365. They implore in this Letter the Aſſiſtance of the Biſhops of the Weſt, which they declare they had in vain expected and deſired for a long time.

We referr to thoſe two laſt years of the Life of St. *Baſil*, ſome Letters of Doctrine and Diſcipline, the time whereof is not certainly known, but which ſeem to be written towards the end of his Life. We may place in this Number the 65 to thoſe of *Joſopolis*, which is written againſt thoſe who affirmed, That Jeſus Chriſt brought a Body from Heaven, reviving hereby the Error of *Valentinus*, and who attributed to the Divinity of Jeſus Chriſt the Properties of the humane Nature. He refutes their Errors, and proves that Jeſus Chriſt had real Fleſh. He ſpeaks alſo of Redemption by Jeſus Chriſt, and of the Fall of Man by the Sin of *Adam*.

The 195 to *Diodorus* then Biſhop of *Tarſus*, was written before the Second Letter to *Amphilochius* wherein it is cited at Canon 63. There a queſtion of Importance is handled, *viz.* Whether it be lawful for a Man to marry his Wife's Siſter after her Death? A Man of St. *Baſil*'s Dioceſs had done it, and alledg'd for his Juſtification a Letter of *Diodorus* who defended his Action. St. *Baſil* anſwers it in this Letter, and oppoſes to *Diodorus* the Cuſtom of the Church which did not at all permit it. He anſwers a Paſſage of *Leviticus*, Ch. 18. which ſeems to allow thoſe Marriages. He anſwers, I ſay, Firſt, That tho' that were ſo, yet there are many things forbidden in the Goſpel, which the Law permitted; and Secondly, That the Levitical Law does not indeed forbid, but neither does it poſitively allow theſe kind of Marriages. He adds, That if it is not lawful to a Son to marry his Mother-in-Law, nor for a Father to eſpouſe his Daughter-in-Law, neither ought it to be allowed to a Man to marry his Siſter-in-Law, no more than to a Woman, to marry the Brother or the next-akin to her Husband: becauſe Man and Wife are ſo cloſely united by Marriage, that the Kindred of one become the Kindred of the other. He would not have them object that Paſſage of Geneſis, *Encreaſe and Multiply*, becauſe it does not reſpect the New Teſtament. He obſerves, That ſecond Marriages are a Remedy againſt Fornication, and not an in-let to immoderate Luſt.

The following Letter to *Parergorius* is upon a like Subject. He admoniſhes this Prieſt who was 70 Years old, to put away a Maid that lived with him, as was Ordain'd by the Canon of the Council of *Nice*. He proteſts, That tho' he ſhould write to him an Hundred Letters, he ſhould always continue Suſpended from his Miniſtry, till he had put her away; and that if notwithſtanding this, he would ſtill intrude upon the Exerciſe of his Office, without amending this Fault, he ſhould be Excommunicated, and ſo ſhould thoſe alſo that receiv'd him.

We may joyn to theſe Two Letters, the 76th Epiſtle of St. *Baſil*, to the Biſhops under his Juriſdiction, wherein he reproves a thing which was practiſed by ſome of them, who under pretence of Piety, received the Money which was offered them by thoſe whom they Ordain'd. He condemns this Practice as Simoniacal, and threatens to depoſe thoſe that ſhould do it for the future. He obſerves, That thoſe Biſhops excuſed themſelves from Simony, becauſe they received not this Money before Ordination, but only after it. *But*, ſays he, *to receive Money before or after, is always to receive it, and under what Pretence ſoever they do it, they always make a gain of Spiritual Gifts: Now to do this in the Church of God, wherein we believe, that we have the Body and Blood of Jeſus Chriſt; to do this there, there, I ſay, is a ſhameful Traffick.* Theſe are the very Words of St. *Baſil*; I add nothing to them.

The 203, and 204, are addreſs'd to thoſe of *Tarſus*. In them he Ordains, That the *Macedonians* in order to their Reception into the Church, ſhould make profeſſion of the *Nicene* Faith; and he anathematizes all thoſe that believ'd the Holy Spirit to be a mere Creature.

The 244 is againſt a certain Biſhop who neglected to Puniſh a Rape. He enjoyns him to cauſe ſearch to be made after the Maid; to reſtore her to her Parents; to declare him Excommunicated, who had Raviſh'd her; to throw him out of the Church, him and his Family, for the ſpace of three Years; not to ſuffer him to be preſent at the publick Prayers, and in caſe he ſhould ſculk in ſome little Village, with the Woman he had raviſh'd, and the Inhabitants would not deliver them, or would defend them, that then they alſo ſhould be interdicted Divine Offices. In the 345, he ſpeaks of a crafty Man, who being Summoned before the Eccleſiaſtical Tribunal, defended himſelf with ſo much Eloquence, that he made himſelf paſs for an Innocent Man. In the 245 he ſpeaks of the manner of Excommunication in his time; he ſays, That the Sinner ought firſt to be rebuked privately. Secondly, in the preſence of two Witneſſes; and Laſtly, ought to be accus'd to the Church; and if he did not then obey, he ought to be Excommunicated. He ſays, That his Soul was ſet upon it to ſeparate this Impoſtor, him and all his Family out of the Church.

The Letter 289 addreſs'd to *Cæſarea*, a Lady, is about frequent Communion. He begins it with declaring, that it is good and profitable to communicate every Day. He ſays, That in his own Church there was a Communion four times a Week, on *Sunday*, *Wedneſday*, *Friday* and *Saturday*, and alſo on other Days, when the Anniverſary of ſome Martyr is Celebrated; That in former times the Faithful themſelves Communicated in their Houſes, and that this Cuſtom cannot be blamed. That it is ſtill in uſe, in *Egypt*, and at *Alexandria*, where the Faithful carry the Communion to their Houſes; That all the Hermits do the ſame thing; That we muſt believe, that the Prieſt having offer'd the

S. *Baſil.* Sacrifice, and diſtributed the Euchariſt to thoſe that are preſent, tho' they take it one after another in parcels, yet 'tis always the ſame. For, ſays he, in the Church it ſelf, the Prieſt gives one part of it into the Hands of the Faithful, and they put it into their Mouth; and is not this the ſame thing, as for them to receive all at once many parts of it from the Hand of the Prieſt?

It was in one of the laſt Years of his Life, that he invited the Biſhops of *Pontus*, by Letter 291, to come to his Synod which he held at the Feaſt of St. *Eupſichius*. There is alſo a Letter, which is the 337, wherein he blames one of his Suffragans, becauſe he did not come to this Synod, and orders him to come thither for the future. In Letter 302 he commends a Lady call'd *Theodora*, whom he calls a Nun: wherein he obſerves, That 'tis an eaſie thing to embrace that kind of Life which is conformable to the Goſpel, but 'tis not ſo eaſie to obſerve it even in the ſmalleſt things, to do nothing but to pleaſe God, to preſerve her Modeſty always in all her Converſation and Behaviour, to eat no more but what is preciſely neceſſary, and to keep nothing that is ſuperfluous; That 'tis not ſufficient to attain a perfect Humility, not to be lifted up when we are admired or commended, or when we have ſome excellency either of Mind or Body; but in order to Perfection, we muſt preſerve an inviolable Purity, we muſt pray continually and fervently; in ſhort, we muſt have Charity for our Brethren, a contrite Heart and an Humble Spirit; we muſt manage our Auſterities with Diſcretion, and always have the thoughts of a future Judgment preſent before our Eyes.

The 317 to a Biſhop named *Optimus*, contains an Explication of that Paſſage of *Geneſis*, *Whoſoever ſhall kill* Cain, *&c.* where he firſt gives the natural Sence of it, affirming, that this Paſſage means only, That whoſoever ſhould kill *Cain*, ſhould deliver him from the Vengeance of God which was ſeven times more ſevere than Death. He enlarges afterwards upon the Myſtical Sence, and upon the Signification of the number Seven, which he takes to denote Remiſſion of Sins. He finds out ſeven Sins in the Actions of *Cain*, and Seven Puniſhments of his Sins. He refutes thoſe that think that *Lamech* kill'd *Cain*, and ſays, That when 'tis ſaid in Geneſis, *Whoſoever ſhall kill* Lamech, *&c.* the meaning is, that *Lamech* was more guilty than *Cain*, becauſe that he having before him the Example of God's Vengeance againſt a Murderer, was not thereby deterr'd from this Crime. He adds another Myſtical Explication, that for the Expiation of *Lamech*'s Crime, there was not only a neceſſity of the Deluge which happened in the Seventh Generation after *Cain*, but alſo the Death of Jeſus Chriſt which happened Seventy Seven Generations after *Lamech*. At laſt he explains that Paſſage of the Goſpel, wherein *Simeon* tells the Virgin when he ſaw the Infant Jeſus, *That a Sword ſhould pierce through her Heart*; where by a Sword he underſtands the anxiety and trouble of Mind, that the Virgin was to endure during the Paſſion of Jeſus Chriſt. As theſe Explications will not be reliſh'd by all the World, ſo St. *Baſil* gave them only for the Satisfaction of that good Biſhop who had conſulted him.

In the 323 to *Nectarius*, St. *Baſil* admoniſhes him to hinder all Canvaſſing at the Election of the Biſhops.

In the 325th he Congratulates the Biſhop *Sophronius*, becauſe he continued in the ſimplicity of the Faith of his Anceſtors. He ſays, That to maintain this Simplicity we muſt revive the Credit of the Primitive Chriſtians; but now there were few Perſons that were free from Curioſity, and would confine themſelves to that Simplicity of Faith, which teaches us to believe in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.

In the 340, he reproves a Suffragan Biſhop, call'd *Timotheus*, for concerning himſelf about Civil Affairs, after he had embraced a Monaſtick Life. The 343, and 344, are addreſs'd to a Monk call'd *Urbicius*; in the Second he refutes the Error of thoſe who affirm that the Divinity of Jeſus Chriſt was changed into his Fleſh.

The 383 to a Superiour, treats of the manner how he ſhould admit a Perſon who would make Profeſſion of a Monaſtick Life: He orders him to receive him according to the Rules of the Holy Fathers, after he had taught him to underſtand the Obligations, the Duties and the Troubles of a Monaſtick Life.

In Letter 387 he prefers the Creed of the Council of *Nice* to all the Creeds that had been made ſince that Council. He ſays, That it did not expreſly determine the Divinity of the Holy Spirit, becauſe no Body had then expreſly oppoſed it; and then he proves that the Holy Spirit is not a Creature.

In the 388 he informs *Calliſthenes*, That he was not obliged to keep the Oath which he had made in heat of Paſſion to puniſh his Servants.

In the 391 to *Amphilochius*, he anſwers many Queſtions which this Biſhop had put to him. Firſt He explains that Paſſage of the Goſpel, *No Man knoweth of the Day of Judgment, but the Father only*; and ſays, That the Sence of this place is, that the Father knows it of himſelf, becauſe he is the Fountain and firſt Principle of this Knowledge, whereas the Son of God receives this Knowledge from his Father, in which Sence it is alſo ſaid, *That there is none Good but God only*. He explains in what Sence the Scepter was always in the Tribe of *Judah*, tho' it be ſaid, that *Jechonias* was the laſt of the Princes of *David*'s Family. He refutes the Opinion of the *Encratites*, who affirmed, that it was unlawful to Eat of ſome kind of Meats. He ſays, That the Tripple Immerſion obſerved in Baptiſm is a Figure of the Three Days that Jeſus Chriſt was in the Sepulchre. He diſtinguiſhes *Eſſence* from *Subſiſtence*; He gives to the Three Hypoſtaſes of the Divine Perſons, the Names of Paternity, Filiation and Sanctification; He condemns thoſe that admit but one Hypoſtaſis, as being not far off from the Hereſie of the *Sabellians*. At laſt he ſays, That Corporeal and Temporal Goods, are not good in themſelves, tho' they ought to be preferred to the Evils that are oppoſite to them: But he averrs that God ſends theſe Good Things according as he thinks fit for the Good of Men: That there is ſuch a Juſt Man to whom theſe Evils are neceſſary, that he may be juſt; and there is another juſt Man to whom God

gives

gives theſe temporal Good Things for a Recompence; and there is ſuch a Wicked Man to whom God denies them, becauſe they would harden him; but there are other bad Men to whom he gives them in order to their Converſion. St. *Baſil.*

In the 399 to the ſame Perſon, he ſays, That the Spirit of a Man is good of it ſelf; but it can apply it ſelf to Good or Evil, and to that which is indifferent; That 'tis given to it to know the Truth; That God is this Truth which it ought to know; And, that he is to be known as far as an infinite Being can be known by a finite Mind. This Letter is againſt the Error of *Aëtius*, who believed, that the Eſſence of God might be perfectly known.

In the following Letter he propoſes alſo one of the Sophiſms of this Heretick, who thus objected to the Catholicks: Do you know whom you adore? If you ſay that you know him, What then is his Subſtance? If you know him not, How then do you adore him? St. *Baſil* anſwers, That the Attributes and Operations of God may be known, but we cannot comprehend his Eſſence nor his Nature: That by Faith we believe his Exiſtence, which alſo may be known by his Power and its Effects, and yet both Faith and Reaſon teach us that he is Incomprehenſible.

In the 401 he ſolves alſo another Sophiſm of *Aëtius*, who ask'd whether Knowledge were before Faith, or Faith before Knowledge. He anſwers, That Knowledge is the Principle of Faith, becauſe the Exiſtence of God is known by the Creatures; and Faith follows this imperfect Knowledge, as Adoration follows Faith. He proves alſo, that the Works of God and the Effects of his Power may be known, but that we cannot perfectly know his Eſſence. He explains many ſignifications of the Word *Know*. In the 408 Letter, he ſpeaks of the Relicks of the Martyrs, as well as in 241.

In the 410. he ſays, That we ought to be content with the Faith, which we made Profeſſion of at our Baptiſm, and to confine our ſelves to the Words that are taken out of the Holy Scripture for expreſſing it; That we ſhould ſhun all new Expreſſions, becauſe our Salvation does not depend upon the Words, but the Orthodox Faith.

The 412. is againſt a Deacon nam'd *Glycerius*, who had got into Orders, to ſerve the Cure of a Church in *Veneſa*, together with a Prieſt. This Deacon after he was Ordain'd had neglected his Miniſtry and had gathered together a multitude of Virgins, to whom he had made himſelf Patriarch: For St. *Baſil* makes uſe of this very Term, and ſays, That he had taken upon him the Habit: St. *Baſil* adds, That he did not this for Piety, nor Devotion, but to get Money; That thus he had diſturb'd the Church to which he belonged, and deſpiſed the Pariſh-Prieſt that govern'd it: That being reproved for this Diſorder by the Pariſh-Prieſt and the Biſhop, he had fled with a Company of Virgins and Young Men, himſelf being at the head of them; That this happened when there was an Aſſembly of Biſhops in the place, and that he had abuſed the Parents who demanded their Daughters back again. St. *Baſil* prays him to whom he ſent this Letter, who had written to him in favour of this Deacon, to perſwade him to return, to ſend back the Virgins, or at leaſt not to detain thoſe by force who deſired to return. He promiſes alſo pardon to *Glycerius*, if he returned with a Letter from him to whom he wrote, and a Reſolution to behave himſelf more Modeſtly; if not, he declares him Suſpended from his Function.

In the following Letter he ſtill preſſes this Friend to procure the Return of *Glycerius*, and the Young Women whom he had carried away with him, and bids tell them, That they needed fear nothing. At laſt, in the laſt Letter ſuperſcribed to this *Glycerius*, he exhorts him to return, and promiſes to Pardon his Fault upon their Account that had begg'd it for him; and chiefly for the ſake of his Pariſh-Prieſt, who had interceeded for him. He declares, That he ſhould looſe the Dignity of a Deacon, if he abſented himſelf any longer.

The 417 is written to a Judge, upon a Robbery that was committed in his Church. Some Garments of the Poor were taken away; and the Robbers were diſcover'd by thoſe that look'd after the Fabrick of the Church; whereupon St. *Baſil* condemned them to make Reſtitution. Nevertheleſs, they were accus'd before this Judge; and St. *Baſil* wrote to him, That he had judg'd them, and that the Cognizance and Puniſhment of any thing that happened in Churches, belong'd to Biſhops.

The 418 and 419, are written to a Receiver of the Taxes, to pray him to relieve the Poor.

Theſe are all the Letters of St. *Baſil*, which concern Religion; The others are Letters of Civility, of Recommendation, or Conſolation, which have no reſpect to the Affairs of the Church; of which I ſhall here give you a Catalogue.

The Letters of Civility, of Complement and Congratulation, &c. are the 83; the 142, and thoſe that follow to the 164; the 169, and ſo on to the 181; the 122, and ſo on to the 244; the 248, 268, 282, 283, 285, 286, 287, 288, and 312; the 328, &c. to 335; the 341, 350, 351, 354, 355, 356, 359, 363, 369, 378, 384, 386, 389, 390, 407, 425, and 426, and the Three Letters of *Libanius* and St. *Baſil*, publiſh'd by *Cotelerius*.

Thoſe of Recommendation or Requeſt, are the 11, 84, 215, &c. to 220, 221, 232, 236, 237, 247, 248, 267, 333, 352, 353, 357, 360, 365, 366, 367, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 380, 381, 415, 416, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 427, 428; and the Two publiſh'd by *Cotelerius*.

The Letters of Conſolation are 186, 188, 189, 201, 202, 347, 362. I ſay nothing of the Letter to the Emperour *Theodoſius*, publiſh'd by *Cotelerius*; becauſe 'tis evidently Suppoſitious. All theſe Letters are written very pleaſantly, and they may be compared for their Style and Wit, to thoſe of the moſt able Writers of Letters.

We have reſerv'd the Letters of St. *Baſil* to *Amphilochius*, to be particularly treated of, becauſe they contain Deciſions upon principal Points of Diſcipline, which are not to be conſidered as the particular Opinions of St. *Baſil*, but as the Laws of the Church in his time: And therefore they are not written in the form of particular Letters, but after the manner of Synodical Deciſions, which are call'd Canons.

S. Baſil. The 1ſt. of theſe Canons is concerning the Validity or Invalidity of the Baptiſm of Hereticks St. *Amphilochius* had ask'd him particularly, whether it was neceſſary to rebaptize thoſe who had been baptized by the *Novatians*, or the *Montaniſts*? He anſwers him, That as to the firſt of thoſe Hereticks, he ſhould follow the cuſtom of the Churches where he lived; becauſe there were different Opinions upon that Subject. As to the Baptiſm of the *Montaniſts*, he believed that it could not be accounted Valid, and he wonders that the great St. *Denys* of *Alexandria*, who was ſo well skill'd in the Canons, could be ignorant of this Truth. To explain his Anſwer, he diſtinguiſhes three ſorts of Perſons that were divided from the Church; The Hereticks who differed in matters of Faith, the Schiſmaticks who ſeparated upon Points of Diſcipline, and ſome of the diſobedient Chriſtians who withdrew from the Church. He maintains, That the Ancients were perſwaded that the Baptiſm of Hereticks was abſolutely void. He adds, That the *Pepuzians* were Hereticks, and therefore their Baptiſm could not be valid. As for Schiſmaticks, he obſerves, That St. *Cyprian* and *Firmilian* ſubjected them to the ſame Law with Hereticks, becauſe being ſeparated from the Church, they had not the Holy Spirit, and ſo could not give it. He ſeems alſo to like this Opinion well enough: And yet he adds, That ſince the Biſhops of *Aſia* had thought it convenient to admit the Baptiſm of Schiſmaticks, he would not hinder it. But though the *Encratites* were Schiſmaticks, he declares, That their Baptiſm ought not to be approv'd, and that thoſe ought to be rebaptized, to whom they had given Baptiſm, becauſe they gave it with Precipitation, on purpoſe to hinder the receiving of it from the Church. Nevertheleſs he confeſſes, That if the contrary Cuſtom were eſtabliſh'd, it ought to be follow'd; and that the Deciſions of the Antients ſhould be obſerv'd. In ſhort, he recommends this upon the whole Matter, That none of thoſe who return'd to the Church, ſhould be permitted to approach the Holy Myſteries, till they had receiv'd the Unction. [That is, till they were Confirmed.]

In the 2d. Canon, St. *Baſil* condemns to a Penance of 10 Years, a Woman that had procur'd an Abortion, and he judges her to be guilty of Murder, whether the Child had Life or no. He obſerves That the time of Abſolution ſhould be regulated by the fervour of the Penance, as well as by the length of it.

In the 3d. Canon he declares, That if a Deacon commits Adultery, after he has been received into the Order of Deacon, he ought to be turned out of his Miniſtry: but he would not have him put under Penance, nor ſeparated from the Communion of the Layety, becauſe we ought not to puniſh the ſame fault twice, and a Clergy-man is ſufficiently puniſh'd by his Depoſition, and ſo much more than a Lay-man who is deprived of Communion, becauſe he can be readmitted afterwards into the Church; whereas a Clergy-man cannot be reſtor'd when once he is depos'd: But in concluſion, the moſt Effectual Remedy of all Sins, is to forſake Sin, and abſtain from Pleaſure.

The 4th. Canon is concerning thoſe that are many times Married. He condemns 3d. Marriages as a kind of Fornication; and ſays. That the Cuſtom of his Church, was to excommunicate thoſe who Married the third time, for Five Years; That in other places, they were only put under Penance for two or three years. He enjoyns the ſame thing to Bigamiſts, for one or two Years; though he would have neither the one nor the other reduc'd to the loweſt Penance; but that they ſhould be the firſt Years in the Rank of Hearers; and that the laſt Years they ſhould partake of the Prayers, though they were ſtill excluded from the Participation of the Euchariſt, till their Penance was finiſh'd, and they had given Signs of their Converſion.

In the 5th. he ordains, That Hereticks ſhould be received who were converted at the point of Death, provided they gave Signs of their ſincere Repentance.

The 6th. is againſt Concubinage.

The 7th. is againſt Murders, Poyſoning, Adulteries, and againſt other more infamous Crimes. St. *Baſil* ſays, That all who are guilty of theſe Crimes, are to be treated with the ſame Rigor. However he thinks that we ought to have Pity on thoſe who have done Penance for Thirty Years, and that we ſhould receive them without delay; eſpecially if they ſtill bewailed their Sins, and gave Signs of Converſion.

In the 8th. Canon St. *Baſil* treats very largely of Murders, and diſtinguiſhes the different Kinds of them, as well thoſe that are Voluntary, as thoſe that are Involuntary. This Canon is more Curious than Uſeful.

The 9th. Canon is about Divorce. He lays it down as a Principle, That the Law of Jeſus Chriſt is equal both to Men and Women, and that it does not allow of the Separation of a Man and his Wife, but in caſe of Fornication: But he ſays, That the preſent Cuſtom is not altogether agreeable to the Law of Chriſt, becauſe it does not allow Women to ſeparate from their Husbands upon any account whatſoever; ſo that it ſeems to excuſe from Adultery a Woman that ſhould Eſpouſe a Man whoſe Wife had divorc'd her ſelf; but on the contrary, if it was a Husband that quitted his Wife to Eſpouſe another, that Man ſhould commit Adultery, both he that Married to this laſt Woman, and ſhe that was Eſpouſed to him.

In the 10th. St. *Baſil* is againſt Ordaining thoſe who had Sworn never to take Orders, though there be, ſays he, a Canon which ſeems to permit it; but he obſerves, that we muſt conſider the Form of the Oath, the terms in which it was conceiv'd, the Diſpoſition of the Perſon that made it, and all the leſſer Circumſtances, to ſee whether he is oblig'd by his Oath or no; and if no way can be found to diſpenſe with it, then he ought not to be Ordain'd. After this, he explains a particular Queſtion which had been propos'd to him by *Amphilochius*, as far as it can be diſcover'd by St. *Baſil*'s Anſwer, it ſeems to have been this.

One *Cyriacus* a Prieſt of the Church of *Mindana*, whereof *Longinus* was Biſhop, was obliged by Oath never to quit that Church; yet he was made Pariſh-Prieſt to a Village very near it, which was in another Dioceſs. *Longinus* ſeeing himſelf depriv'd of a Prieſt who did very much aſſiſt him, earneſtly deſired his Return, and ſaid, That unleſs he returned to him, he ſhould quit his Church. 'Tis alſo probable, that the Prieſt had ſome remorſe of Conſcience for having violated his Oath. *Amphilochius* demands of St. *Baſil*, what was to be done in theſe Circumſtances? And this Saint gave an Advice full of Wiſdom, That they ſhould joyn to the Dioceſs of *Mindana*, the Territory of *Muiſtia*, where this Prieſt was made Miniſter by the Biſhop *Severus*: And he ſays, That by this means, he ſtill belonging to the Church of *Mindana*, might fulfill his Oath, and might aſſiſt the Biſhop *Longinus*, who had demanded him back again. He blames the Conduct of the Biſhop *Severus*, who had acted againſt the Canons, in removing a Prieſt from one of his Brethren, and had made him guilty of Perjury. St. *Baſil.*

In the 11th. Canon, he ordains, That a Penance of 11 Years, ſhould be impos'd upon him who commits Murder, though it was done without any Premeditated Deſign.

In the 12th. he declares, That the Canons wholly exclude all Bigamiſts from Eccleſiaſtical Functions.

In the 13th. he ſays, That the Fathers did not puniſh as Murders thoſe that were committed in War, becauſe they judg'd that thoſe ſhould be pardoned who were oblig'd to defend their Country, their Life and their Honour; But he adds, That 'twas adviſable for ſuch as had their hands defiled with Humane Blood, to continue Three Years out of the Communion of the Church.

The 14th. Imports, That if he who had been an Uſurer, would diſtribute to the Poor all the Profit he had made by this ſhameful Trade, and keep himſelf from the Paſſion of Covetouſneſs, he might be advanced to the Prieſt-hood.

The 15th. and 16th. are not Canons which concern Diſcipline; but an Explication of ſome Difficulties about the literal ſence of ſome Paſſages of Scripture, which had been propos'd to him by *Amphilochius*.

The 2d. Letter begins with Canon 17th. It contains a Deciſion in favour of one nam'd *Bianon*, who was ordain'd Prieſt contrary to the Oath he had made. St. *Baſil* ſays, That he had already made this Rule for the Prieſts of *Antioch*, that theſe kind of Perſons ſhould not publickly exerciſe their Prieſtly Function, but only in private. He adds, That he of whom he there ſpeaks, might have a Diſpenſation from this Law; becauſe he was not at *Antioch*, but *Iconium*.

In the 18th. St. *Baſil* obſerves, That the Ancients did not treat the Virgins conſecrated to God who abandon'd their Profeſſion, more rigorouſly than Bigamiſts, and that they impos'd upon them only a Penance of one Year; but he adds, That the Church and the number of Virgins encreaſing now every day, it was neceſſary to treat them as Adulterers. He gives this Advertiſement, That he ſpeaks of Virgins which have conſecrated themſelves to God, and renounced Marriage; That their Profeſſion ſhould commence from ſuch an Age at which they were perfectly come to the uſe of their Reaſon; becauſe no regard was to be had to ſuch Promiſes as were made before that time; That we ought not to admit any into the number of Virgins conſecrated to God, but thoſe who were 16 or 17 Years old, and even then after they had been try'd a long time, and paſſionately deſired to be received, and that we ought to reject thoſe who were brought by their Parents before they had arriv'd at this adult Age, before they had a Judgment ſufficiently ripe, and before they could give any aſſurance of their fix'd Reſolution.

In the 19th. Canon, St. *Baſil* obſerves, That Men make no Vow nor Profeſſion of Virginity, as Virgins do; That thoſe who enter into a Monaſtical ſtate, ſeem tacitely to embrace Celebacy; but to oblige them to it, it was neceſſary that they ſhould be ask'd, and that they ſhould make Profeſſion of it: And then if they ſhould paſs to a Voluptuous Life, they ſhould be puniſh'd as Fornicators.

In the 20th. he ſays, That we ought not to puniſh the Women that Married after they had made Profeſſion of Virginity while they were without the Church, being Infidels, or Hereticks, or Catechumens; becauſe we ought not to ſearch after the Sins committed before Baptiſm, ſince that Sacrament pardon'd them.

The 21ſt. is alſo about the difference which cuſtom had put between the Faults of Husbands and Wives. He obſerves, That a Man who is unfaithful to his Wife is not look'd upon as a Fornicator, provided ſhe with whom he committed the Sin was not Married; That the Husband cannot for this be parted from his Wife, though the Wife might be from her Husband, if ſhe ſhould commit the ſame Sin with a Man. He confeſſes, That 'tis difficult to give a Reaſon for this Proceeding; but he ſays, 'tis the Cuſtom.

In the 22d. Canon, he obliges thoſe who have forcibly carried Maids away, to reſtore them to thoſe to whom they were Contracted, or to their Parents; and declares, That they muſt not be received into Communion before they have reſtor'd them. He condemns thoſe who detain the Women whom they have ſecretly or by force corrupted, to the ſame Puniſhment with Fornicators, which is to endure Penance for four Years; That for the 1ſt. Year they ſhall be excluded from the Prayers, and obliged to ſtand at the Church-Gate; That for the 2d. they ſhall be in the rank of Hearers; That for the 3d. they ſhall be in the number of Penitents; That in the Laſt Year, they ſhall be preſent with the People at all the Divine Service, without being capable of partaking of the Oblation.

In the 23d. Canon concerning thoſe that Married two Siſters, he refers *Amphilochius* to that which he had written in his Letter to *Diodorus*, of which we have already ſpoken.

The

St. *Baſil.* The 24th. is againſt Widows, who being received into the Number of Deaconeſſes, Married afterwards. He would have them more ſeverely puniſh'd than Bigamiſts, if they be above 60 Years old; but he excuſes them if they be younger, becauſe it was the Biſhop's fault to receive them too young.

By the 25th. Canon it is provided, That he who ſhall marry a Woman after he hath abus'd her ſhall be put under Penance, but he ſhall have leave to keep her for his Wife.

In the 26th. he declares, That Fornication is never Marriage, and that it cannot lawfully be the Beginning of a Marriage; and therefore it would be better to part thoſe who have committed this Sin, than to Marry them together; but yet if they have a mind to Marry, they ſhould not be hindered leſt ſome greater Miſchief ſhould follow.

The 27th. is upon occaſion of a Prieſt, who through Ignorance was entangled in a Marriage within the Prohibited Degrees. St. *Baſil* thinks that he ought not wholly to be depriv'd of the Honour and Dignity of Prieſthood: But he forbids him to exerciſe his Function, and would have him be ſatisfied with that place of Honour which is left him, without being able to give the Bleſſing, to diſtribute the Body of Jeſus Chriſt, or to do any part of his Sacerdotal Function.

The 28th. Canon is againſt ſome Perſons that had made a Vow not to Eat Pork. St. *Baſil* ſays, That this Vow was ridiculous; and admoniſhes *Amphilochius*, to exhort thoſe who made it, not to make any more ſuch kind of Vows, and to allow themſelves to eat indifferently all kinds of Meat.

The 29th. is againſt thoſe great Lords, who take an Oath to prejudice thoſe that are ſubject to them. The ſubſtance of it is, That pains ſhould be taken to correct this Fault; and the means to do it, was to teach them, that they ought not to make ſuch kind of raſh Oaths, and that they ought to beware of executing the Evil they have Sworn to do.

The 30th. Canon is againſt Raviſhers. St. *Baſil* ſays, That there is no ancient Canon that concerns them; but that his Opinion is, That both they, and ſuch as are Complices in their Crime ought to ſuffer Penance for three Years time.

The 31ſt. declares, That a Woman can never Marry, though her Husband does not appear, as long as ſhe is not ſure of his Death, and that if ſhe does, ſhe commits Adultery. The 36th. ordains the ſame thing to Souldier's Wives, who Marry again, when they have no more News of their Husbands; yet he thinks them more excuſable, becauſe they have more Reaſon to believe that they are dead.

The 32d. ordains, That Clergy-men who Sin mortally, ſhould be degraded, but not turn'd out Communion.

The 33d. That a Woman who takes no care of the Fruit of her Womb, and who is brought to bed in the middle of the Street, ſhould be puniſh'd as one guilty of Murder.

The 34th. That Women guilty of Adultery, who voluntarily confeſs it, or are partly convicted of it, ſhould not be defam'd, leſt their Crime coming to publick Notice, ſhould be the cauſe of their Death; but that they ſhould be order'd to ſtay out of Communion, till the time of their Penance be over.

The 35th. is, That when a Husband is forſaken by his Wife, it ſhould be inquir'd whether there was any Fault in him; and if there was not, but ſhe only was in the Fault, then they ought not to deprive the Husband of the Communion of the Church, but only puniſh the Wife.

The 37th. is, That if a Man who had Eſpouſed another Man's Wife, Marries another Woman, after the former was taken away from him, he is guilty of Adultery againſt the Firſt, but not againſt the Second.

The 38th. is, That young Women who follow thoſe that have abus'd them, without the conſent of their Parents, are guilty of Fornification; And, that though it may ſeem, that their Fault is made up when the Parents afterwards conſent to it; yet they ought to be put under Penance for Three Years.

The 39th. That ſhe who ſtays with him, whom ſhe had committed Adultery with, is to be accounted guilty of the Crime as long as ſhe continues with him.

The 40th. That a Slave who Marries without the conſent of his Maſter, has committed Fornication; becauſe the Contracts and Promiſes of all thoſe who are under the Power of others, are void without their conſent.

The 41ſt. That the Marriage of a Widow that's free cannot be null'd.

The 42d. contains this general Maxim, That the Marriages of all thoſe who are under the Power of another without his conſent, are not Marriages, but Fornications; and therefore, that the Marriages of the Sons and Daughters of a Family, are void without the conſent of their Fathers, as that of Slaves is without the conſent of their Maſters.

The 43d. declares, That he who has given a Mortal Wound to another, is guilty of Manſlaughter, whether he firſt attack'd him, or did it in his own defence.

The 44th. That a Deaconeſs that hath committed Fornication with a Pagan, ought not to be Excommunicated, but only depriv'd of the Oblation for the ſpace of Seven Years; after which ſhe ſhall be receiv'd, if ſhe liv'd chaſtly during that time.

In the 45th. he obſerves, That the Name of a Chriſtian will ſtand him in no ſtead, who leads a Life unworthy of a Chriſtian.

In the 46th. he ſays, That a Woman that without her knowledge eſpouſed a Married Man, whom his former Wife was parted from, and afterwards ſeparated from him, may Marry again to another; but that it were better if ſhe continued as ſhe was.

The

The 47th. Canon is about the Baptiſm of Hereticks. It ſeems in ſome Points to be contrary to the firſt; but when the matter is well examin'd, 'tis eaſie to reconcile them. He obſerves, That the *Encratites*, the *Saccophorians*, and the *Apotactites*, ought to be treated as *Novatians*. Now he ſeems to have ſaid the contrary in the firſt Canon, where he affirms, That it was abſolutely neceſſary to rebaptize the *Encratites*. This Difficulty made an Author of our Age believe. That a Negative Particle muſt be added in the Canon, The Reaſon which St. *Baſil* alledges to prove this Propoſition, ſeems to confirm this Conjecture, for he adds, That there are Canons which have regulated what concerns the former, though differently, whereas there is none which ſpeaks of the latter. But after a full Examination of the words of this Canon, I find that 'tis not neceſſary to change any thing in it. Take the true Sence of it as follows: St. *Baſil* ſays, That the *Encratites*, *Apotactites*, and *Saccophorians*, ought to be treated after the ſame manner as the *Novatians*: That's to ſay, That with reſpect both to the one and the other, we muſt follow the Cuſtom of the Church where we live; and the Reaſon which he gives for it, is, becauſe there is no Rule and Determination about their Cauſe, ſince the Canons are found different about the former, and there is nothing order'd about the latter. He adds, That in his Countrey they were all re-baptized; but if this Rebaptization was forbidden in the Province whereof *Amphilochius* was Biſhop, as it was at *Rome*; and yet he found the Reaſons were convincing, which he had brought to prove that the *Encratites* muſt be rebaptized, then he ought to call a Council to make this Regulation. St. *Baſil*.

In the 48th. Canon he counſels Women divorced by their Husbands, not to marry again, ſince Jeſus Chriſt hath ſaid, That he who putteth away his Wife, except for Fornication, commiteth Adultery, when he eſpouſeth another, and is the cauſe of her committing Adultery by marrying again.

In the 50th. Canon he ſays, That the Laws do not forbid, nor puniſh Third Marriages, and yet the Church looks upon them as ſhameful Actions.

The Third Letter to *Amphilochius*, is alſo a continuation of Canons. St. *Baſil* ſpeaks in the Preamble of a Journey he had made a little before into *Pontus* about the Affairs of the Church. He thanks *Amphilochius* for the Letters he had written to him; he declares to him that he deſired to ſee him, and that he would do all that lay in his Power to come and meet him; but that perhaps he might be obliged to go ſoon to *Nazianzum*, becauſe of the departure of St. *Gregory* who was gone from it, tho' no Body knew the Reaſon of his going. He acquaints him, That he of whom he had ſpoken before (probably to make him Biſhop of ſome City depending upon the Metropolis of *Amphilochius*,) was fallen ſick; that there was no other Perſon that he could caſt his Eyes upon. He counſels him rather to put into that place, one whom the Inhabitants of the City deſired to have, tho' he had been but lately Baptiz'd. He repeats what he had ſaid in the 10th. Canon concerning thoſe that had taken an Oath that they would not be Biſhops.

The 51ſt. Canon ordains, That Clergy-men ſhould not be otherwiſe puniſh'd for their Crimes but by Depoſition, whether they were in Sacred Orders which are given by Impoſition of Hands, or in Inferior Orders.

The 52d. is againſt Women that Voluntarily ſuffer their Infants to periſh.

The 53d. ordains, that a Widow-Slave that procures her being taken away forcibly to be Married again, ſhould undergo no other Puniſhment but that of Bigamiſts.

In the 54th. he referrs us to what he had ſaid in the former Letter concerning Involuntary Manſlaughter; he adds, That it belong's to the Biſhop's Prudence to encreaſe or diminiſh the Penance according to Circumſtances.

In the 55th. he declares, That thoſe who ſet upon Robbers, ought to be depriv'd of Communion if they be Lay-Men, and depos'd if they be Clergy-men.

In the 56th. he impoſes 20 Years Penance upon Voluntary Murders; and in the 57th. 11 Years Penance upon thoſe that are Involuntary. In the 58th. he impoſes 15 Years Penance upon Adultery; In the 59th. 7 Years upon Fornicators. In the 60th. he condemns Virgins who break their Vow of Virginity, to the ſame Puniſhment with Adulterers. In the 61. he impoſes one Years Pennance upon him that ſhall accuſe himſelf of Robbery, and two Years upon him that is convicted of it. In the 62d. and 63d. he impoſes the ſame Penance as upon Adulterers, upon thoſe that commit infamous Crimes. In the 64th. he impoſes 11 Years Penance upon Perjury. In the 65th. he impoſes the ſame Penance upon Poyſoners. In the 66th. 11 Years Penance upon thoſe that dig up the dead. In the 67. the Penance of Murderers upon thoſe that commit Inceſt with their Siſters. In the 68th. the Puniſhment of Adulterers is decreed againſt thoſe that marry their Kinsfolk in prohibited Degrees. In the 69th. he ordains, That a Reader who ſhall have to do with a Virgin to whom he was contracted, ſhall be deprived of his Miniſterial Function, and become uncapable of riſing to a higher Order. He adds, That if he has committed this Sin with another Virgin than her to whom he was contracted, he ſhall be depos'd, and that the ſame ſhall be obſerv'd with reſpect to other Miniſters. The 70th. ordains, That Deacons and Prieſts who have polluted their Lips, if they confeſs their Crime, ſhall be Suſpended for ſome time from their Miniſterial Function. The 71ſt. That thoſe who ſhall be convicted of thoſe Crimes without their own Confeſſion, ſhall be puniſh'd as Malefactors. The 72d. That thoſe who meddle with Divination, ſhall be puniſh'd as Murderers. The 73d. That he who has renounced the Faith of Jeſus Chriſt ſhall not be received until the point of Death. In the 74th. St. *Baſil* tells him, That the time of Penance may be ſhortned to thoſe who fulfil their Penance with fervour and humility. In the 75th. he impoſes 12 Years Penance upon him that hath committed Inceſt with his Siſter by the ſame Father and Mother; and ſays in the 76th. That the ſame Law ſhould take place againſt thoſe who Marry their own Daughters-in-Law. The 77th. ordains 7 Years Penance againſt thoſe who Divorce their Wives, and Marry others. The 78th. decrees the ſame Puniſhment againſt thoſe who Marry

two

St. *Baſil.* two Siſters, tho' at different times. The 79th. condemns thoſe that Marry their Mothers-in-Law to the ſame Puniſhment with thoſe that Marry their Siſters. In the 80th. he ſays, That the Ancients ſpoke nothing of Polygamy, becauſe they look'd upon it as a brutiſh Sin, to which they thought that Men could not be ſubject; he believes it worſe than Fornication, and he impoſes upon thoſe that ſhall be Guilty of it a Penance of 4 years. In the 81ſt. he impoſes 8 Years Penance upon thoſe that being taken by the *Barbarians*, were forced by Torments to eat of Meats ſacrificed to Idols, and 11 Years upon thoſe that did it without any conſtraint. In the 82d. and 83d. he condemns the Perjur'd, and thoſe that meddle with Pagan Superſtitions, to 6 Years Penance. In the 84th. and 85th. he declares, That all thoſe Canons are to be underſtood of thoſe that are willing to do Penance and amend themſelves; but for thoſe that continue in their Crimes, we ought to have no Converſation with them, and never to receive them into the Church, leſt we be partakers of their Crimes. There is at the End of this Letter, a Fragment of another Letter of St. *Baſil*, written to the ſame Perſon againſt the *Encratites*.

For obſerving ſome Order in the other Writings of St. *Baſil*, we may divide them into three Claſſes. The Firſt ſhall comprehend thoſe that are upon the Scripture; The Second, Thoſe that concern Doctrine; and the Third, Thoſe that are about Morality.

Caſſiodorus aſſures us, That St. *Baſil* made Commentaries upon almoſt all the Books of the Holy Scripture; of which there remains now but a ſmall number. The Nine Homilies or Sermons upon the beginning of *Geneſis*, are the firſt of his Works. St. *Jerom*, *Photius* and *Suidas*, mention them. There are added to thoſe Nine Homilies, Two others about the Formation of Man, which at firſt were attributed to St. *Baſil*, and afterwards were aſcribed to his Brother St. *Gregory Nyſſen*. But they cannot belong to this laſt, who has treated of this Matter in a particular Work: But there is no convincing Reaſon, why they may not be attributed to St. *Baſil* upon the Credit of ancient Manuſcripts. 'Tis true that thoſe Authors we have juſt now cited, mention but Nine Homilies of St. *Baſil*'s upon the *Hexameron*; and that *Caſſiodorus* obſerves, That he did not explain what concerns the Creation of Man; but perhaps thoſe Authors had not ſeen theſe two Homilies, which St. *Baſil* compos'd long after the others. Beſides, let Men ſay what they pleaſe, theſe have the Stile of St. *Baſil*, and are like enough to the firſt, tho' they are not altogether ſo large. After theſe Homilies, there ought to follow the 30th. Homily about Paradiſe.

Cotelerius has publiſh'd in Greek in his Firſt Volume of the Monuments of the Greek Church, a Homily upon theſe Words in the 6th. Chapter of the *Proverbs*, *Suffer not your Selves to be overwhelm'd with ſleep*, which is not unworthy of St. *Baſil*, and has his Stile and Air.

The firſt of the 22 Homilies upon ſome Pſalms, which is a Preface to all the Pſalms, is wholly the ſame with the Latin Preface, that is prefixed to St. *Auſtin*'s Commentaries upon the Pſalms. Either therefore we muſt ſay, That St. *Auſtin*'s Preface was tranſlated into Greek, or rather that St. *Baſil*'s was tranſlated into Latin, and plac'd at the beginning of St. *Auſtin*'s Commentaries. Theſe Homilies are quoted in *Nicetas*'s *Catena*, and by ſome others; and there is no doubt but they are St. *Baſil*'s. Yet Father *Combefis* rejects the ſecond Homily upon Pſalm 28, which is an Abridgment and Repetition of the preceding, and which is wanting in many Manuſcripts. He paſſes alſo the ſame Judgment on that upon Pſalm 37; and he affirms, that the Stile of it is different from that of the others. In ſome Latin Editions of St. *Baſil*, there are publiſh'd under the Name of St. *Baſil*, Commentaries upon the Pſalms; but 'tis plain they are none of St. *Baſil*'s, becauſe they are Extracts out of St. *Chryſoſtom* and *Theodoret*.

The Commentary upon the firſt ſix Chapters of *Iſaiah*, ſeemed doubtful to *Eraſmus*, becauſe he thought that they were written in another Stile. *Tilmannus* who has tranſlated them into Latin, has undertaken to defend them againſt the Conjecture of *Eraſmus*, and he proves that they are this Father's by the Authority of four Modern Greek Authors, which are *Metaphraſtes*, *Antonius*, *Maximus*, and St. *John Damaſcene*. *Fronto Ducæus* adds to theſe Four, the Patriarch *Taraſius*, in his Epiſtle to Pope *Adrian*, and the Author of the Greek *Scholia* upon the Epiſtles of St. *Paul* attributed to *Oecumenius*. The Authority of theſe Modern Greeks would be of no great Moment, if this Work had evident Marks of Forgery, or if the Stile of it were altogether different from that of St. *Baſil*; but it muſt be confeſs'd, that tho' it is not ſo Elegant as the Work of the Creation, yet it is not much different from the Stile of St. *Baſil*, neither is it unworthy of this Father. *Rivet* has found in it a difference of Opinion, which might make it be rejected, if it were more conſiderable. He obſerves, That St. *Baſil* in his Letter 80 to *Euſtathius* the Phyſician, affirms that the Witch of *Endor* made the Soul of *Samuel* really to return, whereas the Author of this Commentary upon *Iſaiah*, on *Ch.* 8. affirms, That it was the Devil who aſſum'd the Shape of *Samuel*. Some have anſwer'd, That this Epiſtle to *Euſtathius*, was St. *Gregory Nyſſen*'s, but we have ſhewn, that 'tis rather St. *Baſil*'s. Therefore all that can be ſaid is this, That St. *Baſil* might change his Opinion about a thing of ſo ſmall conſequence as this is.

The Second Claſs of St. *Baſil*'s Works comprehends his Dogmatical Books. The firſt of theſe Diſcourſes are the Books againſt *Eunomius*. St. *Gregory Nazianzen*, St. *Jerom* and *Photius* all aſſure us, That he wrote againſt this Heretick, but they ſay nothing of the Number of the Books. We have at preſent five of them. The Three firſt are written in the ſame Stile and after the ſame Method, and there can be no doubt but they are St. *Baſil*'s. The two laſt are more Dry and Scholaſtical; but we ought not to wonder at that. In the Firſt he overthrows the principal Arguments of *Eunomius*; and in theſe Two laſt, he inſiſts upon the Refutation of the Subtilties and Sophiſtical Arguments of this Heretick upon many Paſſages of Holy Scripture, as he had promis'd to do in the Second Book. There is no Cauſe therefore to reject theſe Books as ſuppoſititious. They were quoted as Genuine by the Greeks and Latins in the Council of *Florence*.

The

The Book of the Holy Spirit to *Amphilochius*, is that Treatise of all the Works of St. *Basil*, which most of all Displeases the Protestants; because it contains such things as do not favour them. *Erasmus* who took great Liberty to condemn every thing that did not please him, made no scruple to reject this in the Preface which he prefix'd to his Version: He was wearied with translating it, and the Stile appear'd to him perplex'd in several Places. These are the Reasons on which he grounds his Judgment about this Book to which he had added many things in the same Preface; That tho' 'tis true, that there are some things in it, which are not unworthy of St. *Basil*, and which sufficiently discover that they belong to him; yet there are other things in it which are none of his. The greatest part of Protestant Criticks, being dissatisfied with that necessity of Tradition which this Book evidently proves, have gladly received this Opinion of *Erasmus*, and have also added some other Conjectures of their own to his, to reject this Book entirely. Nevertheless, *Casaubon* being more impartial than the rest, has plainly declar'd in his Writings against *Baronius*, That he was not of *Erasmus*'s Opinion. And indeed 'tis certain that St. *Basil* did write a Treatise of the Holy Spirit; he says it himself in his Letters. St. *Gregory Nazianzen* speaks of it. St. *Jerom* and *Suidas* mention it. *Theodoret* quotes that Book which we have at this Day, in his first Dialogue, and in the Refutation of the Anathematisms of St. *Cyril*. After this Author, St. *John Damascene* in his third Discourse of Images, the II. *Nicene* Council *Act* 4. *Photius* in the *Nomo-canon*, *Burchardus* in the *Decretals*, *Euthymius Zygabenus* in his *Panoplia*, *Zonaras* and *Balsamon* in the *Nomo-canon*, *Anastasius* of *Nice* Quest. 84, and *Nicephorus* B. XII. Ch. 20. quote it also. Moreover the Reasons of *Erasmus* are very weak: For first he accuses the Author of this Work of raising his Stile too high, as if this were not ordinary with Authors, and particularly with Writers of Controversy. He reproves him for discovering his Ability in the Logick of *Aristotle* and *Porphyrie*. Could he do otherwise, having to do with Adversaries which made use of these Arms? Lastly, *Erasmus* affirms, That the Stile is different from St. *Basil*'s; but he pronounces this Sentence upon slight Grounds, and without a sufficient Examination of the Matter; for those who read this Work, find no such difference of Stile in it; but on the contrary they find a great agreement between it and his other Books. *Scultetus* pretends, that what this Author says of the Authority of Tradition, is contrary to the Doctrine of St. *Basil*; but it is a Groundless Allegation. Neither is it true, that he lays down in this Book other positions than those which he has explain'd in other places concerning the descent of Christ into Hell, and concerning Baptism. If *Scultetus* had well consider'd what he affirm'd with so much boldness, he would have chang'd his Opinion. St. *Basil*.

No body doubts but the two Books of Baptism are St. *Basil*'s, tho' they be not cited by the Ancients.

The Book of Virginity has the Stile of St. *Basil*, and what St. *Gregory Nazianzen* says of St. *Basil*'s Writings concerning Virginity, does perfectly agree to it. It is also cited by *Suidas*. Yet Mr. *Hermant* believes it suppositious, because it is address'd to *Letoius* Bishop of *Melitine*, since while St. *Basil* was living, that See was possess'd by *Otreius*, who lived after the Council of *Constantinople*, as appears by the Law which the Emperour *Theodosius* made after this Council. It may be said, that *Letoius* was his Predecessor; but there is more probability that he succeeded to him. Either therefore we must say, that the Dedication of this Book is corrupted, and then we must read *Otreius* for *Letoius*, or else that *Letoius* was not yet Bishop.

Among the 31 different Homilies of St. *Basil*, there are 11 of them which are Dogmatical: *viz.* The 9th. wherein he proves that God is not the Author of Sin; The 12th. upon the beginning of the Proverbs; The 15th. concerning Faith; The 16th. upon the Beginning of the Gospel of St. *John*; The 17th. upon Baptism; The 25th. of the Humane Birth of Jesus Christ; The 27th. against the *Sabellians*, the *Anomæans* and the *Arians*; The 29th. against those who accuse us of worshipping Three Gods; The 31st. of Free-will. All these Homilies have St. *Basil*'s Stile and no Body doubts but they are his.

But there is more Difficulty about St. *Basil*'s Books of Morality. St. *Jerom* and *Suidas* mention in general the Ascericks of this Father; but *Sozomen*, Ch. 15. of B. III. of his History, says, That they were written by *Eustathius* of *Sebastea*. On the contrary, *Photius*, Vol. 191 of his *Bibliotheca*, attributes to St. *Basil*, the great Rules, small Rules and their Prefaces.

The Ascetical Books attributed to St. *Basil*, are as follow. The First is a Discourse which may serve as a Preface and Introduction to all his Ascetical Discourses. The Second is a Treatise about the Monastical State, and the renouncing the things of this World. The Third is a Discourse of the Ascetical Life. The Fourth is a Treatise of faith. The Fifth is a Treatise of the Judgment of God, and a little Preface which in some Manuscripts, makes a part of the Book about Faith. We must also add Two other little Discourses publish'd by Father *Combefis*, in the Second Volume of St. *Basil*, Restor'd. These Tracts are as preliminaries to the great Ascetical Treatises, which are *his Morals*, the *Ascetical Book*, the *Great Rules* explained very largely, which are in number 55, the *Little Rules abridg'd*, which are continued unto number 313, some Canons concerning the Punishment of Monks and Nuns, and the Monastical Constitutions. To these Books we may joyn his Epistle to *Chilo*, and the following Letters, as well as 411, and some others which concern the Monastical State, of which we have spoken among the Letters of St. *Basil*. 'Tis not certain whether all these Books that we have mention'd be St. *Basil*'s; but 'tis agreed on all hands that the Constitutions, and the Ascetical Treatises are his: But many adhere to the Testimony of *Sozomen*, who attributes the Little Rules, and also the Great ones to *Eustathius* of *Sebastea*. Yet I see nothing which can confirm this Opinion, and it seems to me that they bear so great a Relation to the other Ascetical Works of St. *Basil*, that it may be affirm'd with much probability, that they all belong to the same Author. *Ruffinus* who has made an Abridgment of them attributes them to St. *Basil*: They are cited under his Name in the 5th. Council; and in short, *Photius* acknowledges all these Treatises for Genuine. Even in his time they made but one Body

St. *Baſil.*

divided into two Parts: The First contained the Diſcourſe of Judgment, and that of Faith which is a Continuation of it: The Second Part contain'd the Morals, the 55 Great Rules, the 313 Short Rules, and the Titles of theſe Rules. This ſhews that all theſe Books belong to the ſame Author, and that they compos'd but one Book, entitled *Aſceticks*, whereof the Firſt Part is not entire. As to the Three Diſcourſes which precede that which is entitled, *Of Judgment*, they are diſtinct Treatiſes which have no Relation to the other Aſcetical Books: The Treatiſe of Judgment ought to precede that of Faith, and both the one and the other are a Preface to the Aſceticks. The Book of a Monaſtick Life, and the Conſtitutions are diſtinct Works, as well as the Rules concerning the Puniſhment of Monks.

Of the Moral Homilies, the firſt is that about Faſting, cited by St. *Auſtin* in the First Book againſt *Julian*, where he recites alſo ſome other Paſſages which this Heretick had taken out of a Treatiſe of St. *Baſil* againſt the *Manichees*, which we have not at preſent. The Second Homily of Faſting, which *Eraſmus* has condemned too ſlightly, is cited by St. *John Damaſcene* and by *Euthymius*. The Third Homily upon the ſame Subject publiſh'd by *Cotelerius*, is not unworthy of St. *Baſil*, tho' it be not ſo Elegant. The Fourth Homily is upon theſe Words, *Take heed to your ſelves*. The Fifth is concerning Thankſgiving, which ſome have believed not to be St. *Baſil's*. The ſixth is upon theſe Words, *I will pull down my Barns*. The Seventh to Rich Men. The Eighth upon Famine and Barrenneſs. The Tenth of Anger. The Eleventh of Envy. The Twelfth upon the beginning of the Proverbs. The Thirteenth contains an Exhortation to Baptiſm. The Fifteenth is upon Drunkenneſs. The One and Twentieth was recited to *Laciza*. The Two and Twentieth of Humility. The Three and Twentieth, that we ought not to ſet our Hearts upon the Things of this World. The Four and Twentieth preſcribes Rules to Young People about reading Profane Books: And the Eight and Twentieth is of Penance. To theſe we may add the Panegyricks, which are the Panegyrick of the Holy Martyr *Julita*, that of St. *Gordus*, and that of St. *Mamas*. There is alſo one upon *Barlaam* a Martyr of *Antioch*; but it has more of the Stile of St. *Chryſoſtom* than of St. *Baſil*; and 'tis more probable, that it was recited at *Antioch*, where the Memory of St. *Barlaam* was held in ſingular Veneration, than at *Cæſarea* of *Cappadocia*.

The 24 Moral Homilies collected by *Simeon Logotheta*, are Extracts out of ſeveral places of St. *Baſil*.

The Latin Diſcourſe of Conſolation, and the Advertiſement to his Spiritual Son, ſeem to me to have neither the Stile nor Genius of St. *Baſil*. The Treatiſe of the Praiſes of a Solitary Life, is taken out of the Treatiſe of St. *Peter Damian*, upon *Dominus vobiſcum*. I ſay nothing of the Grammar attributed to St. *Baſil*, which is an Abridgment of Grammar by a Modern Greek.

There remains now no more but the Liturgies attributed to this Father which are Three in Number. The Firſt is in Greek, and Printed by *Morellus*. The Second was tranſlated from the Syriack, and publiſh'd by *Maſius*. The Third was tranſlated from the Arabick by a *Maronite* of Mount *Libanus*. But tho' 'tis certain that St. *Baſil* compos'd a Liturgy, as St. *Proclus*, the Council in *Trullo*, and *Leontius*, aſſure us: Yet it cannot be poſitively affirmed, that any of thoſe which we have is the Liturgy of that Father, as he compos'd it: On the contrary, there is great probability, that it has not been preſerv'd in its Purity, and that many things have been added and changed in it, as uſually happens to thoſe kind of Works. It is obſerved alſo, That *Petrus Diaconus* cites a Famous Prayer taken out of the Liturgy of St. *Baſil*, which is not to be found in any of thoſe Liturgies, which now go under his Name.

The Homilies of St. *Baſil* upon the Six Days of Creation, are in *Photius*'s Judgment the moſt Excellent of all his Works. And indeed, he handles this Matter in a very grateful manner; they are fill'd with many Embelliſhments of Rhetorick, with agreeable Deſcriptions, ſublime Thoughts, curious and Learned Remarks, and ſolid Reflexions. He explains the Words of Holy Scripture literally, without having recourſe to Allegories; and yet he ſets of this Explication with ſo many Ornaments, that 'tis very delightful. He reſolves many Queſtions about the Nature and Difficulties of *Moſes*'s Relation: He intermixes from time to time ſome Moral Thoughts. It appears that he preach'd theſe Sermons to his People in the Afternoons.

The Homily of a Terreſtrial Paradiſe, is alſo a continuation of this Work; he deſcribes it moſt Eloquently, and underſtands it in a Spiritual Sence of a State of Righteouſneſs and Holineſs.

In the Homily upon the Words of the Proverbs, *Give no ſleep unto your Eyes*, publiſh'd by *Cotelerius*, St. *Baſil* exhorts to Watchfulneſs, and the Practice of Good Works.

His Homilies upon the Pſalms are written in the ſame Stile, but they are more fill'd with Morality. He departs ſometimes from the Literal Sence, and does not always apprehend the true Sence of the Prophet. Yet he does not make uſe of obſcure and forc'd Allegories; but all that he ſays is Intelligible, Natural, Uſeful, and Pleaſant. The Commentary upon *Iſaiah*, is not ſo lofty, nor ſo full of Morality, but 'tis very Intelligible and very Learned.

The Five Books againſt *Eunomius* are a moſt compleat Work of Controverſy; he recites the Arguments and Words of this Heretick, and refutes them very ſolidly and very clearly.

In the Two firſt Books, he refutes the principal Arguments which this Heretick uſed to prove that the Son was not like to his Father. He anſwers them very clearly, and diſcovers the Falſhood of this Heretick's Reaſonings.

In the Third he anſwers the Objections which he made againſt the Divinity of the Holy Spirit.

In the Fourth he proves that the Son of God is not a Creature, but is truly God.

And Laſtly, in the Fifth he proves the ſame thing of the Holy Spirit.

He

St. *Baſil.*

He handles the moſt intricate Matters of Theology, in a manner very Learned and Profound, and yet without perplexing and entangling them with the Quirks, the Difficulties and Terms of the Schoolmen.

He proves alſo the Trinity of Divine Perſons, and their Equality, in the 16th. Homily upon the Beginning of the Goſpel of St. *John*, and in the Book againſt the *Sabellians*.

He particularly Eſtabliſhes the Divinity of the Holy Spirit, in the Treatiſe of the Holy Spirit, addreſs'd to *Amphilochius*. He compos'd it upon occaſion of a Complaint that ſome Perſons had made againſt him, that at the Concluſion of his Sermons he had ſaid, *Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, with the Holy Ghoſt*, inſtead of ſaying as ſome do, *In the Holy Ghoſt*. *Amphilochius* had ask'd him the proper Signification of theſe Terms, and the Difference between the one and the other Expreſſion. St. *Baſil* commends him for this Exactneſs, and obſerves that 'tis very uſeful to ſearch out the proper Sence of the Terms and Expreſſions which we uſe.

In the 2d. Chapter he makes this Obſervation, That thoſe who will uſe different Terms in Glorifying the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt, do it for no other End, but to conclude from thence the Diſſimilitude and Inequality of the Three Perſons of the Trinity.

In the 3d. Chapter he ſhews, That the difference of theſe Terms, *of whom*, *by whom*, *in whom*, have no place but in Philoſophy, and we ought not to uſe them when we ſpeak of the Three Divine Perſons.

In the 4th. he ſhows, That this Particle, *of whom*, ſignifies in Scripture the Efficient Cauſe, ſince 'tis ſaid that all things are of God.

In the 5th. he ſhows, That the Scripture ſays of the Father, *by whom*, and of the Son, *of whom*, and that it uſes the ſame Expreſſions when it ſpeaks of the Holy Ghoſt.

In the 6th. he anſwers thoſe who affirm, That we cannot ſay, the Son of God is *with* his Father becauſe he is *after* his Father. St. *Baſil* maintains, that the Son of God is not at all inferiour to the Father, neither in reſpect of Time, nor in reſpect of the Place he holds, nor in reſpect of Honour and Glory, being Eternal as the Father, Infinite as the Father, and having a Glory and Majeſty equal to that of the Father.

In the 7th. he proves, That this Expreſſion, *with the Son*, is not New; That the Church has uſed it to denote the Majeſty of his Divine Nature, as ſhe has alſo uſed that other, *by the Son*, to ſignify the acceſs which we have to God the Father by his Son, and therefore we ought to uſe the former Expreſſion when we ſing the Praiſes of God; and the latter when we thank him for the Favours he has done us.

He explains this Diſtinction in *Ch.* 8. and there he recites many Names of Jeſus Chriſt.

In the 9th. he explains his Judgment concerning the Divinity of the Holy Spirit, which he received by Tradition, and which is agreeable to the Doctrine of the Holy Scripture. He proves that the Holy Spirit is a Spiritual Perſon, Eternal, Infinite, Unchangeable, *&c.* who ſtrengthens us, and gives us Life by his Gifts.

In the 10th. and 11th. he refutes thoſe that would not joyn the Holy Spirit to the Father and the Son. He proves the contrary by the Inſtitution of Baptiſm, and accuſes thoſe that would not add the Holy Spirit to the Father and the Son; Of Violating the ſaving Sacrament of Baptiſm; Of Prevaricating in the Vow which they had made, and of Revolting from the Religion which they had once profeſſed.

In Chapter 12. he anſwers the firſt Exception of his Adverſaries, who ſaid, That Baptiſm given in the Name of Jeſus Chriſt was ſufficient. St. *Baſil* anſwers, Firſt, That the Name of Jeſus Chriſt denotes the whole Trinity, becauſe it ſignifies the Anointed of the Lord. Now he ſays, that the Word *Anointed*, deſigns him that does Anoint, and him by whom he is anointed. Secondly, That Faith is inſeparable from Baptiſm, becauſe Faith is perfected by Baptiſm, and Baptiſm ſuppoſes Faith; That the Profeſſion of Faith precedes Baptiſm, which is as it were the Seal of it. Laſtly, He maintains that 'tis not ſufficient to Baptize in the Name of Jeſus Chriſt, but that we muſt invoke the Three Perſons of the Godhead according to inviolable Tradition, and that we ought to add nothing to nor take any thing from this Invocation.

In the 13th. he refutes a Second Anſwer of his Adverſaries, who ſay, That tho' the Holy Spirit were oftentimes in Scripture joyn'd to the Father and the Son, yet it would not follow from thence, that he was equal to them, ſince the Angels are there ſometimes joyn'd with God. St. *Baſil* anſwers, That there is a great Difference between the manner in which the Scripture ſpeaks of Angels, and of the Holy Spirit, becauſe it conſiders the former merely as Miniſters, whereas it conſiders the Holy Spirit as the Fountain of Life, and joyns him with the Father, becauſe of the Unity of Eſſence.

In the 14th. he reſolves alſo a third Difficulty: It was objected to him, That tho' Men be baptiz'd in the Name of the Holy Spirit, yet it does not follow, that the Holy Spirit is equal to the Father and the Son, ſince 'tis alſo ſaid in Scripture, That they were all baptiz'd into *Moſes* in the Cloud. St. *Baſil* anſwers, That this Expreſſion of St. *Paul*, ſignifies only, that *Moſes* and the Cloud were the Figure of the Baptiſm of Jeſus Chriſt, but that the Truth is much more Excellent than the Type.

In the 15. he anſwers a fourth Sophiſm: We are baptiz'd in Water, ſaid the Hereticks, and yet we do not honour the Water as the Father and the Son. St. *Baſil* anſwers, That this Objection is ridiculous, and that thoſe who make it are mad; That 'tis not the Water that Baptizes us but the Spirit; That the Water indeed is joyned with the Spirit, as the Sign of the Death and Burial of the Old Man, but that 'tis the Spirit who gives a New Life; That Baptiſm is adminiſtred by dipping three times into

St. Baſil. into the Water, and by invoking the Trinity three times, to ſignify our dying to Sin, and the giving of Life; That the Baptiſm of Jeſus Chriſt is very different from that of St. *John*, which was only the Baptiſm of Water, whereas that of Jeſus Chriſt is the Baptiſm of the Holy Spirit and of Fire. Laſt of all, he ſays, That the Martyrs who ſuffer'd Death for Jeſus Chriſt, needed not the Baptiſm of Water in order to their receiving the Crown, being baptized in their own Blood he ſpeaks alſo in this place of the Fire of the Day of Judgment, which he calls the Baptiſm of Fire, that ſhall try all Mankind.

In the 17th. and 18th. he ſhews that the Holy Spirit is joyn'd to the Father, and to the Son, as a Perſon equal, and not as one inferiour. To prove this, he uſes the Rules of Logick, having to do with an Adverſary, againſt whom he muſt uſe theſe Arms.

In the 19th. he proves, That we ſhould celebrate the Glory and Praiſes of the Holy Spirit, as we do thoſe of the Father and of the Son, and that we ſhould give him the ſame Honours.

In the 20th. the refutes the Opinion of thoſe who ſay, That the Holy Spirit is neither a Lord nor a Servant, but that he is Free. He ſhows that this Opinion is very abſurd, for either he is a Creature or not; if not, then he is God or Lord, and if he is, he muſt be a Servant, for all Creatures have a Dependance upon God.

In the 21ſt. he ſhows by many Teſtimonies of Scripture, That the Holy Spirit is there called Lord.

In the 22d. he proves his Divinity by many paſſages of Scripture.

In the 23. he alledges the Miracles attributed to the Holy Spirit, to prove that he is God.

In the 24th. he ſhows, That we ſhould Glorify the Holy Spirit, as we do the Father and the Son.

In the 25th. he anſwers thoſe who object, That the Scripture never uſes this Expreſſion, *The Father, and the Son, with the Holy Spirit*; and he ſhews, that to ſay, *The Father, and the Son, with the Holy Spirit*, ſignifies nothing elſe but, *the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit*; That the erroneous way which they would have us uſe, is not to be found in the Holy Scripture; *Glory be to the Father by the only Son in the Holy Spirit*; That the Particle *in* has the ſame Sence in this place as the Particle *with*; That the Fathers made uſe of the Particle *with*, as being moſt proper to oppoſe the Errors of *Arius* and *Sabellius*, and that 'tis leſs capable of an ill Sence; That notwithſtanding he is not ty'd up to this Expreſſion, provided we be willing to render Glory to the Holy Spirit.

In the following Chapter, he goes on to explain with much ſubtlety the Difference between the Particles *in* and *with*.

In the 27th. he propoſes this Objection, *We ought to receive nothing but what is in the Holy Scripture*: But theſe Words are not to be found, *Glory to the Father, and to the Son, with the Holy Spirit*. In anſwer to which, he Firſt ſends his Adverſaries back to what he had ſaid in *Ch.* 25. Afterwards he adds, "That in the Church there are ſome Opinions and Practices founded upon the Teſtimonies of Scripture; but then there are alſo ſome which are founded only upon unwritten Tradition: That the Scripture and Tradition have an equal Authority for the eſtabliſhing of Piety and Truth, and that none who follow the Eccleſiaſtical Laws reſiſt them: That if we ſhould reject all Cuſtoms that are not founded on Scripture, we ſhall greatly prejudice Religion, and reduce it to a ſuperficial Belief of ſome particular Opinions. 'Tis eaſy, ſays he, to give Examples of this; and to begin with that which is moſt common. Where find we it written, that we muſt make the Sign of the Croſs upon thoſe who begin to Hope in Jeſus Chriſt? What Book of Scripture teaches us, that we muſt turn to the Eaſt to make our Prayers? What Saint has left us in his Writings, the Words of Invocation, when we Conſecrate the Bread of the Euchariſt and the Cup of Bleſſing? For we do not content our ſelves with pronouncing the Words ſet down by the Apoſtle St. *Paul*, and the Evangeliſts, but we add ſeveral Prayers, both before and after, which we conſider as having much Efficacy upon the Sacrament; and yet we have them not but by Tradition. We Conſecrate the Water of Baptiſm, the Oyl of Unction, and him alſo who is to be baptiz'd; Where is this written? Is not this a Secret Tradition? Is it not Cuſtom which has taught us that we muſt Anoint him who is to be baptiz'd? Where has the Scripture taught us, that we muſt uſe three Dippings in baptizing? We muſt ſay the ſame of the other Ceremonies of Baptiſm, as of Renouncing the Devil and his Angels. Who has oblig'd us to do theſe things? Whence have we Learn'd them? Have we them not from the Tradition of our Fathers? Who obſerved them, without divulging or publiſhing of them, being perſwaded that Silence kept up a Veneration for the Myſteries? What neceſſity was there of putting that in Writing which it was not lawful to reveal or to explain to thoſe who were not yet baptiz'd?" Afterwards he gives the Reaſon of ſome Uſages which he had mentioned. He obſerves alſo, That Chriſtians pray to God ſtanding from Eaſter to Whitſunday; That they kneel and afterwards riſe up. He gives Myſtical Reaſons for theſe Cuſtoms, which are ſo forc'd, that 'tis eaſy to perceive, there is no better Reaſon to be given than Cuſtom and Practice. Laſtly he concludes, That ſince there are ſo many things which we have by Tradition, we ought not to reprehend one ſimple Particle which the Ancients made uſe of.

This he proves in the 29th. Chapter, where he alledges the Authorities of St. *Irenæus*, St. *Clemens Romanus*, the Two *Dionyſii*, *Euſebius* of *Cæſarea*, *Origen*, *Africanus*, *Athenogenes*, *Gregory Thaumaturgus*, *Firmilian* and *Meletius*, beſides the Prayers of the Church, and the Conſent of the Eaſtern and Weſtern Churches. Towards the end of this Chapter he complains of the hardſhips which his Calumniators make him ſuffer. In the laſt, he deſcribes the miſerable State of the Church. He

compares

compares it to a Fleet of Ships toſt with a great Tempeſt, which is the cauſe of Shipwrack to many of them, and Points out the Troubles and Miſeries wherewith the Church was afflicted very admirably: This Chapter alone is ſufficient to ſhow that this Book is undoubtedly St. *Baſil*'s. St. *Baſil.*

He proves alſo the Divinity of the Holy Spirit in Homily 17th. upon Baptiſm, and he explains the Faith of the Church concerning the Trinity in Homily 15th. of Faith. He enlarges upon the Gifts of the Holy Spirit. He treats alſo of the ſame thing in Homily 29. againſt thoſe who accuſe us of worſhipping Three Gods.

In Homily 19. St. *Baſil* treats of that famous and difficult Queſtion, *Why do the Juſt ſuffer, and why is there any Evil, if God takes care of things here below?* St. *Baſil* anſwers, That all this is done by the Permiſſion of God; That Diſeaſes, Calamities, Pain and Death are not real Evils; That Sin which is the only Evil, comes not from God, but from our ſelves; That God expoſes men to Sufferings either to cure them, or to puniſh them, or to make them ſerve for an Example; Or laſtly, to make them good and deſerving: And moreover, That God is not the firſt Author of Diſeaſes, Pain and Death; becauſe he created Man free from them, and theſe things entred into the World only by his Sin. But why, may ſome object, did not God make him impeccable? He anſwers, becauſe in order to the honouring of God, and meriting from him, 'twas neceſſary that he ſhould obey him voluntarily and freely; That the Devil was the Cauſe of his own Perdition, by uſing his Liberty amiſs; That the Tree of Life and Death was placed in Paradiſe, to try the Obedience of Man; and that it was his own fault that he made an ill uſe of it. He obſerves that the Dæmons dwell in the Air, and are incorporeal.

The 31ſt. Diſcourſe which is of Free-Will, has ſome Connexion with the preceding. Therein he teaches, Firſt, That Men deceive themſelves, if they imagine that they can overcome Temptations, by the ſole Power of their own Liberty, without the aſſiſtance of God; That Free-Will can indeed chooſe for us Good and Evil; but God only can enable us to do Good; That we muſt therefore beg the Aſſiſtance of the Divine Power, which cannot be obtain'd without refraining from Worldly Pleaſures: That by the Sin of the Firſt Man, we are become like Beaſts; That we muſt labour to be of the Number of the Children of God, and to excite in us the Fire of the Holy Spirit, which Jeſus Chriſt came to bring down upon the Earth, and which deſcended on the Apoſtles at the day of Pentecoſt; That we muſt pray God that this Fire may deſcend upon us, that we walking always in the Light may never fall, and that we may be as the Lights of the World.

In Homily 25th. of the Nativity of the Word, he explains the Myſtery of the Incarnation. He ſays, That the Word was not chang'd by uniting it ſelf to the Humane Nature; That he was made Man to Redeem us; That he took a Body in the Womb of the Virgin *Mary*, by the Operation of the Holy Spirit; That his Body was made all at once; That *Mary* was a Virgin, though ſhe was Married to St. *Joſeph*. After this, he examines this Queſtion, Whether ſhe knew her Husband after ſhe brought forth Jeſus Chriſt into the World? He ſays, That this is not a Fundamental Article of our Faith; but that thoſe who have a love for Jeſus Chriſt, cannot endure to hear it ſaid, that the Mother of God loſt her Virginity, and became the Mother of a Man. He explains the Difficulties which may be raiſed againſt this Doctrine, from the Particle, *Until that*, and from the Character of *Firſt-Born*, which is given to Jeſus Chriſt. Afterwards he explains ſome Circumſtances of the Birth of Jeſus Chriſt. He believes that the Wiſe Men were *Perſians*; That the Star which they ſaw was not an ordinary Star, and that they knew it ſignified the Birth of Jeſus Chriſt, as well by the Prophecy of *Baalam*, as becauſe they ſaw the Power of the Devil very much diminiſh'd. Laſtly, He exhorts his Auditors to celebrate with Joy the Feaſt of the Nativity of Jeſus Chriſt.

In the Firſt Book of Baptiſm, he proves, Firſt, That we muſt not Baptize any but thoſe that are well-inſtructed and perſuaded of the Faith of Jeſus Chriſt, and who have renounc'd the World, their Vices, their Paſſions, and if need be, their Life. Secondly, He ſhews, That in order to Salvation, 'tis not enough to be baptiz'd, but that we muſt alſo keep the Commandments and do good Works. He ſhows afterwards what difference there is between the Baptiſms of *Moſes*, of St. *John*, and of Jeſus Chriſt. He ſays, That the Baptiſm of *Moſes* ſeparated ſome Men from others, but did not pardon them; That the Baptiſm of St. *John* being received with a Penitent Heart, conferr'd Remiſſion of Sins; but the Baptiſm of Jeſus Chriſt is much more excellent and efficacious: That by this Baptiſm we die unto Sin and live unto Righteouſneſs; That we are Crucified and Buried with Jeſus Chriſt; That we are raiſed again together with him; That Sin hath no more Dominion over us; That we are filled with the Holy Spirit, and cloath'd with Jeſus Chriſt. At laſt, he adds, That after we are baptiz'd, we have need to be nouriſh'd with the Food of Eternal Life; that's to ſay, with the Euchariſt, which we ought to receive with moſt holy Diſpoſitions, leſt we ſhould eat and drink our own Damnation.

In the 2d. Book he propoſes many Queſtions. The Firſt is, Whether he that is baptiz'd be oblig'd to die unto the World and to live unto God? He anſwers, Yes, he is. The Second is, Whether he that performs the Office of a Prieſt, ought to be pure in Heart? He anſwers, That if *Moſes* removed from the Sacrifices of the Old Law, all thoſe that were impure, Purity is yet more neceſſary to him that touches the Body of Jeſus Chriſt.

The Third Queſtion is, Whether it be lawful for one to receive the Euchariſt when he is unclean? St. *Baſil* anſwers it after the ſame manner as he did the preceding.

In the 4th. he teaches, That we muſt obey the Commandments, though it ſeems to us, that there were ſome Actions of Jeſus Chriſt or the Saints contrary to them; and that we muſt never ſeek for Excuſes nor Pretences to diſpenſe with the Obſervation of the Law. He adds in the 5th. That all diſobedience to the Commands of God is puniſhable, and that it deſerves the Divine Vengeance.

In

St. Baſil. In the 6th. he proves that a Man ſins not only by doing Evil; but alſo by omitting to do good when we are oblig'd to do it.

In the 7th. he advertiſes us, That we muſt regulate the Inward Man, before we give unto God any external Worſhip.

In the 8th. That we muſt not only perform the things commanded; but alſo do them in the manner which is enjoyn'd, in the order and time preſcribed.

In the 9th. he ſhows, That we ought to ſhun the Society and Converſation of wicked Men.

In the 10th. he treats of Scandal. He defines it, That which Seduces us from the Truth and draws us into Error or Impiety; or, That which hinders us to obey the Commands of God as long as we live: So that every thing may be call'd Scandal which is contrary to the Will of God. He adds That 'tis alſo Scandal to do a thing, though it be lawful, when it is the cauſe of the loſs or fall of the Weak. He obſerves alſo, That there is ſometimes a Scandal taken without cauſe.

In the 11th. he ſhows, That 'tis never lawful to do thoſe things which are forbidden by the Law of God, nor to obey thoſe that command ſuch things, and that we muſt never uſe our Reaſon to exempt our ſelves from Obedience to the Law of God.

In the 12th. he ſhows, That we ought not only to take care of thoſe Perſons that are under our Conduct; but that our Charity alſo muſt extend to all other Chriſtians! and that a Biſhop ought in caſe of Neceſſity to help all the Churches.

In the laſt, he proves by Scripture, That we muſt endure all and ſuffer all, even Death it ſelf, rather than fail in our Duty, or diſobey the Law of God. This Treatiſe appears to be rather of Morality than Doctrine; but though he treats there of Moral Queſtions, yet he handles them Dogmatically, and founds his Deciſions upon all the Teſtimonies of Scripture which belongs to his Subject.

The Treatiſe of true Virginity contains many Precepts for preſerving Virginity. In it he extols very much the ſtate of Virgins, and diſcovers the Dangers to which they are expos'd. There are in this Treatiſe ſome Paſſages which may offend nice Ears; but 'tis to be conſider'd, that 'tis addreſs'd to a Biſhop, and not to the Virgins themſelves; ſetting that aſide, 'tis very Eloquent, and very well written.

In Homily 28. of Penance, he proves againſt the *Novatians*, That thoſe who have ſinned after Baptiſm, have ſtill the Remedy of Penance; but he admoniſhes them that they ought not to ſin in hopes of doing Penance; That commonly thoſe who ſin with this diſpoſition of Mind are deprived of Repentance; That in truth there is hope of Pardon when they have ſinned; but ſtill it is like a Wound that can be healed, which leaves ſome Scar for ever behind it.

We are now inſenſibly faln into the Homilies of Morality, out of which we ſhall make our Extracts before we come to the Aſcetical Treatiſes.

The Firſt is a Homily about Faſting. After he has in the Firſt Part admoniſh'd us, that we muſt Faſt with a pleaſant Countenance, then he Exhorts Chriſtians to Faſt, alledging many Authorities and Examples to that purpoſe. He ſhows the Neceſſity of Faſting, and anſwers the Excuſe that is moſt commonly alledg'd for diſpenſing with it, which is the want of Health or Sickneſs. "Do not "alledge to me, ſays he, your Indiſpoſition; Don't tell me that you cannot endure Faſting; 'Tis not "to me that ye alledge theſe Excuſes, 'tis to God, from whom nothing can be hid. But tell me, Can "you not Faſt, ſay you? Alas, Can you fill your ſelves with Victuals, can you charge your Stomachs "with all ſorts of Meats? Do not the Phyſicians preſcribe to thoſe that are Sick Abſtinence and Diet-"ing themſelves, rather than abundance of Food? How come you then to ſay, that you can Eat very "much, and that you cannot Diet your ſelves? At laſt, St. *Baſil* ſays, "That our Faſting ſhould be "accompanied with Abſtinence from Evil; That we muſt faſt from our Paſſions and Vices; and that "without this, bodily Faſting is unprofitable. Take heed, ſays, he, that you make not your Faſt to "conſiſt only in Abſtinence from Meats: True Faſting is to refrain from Vice. Tear in pieces all "your Unjuſt Obligations; Pardon your Neighbour; forgive him his Debts. Faſt nor to ſtir up Striſe "and Contention. You eat no Fleſh, but you devour your Brother; You drink no Wine, but you "cannot refrain from doing Injury to others; You wait till Night to take your Repaſt, but you ſpend "all the Day at the Tribunals of the Judges. Woe be to you who are Drunk without Wine: Anger "is a kind of Inebriation, which does no leſs trouble the Mind than real Drunkenneſs". He ſpeaks afterwards againſt thoſe who uſe Faſting, to prepare themſelves for larger Drinking and Eating, or who indulge themſelves as much as they can after they have Faſted, as if it were to redeem the time they have loſt. He gives a natural and frightful repreſentation of Drunkenneſs, ſufficient to beget a horror of it; he diſſwades from it alſo from the Conſideration of the Body of Jeſus Chriſt which they are to receive. He ſays, That Faſting and Abſtinence are Ornaments to Cities, ſecure the Tranquillity of Publick Aſſemblies, the Peace of Families, and the Preſervation of our Eſtates: He ſays, That to be perſwaded of this, they needed only compare the Night of this preſent day in which he Preached, with the Night of the next Day, (From whence it appears that this Day was a Publick Faſt.) At laſt he wiſhes, That in theſe Days wherein Chriſtians are called to the Practice of Faſting, they might learn to know the Efficacy of their Temperance to prepare them for that Great Day wherein God will reward their Vertue.

The Second Homily is alſo an Exhortation to Faſting. Therein he condemns thoſe who allow'd themſelves great Liberties in Eating and Drinking before their Faſting. He ſays that all Chriſtians of all Ages and Conditions are obliged to it. Laſtly, He ſpeaks of the principal Diſpoſition for profitable Faſting, which is to abſtain from Vice.

The Third Homily about Faſting publiſh'd by *Cotelerius*, is ſhorter than the two preceding; but it is written upon the ſame Principles, and upon the ſame Subject.

In

In the Third Homily upon theſe words, *Take heed to your ſelves*, St. *Baſil* recommends that Vigilance and Care which one ought to have over himſelf, that's to ſay, over his Soul, and his Behaviour. St. *Baſil.* He ſays, That this Care is neceſſary for Sinners that they may amend their ways, and for the Innocent, leſt they ſhould fall: That the firſt have need to watch over themſelves to cure themſelves. "You "have committed, ſays he, a great Sin, you muſt then endure a long Penance, you muſt ſhed bitter tears "you muſt paſs whole Nights in watching, you muſt Faſt continually. Though you have commit-"ted but a ſlight Sin, yet you muſt watch over your ſelves to do Penance for it; for it often happens, "that thoſe who have but a ſlight Sickneſs, become dangerouſly Sick when they neglect it". After this he ſhews, That this Watchfulneſs is neceſſary to fulfil the Duties of all States and Conditions. He reproves thoſe that watch for the Faults of others, but never think of their own. He ſhews, That this Watchfulneſs is neceſſary to every Man in whatſoever ſtate he is, and that it is a Remedy to all our Evils, and to all our Paſſions. "If you are ambitious, ſays he, if you are lifted up above meaſure, "either upon the account of your great Riches, or becauſe of your Nobility; if you take Pleaſure in "your Beauty, if you are inſpir'd with a Paſſion for Glory, if you are Lovers of Pleaſures, you have "nothing to do but to take heed to your ſelves, and you may know that you are Mortal, that you "are Duſt, and ſhall return to duſt. If Anger tranſports you to do brutal Actions, take heed to "your ſelves, and you ſhall preſently be aſham'd of that Condition to which Anger has reduc'd you. In "ſhort, This Watchfulneſs which you ſhould have over your ſelves, will make you know God. "You will find ſome Footſteps of him in your ſelves: Your Soul will make you know that he is Spi-"ritual; you will admire him who has made ſuch an excellent Piece of Workmanſhip, and the more "you conſider the Perfections of your Soul and Body, the more ſublime Idea you will conceive of the "Greatneſs, the Power and theſe Wiſdom of God.

The 4th. Homily intituled, *of Thankſgiving*, is about the Joy which St. *Paul* preſcribes to Chriſtians in theſe words of his Epiſtle to the *Theſſalonians: Rejoyce always, pray without ceaſing, giving thanks to God for every thing.* He explains in what ſence Chriſtians ought always to be Joyful: He ſays, That in order to their having this Joy, they muſt be like St. *Paul*; that's to ſay, they muſt live in Jeſus Chriſt, and their Joy muſt not depend upon changes of Fortune, but it muſt be ſolid, and depend upon their own Good Conſcience, and their hope of Eternal Happineſs, which renders thoſe Happy who are moſt Miſerable in the Eyes of the World. He ſhews, That the Joys of this World are Afflictions to thoſe that are Good; and on the contrary, the Afflictions of this World are an occaſion of Joy to them. He explains in what ſence Jeſus Chriſt wept, and why the Saints have Power to weep. At laſt he exhorts all Chriſtians to be no more ſad, for the loſs of this World's Goods; but on the contrary to rejoyce in the hope of thoſe Good things that are to come.

He continues the ſame Subject in the following Homily which was made upon the Feſtival of St. *Julita* the Martyr. This Saint had a Law-Suit with a Man, which ſhe commenc'd for all her Eſtate. 'Twas promis'd her, that ſhe ſhould gain her Cauſe, if ſhe would renounce Jeſus Chriſt, but ſhe was aſſur'd that ſhe ſhould loſe all if ſhe ſhould not agree to this Propoſition. She anſwer'd with Courage: *You ſhall ſooner take away my Goods, and deprive me of my Life, than ever make me ſpeak one ſingle Word againſt my God.* This Anſwer caus'd her to be condemned to the Fire wherein ſhe expir'd; but her Body could not be burnt by the Flames. This is the Hiſtory which St. *Baſil* relates in this Sermon, upon which Occaſion he purſues the preceeding Diſcourſe and continues the Explication of the Words of St. *Paul*. He ſays, That the continual Prayer which God requires of us, does not conſiſt in a vocal repeating of Prayers, but in the Deſign that one has to do Good. So according to him, if a Man would pray continually, he ought always to be united to God in his Actions, and in every thing to follow his Will. At laſt, he ſays, That we muſt thank God, and praiſe him for every thing, and that neither Loſſes, nor Diſeaſes, nor Wrongs, nor Afflictions, nor the Death of our Relations, nor the other Miſeries of this Life ought to hinder us from praiſing God, and giving him thanks continually; That in Adverſity we ought to thank God, becauſe 'tis good for us to be humbled; and we ought to praiſe him in Proſperity, ſaying to him in the Words of the Royal Prophet, *O my God, what ſhall I render unto thee for all the benefits that thou haſt done unto me.* He recites many Motives of Conſolation in Adverſity, taken from the Mercies of God, the Hope of future Happineſs, the Wiſdom of God, the Submiſſion that's due to his Will, and the Miſeries of others. And Laſtly, he aſſures us that nothing but Sin ſhould make us weep, and that if Charity obliges us to Mourn with thoſe that Mourn, that is only by a kind of Condeſcention which ſhould not laſt long. At the End of this Homily, he reproves thoſe who make themſelves Drunk to drive away Sadneſs.

The three following Homilies are about Riches, and againſt Covetouſneſs. The Fifſt is upon the Words of the Rich Man mention'd in the Goſpel, who ſeeing the Superabundance of his Goods, ſaid, *I will pull down my Barns, and I will build larger.* He begins with this Remark, That Men have Two great Temptations in this Life, Great Adverſity, and Great Proſperity. That *Job* overcame the firſt, but the Rich Man in the Goſpel was overcome by the laſt. After this he makes Reflections upon the Actions and the Puniſhment of this Rich Man, and ſays, they ought to teach us to be Bountiful towards the Poor, and to make good uſe of our Riches. He obſerves, That we are only Stewards of our Riches; That all that we have is for others; That we ſhould imitate the Earth which brings forth her Fruit for others; That the Good which we do will turn to our Profit; That 'Tis more Glorious to give than to receive; That 'tis an accurſed thing to with-hold Corn for a time of Dearth; That 'tis a piece of Inhumanity to deſpiſe the Poor; That Riches are unprofitable if they be not diſtributed; That the Thoughts of the Covetous are vain and ſenſleſs; and that they take a great deal of Pains to heap up Riches which they never enjoy. After this he anſwers the Objections of Covetous Men.

St Baſil

Men. One ſays, I will give to Morrow, to exempt himſelf from giving to Day. "Alas! What do "you know whether you ſhall be alive to Morrow in this place? Another ſays, I am Poor, I have "need enough my ſelf of all my Means. Yes, you are Poor, you are deſtitute, but 'tis of Charity, "of Benignity, of Faith, of Mercy. A Third ſays, Whom do I wrong, I detain nothing but what is "mine own; and here St. *Baſil* is angry with this wicked Maxim. And I, ſays he, demand of you, "Why do you ſay, that thoſe Riches are your own? From whom did you receive them, and from "whence did you bring them? Did not you come naked out of your Mother's-Womb, and ſhall not "you return naked to the Duſt? From whence then did this preſent Wealth come? If you ſay it "came by Chance, you are impious; if you confeſs that you received it from God, tell me why did it "fall to your Lot rather than another's? God is not unjuſt in the unequal Diviſion of Goods which "he makes amongſt Men. Why then are you Rich, and why is this Man Poor? 'Tis that you "who are Rich, may receive the Reward of diſpenſing your Goods faithfully, and that the Poor Man "may receive the Recompence of his Patience. And therefore when you appropriate to your ſelf "that Wealth which belongs to many particular Perſons, and of which you are only a Steward; "you are a Robber, you detain that which is none of your own. Yea, the Bread which you keep to "your ſelf, whereof you have more than ſerves for the uſe of your Family, belongs to the Poor, who "die for Famine; the Garments which you keep lock'd up in your Ward-robe, belong to the naked; "the Money which you hide, belongs to the ruin'd, *&c.* Theſe are fine Diſcourſes, you will tell me, "but Gold is yet a much finer thing. Thus does the Covetous Man talk, when he hears us preach. "For as it is ſometimes ſeen, that the unchaſt hearing us ſpeak contemptuouſly of the Paſſion of "Luſt, do thereby receive a New Fire which ſtirs them up more violently than before; ſo alſo the "Covetous hearing us Diſcourſe againſt Riches, conceive a greater Love and Paſſion for them. But "what think they of theſe terrible Words of Jeſus Chriſt, *Go, ye curſed into Eternal Fire; for I "was a-hungry, and you gave me no Meat, I was a thirſt, and you gave me no Drink*, &c. Not only "thoſe who take away another's Goods ſhall be then condemn'd, but alſo thoſe who do not diſtri-"bute of their Riches to the Poor.

The Second Homily is againſt thoſe who have an inſatiable deſire of Enriching themſelves. The ſubject of this is the Hiſtory of the rich Young Man, who went away ſad, when our Saviour bid him Sell all that he had, and diſtribute the price of it to the Poor. He ſhews by this Example, That 'tis unprofitable to keep the Commandments, if one does not give Alms; and that all other Vertues will avail nothing, if one's Heart be fixed to this World by an immoderate Love of riches. He ſhows, That what is neceſſary is not very much; and at the ſame time he proves, That the greateſt Part of rich Mens Expences are ſuperfluous. He gives a very pleaſant Liſt of them in particulars, and which ſuit well enough with the Manners of our Age. He diſſuades from Avarice by the fear of Death and of Judgment, and by the meanneſs of Riches, and the bad Effects which they produce. Afterwards he refutes the moſt common Pretences which are made uſe of to excuſe Covetouſneſs. The firſt is founded upon the uncertainty of what may come to paſs: We know not, ſay they, the Accidents that may happen, or the Neceſſities we may be reduc'd to. "But, ſays St. *Baſil*, is not "the uſe of your Treaſures yet more uncertain? And though it were not, Can you make uſe of this Ex-"cuſe, while you ſpend your Wealth upon a Thouſand Superfluities? But I want it, ſay you, for "my Children. This Excuſe for Covetouſneſs is plauſible. You cover your ſelves with the Pre-"tence of your Children, that you may ſatisfy your Luſts. Is it from you, that your Son receiv'd "Life? Is it not from God who guides and preſerves him? Ought he then to hinder you from obeying "his Commandments? The Riches that you leave him, will, it may be, be the occaſion of his "Ruine: Who knows whether he will make a good or bad uſe of them? Is not your Soul nearer to "you than your Children? 'Tis for the Good of that, that you ſhould beſtow the Chief Part of your "Riches in Diſtributing to the Poor; and then afterwards, give to your Children what they ſtand in "need of for their Livelihood. Thoſe who have no Children, pretend the Neceſſities of this Life, as "a Cloak for their Avarice. They would uſe what they have, they would neither Sell any thing, nor "give any thing away. St. *Baſil* declares, That this Temper of Mind, is contrary to the Reſpect "which is due to the Faith of Jeſus Chriſt, and that it makes it void, whilſt it forms to it ſelf a Rule "and Conduct contrary to the Maxims of the Goſpel. At Laſt, he refutes the Pretence of thoſe who "think to exempt themſelves from giving Alms in their Life-time, by leaving their Goods by Will "as Legacies to the Poor. Miſerable Wretches that you are, ſays he to them, you will not then be "Liberal and Charitable towards Men, till you ceaſe to Live! What Recompence can you expect for a "Liberality which comes after Death? O brave Piety to practiſe no good Works but with Ink and "Paper! You deceive your ſelves, and you think to fulfil the Commands of the Goſpel in dying. "*Abraham* nevertheleſs will tell you then; My Son, you enjoy'd your Good Things and Pleaſures in "your Life-time: Do not your Actions ſhow, that you could have wiſh'd your ſelves to be Immor-"tal; That you might always have enjoy'd your Riches, and that if you had been ſo, you would never "have remembred the Commands of God, and the Precepts of the Goſpel; and therefore it is to "Death, and not to you, that the Poor ought to give thanks for the Good you have done them. "Do not Deceive your ſelves, God will not be deceiv'd, he will not be thus mock'd; that which is dead "is not to be offer'd unto the Sanctuary, offer up a living Sacrifice. He that offers up only the "remains of the Sacrifices is an ungrateful Perſon.

St. *Baſil* treats alſo of Alms in a Homily, which was made upon the occaſion of a great Famine and Dearth. After he has deſcrib'd theſe Calamities, he ſays, that the hard heartedneſs of the Rich to the Poor, was the cauſe of them. "The Fields are barren, ſays he, becauſe Charity is waxed "cold? "He obſerves, That publick Prayers were made, but in ſo bad a manner, and with ſo much

diſtraction

St. *Basil.*

deſtraction that they were not heard; That Children were ſent to them, whereas the Heads of Families ſhould have come themſelves, to beg God's Mercy for their Sins. He relates the Example of the *Ninevites*; he exhorts Perſons of all Conditions to give Alms according to their Ability. "You are "poor, ſays he, but you may find many poorer than you: You have Corn for two days, and there "are ſome who have it only for to day. If you are Good and Charitable, divide equally what you "have left with him that has nothing; be never the more backward to give him becauſe you have but "little left for your ſelves; you prefer your private Intereſt and Advantage to the common Danger "of many poor People. For tho' you had no more but one Loaf, if a miſerable Wretch ſhall beg of "you one Morſel of it, do not refuſe him, and when you give it to him, lift up your Hands towards "Heaven, and ſay theſe Juſt and Charitable Words: Lord, I have but this one Loaf which you ſee, "and I ſee my ſelf in danger of having no more; but I prefer thy Commandment to the Love of "my ſelf, and of the little that I have, I give a Charity to my Brother, who is ſore pinch'd with "Hunger. Give alſo an Alms on your part, O my God, to your Servant, who runs a hazard of "wanting Victuals. I know your Goodneſs, and put my Truſt in your Sovereign Power, you will "not long delay the Relief of your liberal Hand, but ſcatter abundantly in a few days, the Gifts of "your Magnificence. 'Tis certain, adds he, that thoſe who rely upon Divine Providence, are like the "Springs and Fountains which are not dry'd up by drawing from them, but ſend forth their Waters "with a greater Force than before. If ye are Poor, lend your Money upon Intereſt to God who is Rich." Afterwards he repreſents the Miſery and Pain of Hunger, and deſcribes in a moſt moving manner the Extremity of a Man languiſhing for want of Food, to beget the greater horror of the Cruelty and Barbarity of covetous rich Men, who ſuffer their Brethren to die for Hunger, when they are able to aſſiſt them. He obſerves, That in a time of publick Neceſſity eſpecially, we muſt give conſiderable Alms, and that we muſt expiate our Sins by Charity to the Poor. At laſt, he admoniſhes the Poor not to throw themſelves into Deſpair, but to put their Truſt in the Mercy of God, who has ſometimes plentifully fed the Juſt after an extraordinary manner. He exhorts them to ſuffer with Patience like *Job*, to conſider their Miſery as the Trial of their Vertue, to give thanks to God, to beſtow ſomething to the Poor, even of their Neceſſaries; aſſuring them that this is the way to procure the Multiplication of their Loaves, as God did formerly multiply the Cruiſe of Meal to the Widow of *Sarepta*.

To theſe three Sermons may be join'd the Homily wherein he proves, That we muſt not ſet our Hearts upon the Riches and Pleaſures of this World. There he ſhews, That the only Care which we ought to be concern'd for, is that of our Souls; That we ought to rid our Minds of the Love of Riches, and give bountifully to the Poor. After this he deſcribes a Fire, which it was feared might have burnt down the City: He conjures thoſe that eſcaped this great Calamity, to relieve thoſe that ſuffered, and exhorts theſe laſt to Patience by the Example of *Job*, whoſe Hiſtory he explains.

The 10*th*. Homily is againſt Anger; where firſt he excites a Horrour of this Paſſion, by giving a Deſcription of its miſchievous Effects; and then he ſhews, That we can have no juſt Excuſe for this Paſſion of Anger, by ſhewing that all the Pretences which are alledg'd for it are falſe. The Firſt, is an Injury which we may think we have received. But St. *Baſil* ſhews, That we ought not to render Injury for Injury, and that we muſt not imitate our Enemy, nor follow his Footſteps and Example. He adds, That whatſoever Outrage has been done to us, we need do no more, but remember that we are Duſt, and ſhall return to Duſt, to convince us that we have deſerved all ſorts of Reproaches and Diſgraces: That by ſhowing Meekneſs we revenge our ſelves of our Enemies that we acquire the Glory of being mild and patient, and that ſilence upon this Occaſion, deſerves the Rewards of Heaven. Reproaches are another Cauſe of Anger: But St. *Baſil* ſhews, That even this is ill-grounded, becauſe theſe Reproaches are either true or falſe; if they are true, we are to blame if we trouble our ſelves for them; if the they are falſe, our Anger for them gives cauſe to ſuſpect that they are true. But he call'd me Poor, ſays one: "If that be true, ſays St. *Baſil*, bear with it; if it be "falſe. What does it concern you? 'Tis no ſhame to be Poor, for you came naked into the World, "and Jeſus Chriſt being Rich would appear Poor in it. He treated me as a Fool and an Ignorant "Fellow, will another ſay. Yet many more reproachful Words were ſpoken of Jeſus Chriſt. But "yet, How can we forbear being angry, when we are abus'd and buffeted, when we are beaten and "torn in pieces? Will others ſay. Jeſus Chriſt did alſo ſuffer more than all this, anſwers St. *Baſil*." Laſtly, St. *Baſil* preſcribes Rules to avoid Anger, as not to think more highly of our ſelves than others, to hearken with a Philoſophical Temper to the Diſcourſes of a Man that is truly angry with Sin, with the Devil, with Error, with the Enemies of God; to practiſe Humility, and conſider the Miſeries of Men. He concludes with ſome New Reaſons to diſſuade Men from Anger.

The 11*th*. Homily is againſt Envy. In the firſt part he reckons up the Reaſons which may inſpire a Man with hatred of this Vice. He ſays, That 'tis a Vice proper to the Devil, which gnaws and conſumes him in whom it is found, tho' he receives no Profit by it, and which is always accompanied with Melancholy and Vexation of Spirit, and that an envious Man is the unhappieſt Man in the World. Laſtly, he deſcribes all the troubleſome Conſequences, and miſerable Effects of Envy; and he ſays, That the beſt way to cure this Vice, is to have no great Eſteem of the things of this World, to deſpiſe its periſhable Goods, and to place all our Happineſs in the Hope of a future Life, to believe that nothing but Vertue is a ſolid and true Good, and to deſire nothing elſe.

The 14*th*. Homily is againſt Drunkenneſs. It was compos'd upon the occaſion of a Diſorder which happen'd upon *Eaſter-Eve*. Probably there had been at that time ſome profane Recreations; the Men and Women without any Reverence for the Vigils of ſo Holy a Feſtival, had made Feaſts, and the Women had aſſembled, and were come to dance and ſing, even to places where the Bodies of the Martyrs were kept. "St. *Baſil* having ſeen this Diſorder, was ſenſibly touched, as he ſays of

St. *Baſil.* " himſelf at the Beginning of his Diſcourſe; That after ſo many Exhortations, after ſeven Weeks " Faſting, after being preſent ſo many times at the Service of the Church and the Sermons, during the " time of Lent, they had deſtroy'd in one day the Fruit of all his Labours. He ſays, That he knew " not whether he ſhould hold his Peace, or whether he ſhould ſpeak; That he ſhould have held his " Peace, but that he fear'd the Chaſtiſement of *Jeremy*, for having refus'd to preach to an unbelieving " and rebellious People; That Drunkenneſs was the ſource of this Diſorder, and that he muſt now " preach againſt this Vice." This is in effect the Subject of this Homily, wherein he poſſeſſes Mens Minds with a great horror of this Crime, and deſcribes the pernicious Effects of it. Towards the end of it, he returns to the exceſſes of the preceding Day. He cries out againſt their Songs and Dances, againſt their immoderate Laughter, againſt their Apparel, which was neither honeſt nor modeſt; and he exhorts thoſe of his Hearers who had been of this Company, to cure themſelves of Drunkenneſs by Faſting, to ſing Pſalms inſtead of the merry Songs which they had ſung, to turn their Laughter into Mourning, and their Dancing into Kneeling; and in ſhort, to leave off their ſumptuous and magnificent Apparel, and to put on that which is more agreeable to Modeſty and Chriſtian Humility.

The 22d. Homily is of Humility. He begins it with obſerving, That Man loſt his Dignity by the Sin of *Adam*, and that he cannot recover it but by Humility: That the Devil uſes all his Endeavours to deſtroy this Vertue, and to deprive us of it, by poſſeſſing us with a great Eſteem of Riches, of Honours, and the Advantages of Body and Mind. But he ſhews, That a Man ought not to glory in all theſe things, which are no ways permanent, but paſs away in a Moment; That the only true Glory of Man, is to know God, to be fully perſuaded of his own Miſery, and to believe that we are juſtified only by Faith in Jeſus Chriſt, and that we ought to attribute all to God. This is the great Principle of St. *Auſtin* about Grace, which St. *Baſil* explains in this place, adding that we can do nothing without the Aſſiſtance and Grace of Jeſus Chriſt; That 'tis a Folly and Stupidity to think, that the Grace of Jeſus Chriſt is a Natural Power; That St. *Peter* who anſwer'd with a Spirit of Pride to Jeſus Chriſt, telling him, *Though all your Diſciples ſhould be offended, yet will I never be offended*, was abandon'd to humane Weakneſs, and ſo fell into Sin. He ſpeaks afterwards of the other part of Humility, which is, not to exalt our ſelves above others, not to eſteem our ſelves more than them, not to deſpiſe them becauſe of their Faults; but to believe our ſelves much greater Sinners than they. He exhorts his Auditors to imitate the Life of Jeſus Chriſt, which was a continued Courſe of Actions of Humility; he would have a Chriſtian imitate his Maſter, and give Signs of Humility in all his Behaviour. " Your Humility, ſays he, muſt appear in the Plainneſs of your Apparel, in the Modeſty " of your Ornaments, in your Gate, in the Frugality of your Table, in the Tone of your Voice, in " the Simplicity of your Furniture, in the Order of your Houſe, in the Manner of Accoſting and " Saluting your Brethren. Take heed that you do not diſcover in your Diſcourſe and in your Actions " a ſtately and affected Way, and be affable to your Friends, mild towards your Domeſticks, patient with the Paſſionate, and courteous to Inferiors. Comfort the Afflicted, viſit the Sick, deſpiſe no body, be pleaſant in your Requeſts, chearful in your Anſwers, complaiſant and eaſie to " all the World; do not praiſe your ſelves, do not deſpiſe thoſe who praiſe themſelves; hide as much " as you can your own Merit and Vertue, accuſe your ſelves of your Sins without waiting for the " Reproof of others; be not troubleſome nor ſevere in your Reproofs, neither let them be given in " Anger; Condemn not your Neighbour for ſmall Faults, have a Compaſſion and Tenderneſs for " thoſe that have ſinned. In ſhort, ſhun the Praiſes of Men, by all the ways that others uſe to purchaſe Glory, and think not to pleaſe any but God only. In a Word, put on Humility, and by " this means you ſhall arrive at Glory, Jeſus Chriſt will acknowledge you for his Diſciple, and will " glorifie you.

The Subject of the 21ſt. Homily which was pronounc'd at *Laciza*, in a publick Aſſembly, is more complex than that of the preceding. There he exhorts thoſe to whom he ſpeaks, to remember the Spiritual Diſcourſes which were read to them in the Morning, for finding out Remedies againſt Temptations. He recommends to them, to have no regard to the Condition of Men in this World, but to conſider all Chriſtians as Brethren, to treat the Poor and Rich alike, and the Small as well as the Great, becauſe nothing but Sin puts a Difference between Men. He diſſuades them afterwards from the three principal Vices, which are Anger, Envy, and Covetouſneſs. He repeats in this Homily many things which are found in thoſe whereof we have already ſpoken. He obſerves in it, That theſe kind of Aſſemblies meet every Year; that the People who cannot have Preachers every day are able to teach them theſe things, may learn them at leaſt once a Year by coming to theſe publick Feſtivals.

The 30th. Homily is an Exhortation to the Catechumens, who delay or neglect to receive Baptiſm. He ſays in his *Exordium*, That tho' one may lawfully receive Baptiſm at any time, yet the time of *Eaſter* is the moſt proper time for receiving it: That for this reaſon, the Church as a Good Mother, invites at this time all the Catechumens to receive Baptiſm. He exhorts them to receive it, Firſt, becauſe if the Jews ran with ſo much earneſtneſs to receive the Baptiſm of St. *John*, 'tis very fit that they ſhould ſhow yet more earneſtneſs to receive the Baptiſm of Jeſus Chriſt, which is far greater, more excellent, and more effectual than that of his Fore-runner. Secondly, Becauſe 'tis dangerous to delay, and oftentimes Men are ſurpriz'd by Death; and becauſe without Baptiſm, we can have no part in the Kingdom of Heaven, nor can we be deliver'd from the Tyranny of the Devil. " If one were to diſtribute, ſays he, Gold and Silver; if he were to give temporal Favours in any " place, all the World would run thither: Wherefore then do you not run to Baptiſm? If one promiſes to remit all the Debts of another, will not the Debtor run to receive his Promiſe? When " therefore the Buſineſs is to receive Remiſſion of your Sins, What reaſon have you to delay? If one

" be

" be guilty of many Faults, Grace is promiſed in greater Abundance to thoſe who have more Sins. If St. *Baſil.*
" you be afraid of ſinning, Why do you trouble your ſelf about the Time to come? Seeing you are
" well conducted through the Time paſt, after having liv'd to the World, you muſt live to God.
" Baptiſm is the Sign by which a Chriſtian is known; it changes a Man entirely. He muſt not put off
" Living well till Old Age, which is nothing but to mock God, by giving him the laſt Years of
" Life, after he has beſtow'd the prime of his Years upon the Devil and the World, upon his Pleaſures
" and his Sins. Temperance in Old Age is no longer a Vertue, 'tis a Sign of Weakneſs which will
" never be rewarded. Moreover, he is not certain that he ſhall be in a Condition to receive Baptiſm,
" he may die ſuddenly, he may fall into a Sickneſs, which ſhall take away his Speech and his Senſes:
" 'Tis very difficult when a Man is ſick to lift up his Head to Heaven, to raiſe himſelf, to kneel down,
" to pray, to hearken to what is taught him, to underſtand it, to make Profeſſion of it, to make an
" Agreement with God, and to renounce, as he muſt, the Devil. There is nothing but the Love of
" Licentiouſneſs that can diſſwade Men from receiving Baptiſm; becauſe the Laws of Chriſtianity pu-
" niſh Vice ſeverely, and exact of Men a moſt regular way of Living: Theſe require that we ſhould
" be upright in Heart, moderate in our Words, humble in our Thoughts and Actions, and pure in
" our Intentions. They forbid all Paſſion and Revenge, they command us to love our Enemies, to
" yield to Violence, to ſuffer Perſecution, to die to Sin, to mortifie our Body, and to be crucifi'd
" with Jeſus Chriſt. But, you will ſay, This is hard and difficult; 'Tis ſo, but what Happineſs is
" there in this World, which is eaſie to obtain? Who hath ever won the Prize without Trouble?
" Can one hope for the Reward of a brave Man by ſpending his Life in Pleaſures? Can one obtain
" the Victory without running? We muſt enter into the Kingdom of Heaven through much Trouble
" and Labour. Thoſe who do the Works of the Devil, have they leſs Trouble than we? Are they
" more exempt from Labour, *&c.*

" But, 'tis difficulty, ſay you, to preſerve the Treaſure of Grace, and the Innocence of Baptiſm:
" Muſt we then refuſe a good thing for fear of being deprived of it? If you watch over your ſelves, if
" you be conſtant in Praying, in Faſting, in Singing of Pſalms, and in the Practice of the other Ex-
" erciſes of a Chriſtian, you ſhall preſerve your Treaſure". Afterwards, he repreſents in a lively man-
ner, the Remorſe which they ſhall have at the Day of Judgment, who ſhall ſee themſelves condemn'd for want of receiving Baptiſm. He repreſents the Deſpair which ſhall ſeiſe upon them; and concludes from all theſe Motives, that they ought quickly to purge away their Sins by Baptiſm. This Exhortation is admirably ſuited to the Chriſtians of our Age, who delay from day to day, to do penance for their Sins, and forſake their Diſorders.

The 24th. Homily to Young Men, about reading Gentile Books, is very curious. He does not abſolutely forbid the Reading and Study of profane Books; but he deſires, Firſt, That they would not dwell upon them, and that they would not look upon this Study as the principal Thing of their Life, but that they would be perſwaded, that the principal Knowledge is that of *working out their own Salvation*; and that this Knowledge is to be learnt in the Holy Scripture. 2. That they ſhould read profane Books with Diſcretion, and not give Attention to the Evil that is in them, but only to the Examples and Diſcourſes which may be uſeful, and which lead Men to Vertue. He relates a great Number of Examples and Inſtructions, which he drew from all ſorts of profane Authors. Theſe are all the Moral Homilies of St. *Baſil*; I have now only to ſpeak of his Panegyricks; for that of *Julita* is rather a Moral Diſcourſe than a Commendation of that Saint.

In the *Exordium* of the Panegyrick of St. *Gordus*, St. *Baſil* ſays, That Chriſtians celebrate the Feſtivals of Saints, and praiſe their Actions, to glorifie God in his Servants, to rejoice the Righteous, and to excite all the Faithful to their Imitation. He obſerves that the Saints have no need of our Praiſes; That 'tis ſufficient to relate their Lives, that ſo their Vertues may ſerve for a Pattern to others. He adds, That the Nobility of Extraction, the Family, the Education, the Maſters, are the Subject of Praiſe in profane Panegyricks; but Chriſtians have no other Subject of Praiſe, but the peculiar Vertues of thoſe whom they commend. After this, he gives an Account of the Life of St. *Gordus*. He ſays, That this Saint was of *Cæſarea*, and that he had the Command of a Hundred Men in the Emperour's Army; That in his time a furious Perſecution was rais'd againſt the Church, which St. *Baſil* deſcribes; That then this Saint of his own accord quitted his Office of Captain, and retir'd into a ſolitary Place; That after he had been there exercis'd, purified and prepared for the Combate, he came into the City one day, when all the People were aſſembled to ſee a publick Show which was preſented upon the Theatre, and declar'd who he was; That being led to the Tribunal of the Judge, he made Profeſſion of Chriſtianity; That nothing could ſhake his Conſtancy, but he went with Courage to the Place of Puniſhment; and that after he was fortified with the Sign of the Croſs, he boldly receiv'd the Stroak of Death. St. *Baſil* deſcribes this Hiſtory very eloquently, and introduces this Martyr, ſaying many fine things, and well-worthy of his Conſtancy. I wonder that he did not excuſe his Zeal for coming and preſenting himſelf to the Combate, which ſeem'd to be contrary to Chriſtian Prudence, to the Rules of the Church, and the Determinations of the Holy Fathers. 'Tis believ'd that this Saint ſuffer'd Martyrdom under *Licinius*.

The Hiſtory of the Forty Martyrs related in the following Homily, happen'd alſo under this Emperor. St. *Baſil* begins it with ſaying, That the Martyrs could not be prais'd too much for the Three Reaſons which he alledg'd in the preceding Panegyrick: Firſt, Becauſe we teſtifie by this Remembrance of thoſe who were the Servants of God, the Reſpect we owe to our common Maſter. Secondly, Becauſe we celebrate the Praiſes of the Martyrs, that we may make our own Wills ſuffer Martyrdom. And, laſtly, That Men may be induc'd to imitate their Vertues.

St. *Baſil.* Theſe 40 Martyrs were 40 Soldiers, who being at *Sebaſtea* during the Perſecution of *Licinius*, declar'd that they were Chriſtians. When the Governor of the City ſaw, that their Conſtancy could not be ſhaken, nor they perſuaded by fair means to change their Religion, he order'd them to be expos'd in the Night all naked to the rigor of the Air, at a time when a Pond near the City was quite frozen over: They reſolv'd all to endure this Torment with Conſtancy; but one of them being overcome by Pain, renounc'd the Faith of Jeſus Chriſt, but he loſt his Soul, and could not ſave his Life; for he was no ſooner put into warm Water to bring ſome Heat into him again, but he expir'd. However, God permitted that the number of the 40 Martyrs ſhould be compleat, for one of their Guards perceiving the Angels who diſtributed to each of them a Crown, made Profeſſion of being a Chriſtian, and put himſelf in their Number, and was baptiz'd in his own Blood, and ſav'd by his Faith. The next Morning they were all burnt, and their Aſhes thrown into the River. This is the Hiſtory of the 40 Martyrs, as it is related by St. *Baſil*. 'Tis commonly believ'd that they were expos'd all Night in the Pond; But this procceds from a miſ-underſtanding of St. *Baſil*'s words, who ſays expreſly, That they were expos'd to the Air in the Middle of the City, at a time when the Pond hard by was all frozen over. 'Tis this which makes the Confuſion. He adds one notable Circumſtance, That the Mother of one of thoſe 40 Martyrs exhorted her Son to ſuffer boldly. Laſtly, he ſays, That thoſe 40 Martyrs protect the City of *Cæſarea*; That the Chriſtians can find aſſiſtance by their Prayers; That if we ſhould ardently deſire for us the Prayers of one Martyr only, we ought much more to beg the Interceſſion of 40; That whether we be in affliction, or in a joyful condition, 'tis good to have recourſe to them, either to be deliver'd from Evil, or to be continued in Proſperity; That they hear the Prayers of Mothers who pray for their Children, and of Women who pray for the Return or Health of their Husbands. Let us pray then together with theſe Martyrs, ſays he, concluding his Diſcourſe, Let us join our Prayers with theirs.

In the Panegyrick of the Martyr *Mamas*, which is the 24th. he praiſes this Holy Martyr who had been a Shepherd; ſeeing that he probably had but little to ſay of him, he enlarges in this Homily upon the Praiſes of Shepherds, and gives a Catalogue of the Great Men who had kept Flocks. Towards the end, he makes a Digreſſion againſt the *Arians*: 'Tis believ'd that this *Mamas* ſuffer'd under the Emperour *Aurelian*.

The Panegyrick upon the Martyr *Barlaam*, is a very ſhort Diſcourſe; wherein he praiſes this generous Confeſſor, who had endur'd with Conſtancy the burning of his Hand, rather than ſuffer the Incenſe to fall into a little Box, which was upon the profane Altar of an Idol.

The Aſcetical Treatiſes of St. *Baſil* are very uſeful, not only to the Monks, but alſo to all thoſe that make Profeſſion of Piety, and contain the Rules of the Morality of Jeſus Chriſt, which agree to all the World.

The three firſt Treatiſes which are at the beginning of the Aſceticks, are diſtinct Diſcourſes which have no Reference to them; though the Firſt is entituled, *A Preface to the Aſceticks*. 'Tis an Exhortation to thoſe who have embrac'd a Monaſtick Life, wherein he endeavours to perſuade them, that they are engag'd as Soldiers in a Spiritual Warfare, and that they ought to fulfill all the Obligations of it. The Second alſo, is, *An Exhortation to a Monaſtick Life*; wherein ye repreſents the Advantages of Celibacy, and of the Practices of Religion.

The Third, which is entituled, *Of a Monaſtick Life*; contains many Precepts which concern thoſe who retire from the World.

Theſe three Treatiſes are diſtinct Diſcourſes, but the two following of Faith and Judgment are the Preface, or the Firſt Book of the Aſceticks. We muſt begin with the Book of Judgment, and join to it that of Faith, which ends with a little Preface to the Aſceticks; and all theſe make only one Preface to the whole Work. He declares there, that having been educated in the Chriſtian Religion, and inſtructed from his Youth in the Doctrine of the Holy Books, when he came to the Years of diſcretion, he perceiv'd that there was much Union among the Profeſſors of Arts and Sciences; but that he found great Diviſions in the Church of Jeſus Chriſt, that he was ſometime in doubt which Party he ſhould chooſe; and that meditating upon this Subject, he came to know that the greateſt Evil was Schiſm and Diviſion, which proceeded from the Ignorance and Sin of thoſe who did not obey the Commands of God, and follow'd not his Law: That having afterwards reflected upon the terrible Judgments of God upon theſe Perſons, he believ'd himſelf oblig'd to adhere to the Faith of the Church, and to meditate on thoſe Precepts of the Holy Scripture which concern the Manners and Behaviour of Men: That being then perſuaded, that nothing but Faith working by Love, would avail any thing, he believ'd that 'twas neceſſary after the Explication of the Faith of the Church, and the Doctrine which is to be held concerning the Trinity, to write a Book of Manners.

This Concluſion of the Book of Judgment, ſhews that after it, follow'd the Treatiſe of Faith; wherein he ſays many fine things concerning the Vertue of Faith, and then expounds the Doctrine of the Church, and makes Profeſſion of the Divinity of the Son and the Holy Spirit, whom he affirms to be of the ſame Subſtance with the Father. He exhorts thoſe to whom he wrote, to keep to the Simplicity of this Faith, which is founded upon the Authority of the Holy Scripture, and he prays God that they may always continue inviolably fix'd in it. At laſt, having explain'd this Faith, he declares, That he has collected into one Body many Precepts taken out of the New Teſtament.

Theſe Precepts are compriz'd in 80 Rules, divided into ſeveral Chapters. To theſe muſt be joyn'd the 84 Great Rules, and the 313 Small ones, which are Anſwers to ſeveral Moral Queſtions, that comprehend all that is moſt excellent in Chriſtian Morality. Theſe are they which make up the Body of St. *Baſil*'s Ethicks or Aſceticks, divided in Two Books, as we have obſerv'd. They may be conſulted

concerning

concerning all the Offices and Actions of a Chriſtian Life. They may be uſeful to all States and Conditions, and one may ſay that St. *Baſil* has there collected, and methodically digeſted all the Practical Part of the Goſpel. Upon which Account *Photius* had Reaſon to ſay, That whoſoever ſhall follow theſe Precepts, ſhall undoubtedly be ſav'd. St. *Baſil.*

The Book of the Inſtructions of Monks, and of Monaſtical Conſtitutions, are two Books diſtinct from the Aſceticks, which contain many Precepts and Rules for the Monks, that are not ſo general, nor ſo uſeful to all the World, as the Treatiſe of Morality.

To know the Genius and Doctrine of St. *Baſil*, we can addreſs our ſelves to none better than to his faithful Friend, *Gregory Nazianzen*. See then how he ſpeaks of him. He compares his Eloquence to a Trumpet ſounding in the Air, to a Divine Word which ſhall be ſpread over the whole Earth, to a wonderful Whirl-wind raiſed after a very ſurprizing Manner. He ſays, That he has div'd into the moſt hidden Secrets of the Holy Scripture, which he has made uſe of to inſtruct all Men, and to make them loſe the Reliſh of things preſent, and fall in Love only with things to come. That his Writings are the Object of the Admiration of all Perſons, and the Pleaſure and Study of all Men of Worth. The Authors that wrote after him, ſays he, ſay nothing but what they have drawn out of his Works: The Ancients are neglected, and nothing is minded but what he has ſaid anew. In a word, He alone is ſufficient to make an able Man.

"When I read his Treatiſe of the Creation, adds St. *Gregory*, methinks I am preſent with the "Creator; when I light upon the Books which he wrote againſt Hereticks, methinks I ſee the Fire "of *Sodom*, which reduc'd thoſe Criminal Tongues to Aſhes; when I peruſe what he has written of the "Holy Spirit, I acknowledge the God whom I poſſeſs, and I make no Scruple to publiſh boldly the "Truth; when I read the Explications of Scripture which he has made for the Illiterate, I under-"ſtand the deep Abyſſes of Myſteries; when I hear his Panegyricks of the Martyrs, I deſpiſe my own "Body. I fanſie my ſelf preſent with thoſe whom he praiſes, and I feel my ſelf excited to the "Combat; when I ſet my ſelf to read the Diſcourſes which he has written concerning Morals, and "the manner of living Well, my Heart and my Soul are purified that they may become the Temple "of the Holy Spirit; they reform me, they inſtruct me, they change me, and lead me unto Vertue." We are not here to think, That St. *Gregory Nazianzen* in ſaying all this, heightned the Matter as an Orator, or flattered him as a Friend; what he ſays is very true; and there is not any Author whoſe Writings make a greater Impreſſion than thoſe of St. *Baſil*: He deſcribes things ſo lively, he explains his Reaſons with ſo much force, he urges them ſo vigorouſly, he makes ſuch loathſome Portraictures of Vice, ſuch perſuaſive Exhortations to Vertue, he gives ſo large and ſo profitable Inſtructions, that 'tis impoſſible to read his Writings, but one muſt feel himſelf inſtructed and convinced of the Truth, and he cannot but conceive a Love for Vertue and a Hatred of Vice. His Diſcourſes are not void of Thoughts, and full of Words, as for the moſt Part thoſe of Orators are; but Eloquence is there joyn'd with Doctrine, they inſtruct, they divert, and they move at once. His Stile is pure and ſignificant, his Expreſſions are lofty, his way of Writing elegant, clean and perſuaſive; his Diſcourſes appear always natural, flowing gently, and without Affectation: He perſuades pleaſantly, he explains things with great Clearneſs, he knows how to give them ſo probable a turn, that he may be taken for a Pattern; and he comes near *Demoſthenes*, and the ableſt Orators of Antiquity, in the Judgment of the Learned *Photius*; and even in the Judgment of *Eraſmus*, he excels the Ancient Greek Orators, and is free from their Faults. He was fit for all kinds of Writings. His Commentaries upon Scripture are moſt inſtructive and moſt natural: He excels in his Panegyricks. The Force and Subtilty of his Reaſoning appear in his Treatiſes of Controverſie; His Diſcourſes of Morality are inſtructive and moving. In ſhort, tho' his Aſceticks have not the ſame Loftineſs as his other Works, yet there one may find the ſame Purity of Phraſe, and the ſame Clearneſs; but his Method renders them ſometimes a little obſcure. In word, Whatever Subject he treats of, he does it always very Learnedly. He had all the Properties of a Divine, underſtanding perfectly the Holy Scripture, the Tradition of the Fathers, and the Canons of the Church: He was a very able Rhetorician, a very profound Philoſopher, and a very ſubtil Logician. He underſtood alſo the Mathematicks, and his own continual Sickneſs made him a Phyſician: He underſtood Philological Learning to Perfection, and made uſe of it to very good Purpoſe. He knew all that was moſt curious in the Poets, the Hiſtorians, and profane Orators, as may appear from many places of his Writings, and chiefly from his little Tract of Reading profane Authors. In a word, that which is indeed admirable is, that he join'd with this Learning, a profound Piety, and a ſingular Prudence. He was ſweet and affable ro all the World, charitable towards the Poor, and compaſſionate to others in Miſery. He was accus'd of being Proud, but St. *Gregory Nazianzen*, who ſuſpected him of this Vice, vindicates him from it in his Panegyrick. He was of a very infirm Health, and ſubject to many Diſeaſes; he ſpeaks of them in the moſt part of his Letters, and alſo in ſome of his Homilies. St. *Gregory Nazianzen* informs us, that he was pale, that he wore always a great Beard, that he was reſerv'd in his Speech, often thoughtful and penſive, had a particular way in his Apparel, in his Bed and his Meat, which ſome would imitate after his Death.

The Doctrine of St. *Baſil* is very Pure and Orthodox. He has explain'd the Myſtery of the Trinity, againſt the Hereticks, clearly and beyond Conteſt; tho' at the beginning he was reſerv'd in his Expreſſions about the Divinity of the Holy Spirit, yet he always own'd it, and never ſpoke contrary to what he thought. He never us'd any other Precaution, but to be ſilent upon that Point, when he thought it not neceſſary to ſpeak of it, or that it would be to no purpoſe. He was one of thoſe who troubled himſelf moſt to diſtinguiſh the Three *Hypoſtaſes* in God; that's to ſay, to prove, that *Hypoſtaſis* and *Perſon* ſignifie the ſame thing. As to the Myſtery of the Incarnation, he acknowledg'd in

Jeſus

St. *Baſil.* Jeſus Chriſt two Natures without Confuſion, and yet united in one and the ſame Perſon. He rejected the Error of the *Apollinarians* and *Theopaſſians*, and maintain'd with the Church, that the Properties of the humane Nature do by no means agree to the Divinity. He affirm'd ſeveral times, That the Cauſe and Reaſon why the Son of God was made Man, was the Salvation and Redemption of Mankind, polluted by the Sin of *Adam*. He knew the Greatneſs of that Fall, and the miſerable Effects which it produc'd, as Concupiſcence, Sickneſs, Death, &c. He eſtabliſh'd the Neceſſity of the Grace of Jeſus Chriſt, without which it is impoſſible to do Good. He is the only Perſon of the Greek Fathers who ſpoke moſt clearly of it, and attributed leaſt to Free-will, tho' he own'd it. He admitted the Efficacy and Neceſſity of Baptiſm: Yet he believ'd that this Sacrament might be ſupplied by Faith and Charity, and by the Baptiſm of Blood, and that it ſignified nothing, at leaſt to thoſe that had not Faith, and were not well diſpos'd to receive it: He mentions the Unction that accompany'd it, and approves the Ceremonies that were join'd with it: He call'd the Euchariſt the Body and Blood of Jeſus Chriſt: Tho' he was of Opinion, that we ſhould communicate often, yet he requires Holy Diſpoſitions in thoſe who receive this Myſtery. He ſpeaks of the Ceremonies and Prayers that were made uſe of for the Offering, and of the Manner in which it was diſtributed to the Faithful: He obſerves, That they carri'd it and kept it in their Houſes, and that they believ'd it was always conſecrated. He commends Faſting, and ſpeaks of Lent as a Faſt to which we are oblig'd. He has alſo obſerv'd, That it was attended with Abſtinence from Meat. He ſpeaks of the Uſage of Invocating Saints and Martyrs. He is perſwaded that they pray for us, and that their Interceſſion is very profitable. He prefers Celibacy to Marriage. He approves of Vows and a Monaſtick State. He acknowledges the Authority of Traditions, as well as that of Scripture. However, he has ſome particular Opinions, as when he maintains in the Firſt Homily of the Creation, That the Angels were created long before the World; and when he affirms in another place, That all Men ſhall be purified at the Day of Judgment by Fire. But there are very few of this ſort of ſlight Errors in this Author. There were alſo ſome Expreſſions objected to him which appear'd Hyperbolical or leſs Exact; but 'tis eaſie to give them a good Sence. I ſhall not ſtay to make a larger Enumeration of his Opinions, which I have explain'd at length in the Extracts out of his Works. I conclude therefore with giving a Catalogue of the Tranſlations and Editions of the Works of this Father.

The firſt Edition of the Works of St. *Baſil* in Greek is, that of *Frobenius*, printed at *Baſil* in the Year 1532. It contains the Homilies upon the Creation, and the Pſalms, 29 different Homilies, the Book of the Holy Spirit, and ſome Letters. After it followed the Edition at *Venice*, made by *Sabius*, in the Year 1537. in which are added the Three firſt Books againſt *Eunomius*.

At laſt, in the Year 1551, almoſt all the Works of St. *Baſil* were printed in Greek at *Paris*, by the Care of *Janus Cornarius*; who alſo printed them in Latin by *Frobenius*, in the Year 1549.

Wolfgangus Muſculus made a New Edition at *Baſle*, in 1565, by *Oporinus*, and added the Commentaries upon *Iſaiah*, and 20 Letters. *Gothofredus Tilmannus*, a *Carthuſian* of *Paris*, was the firſt *Roman Catholick* that took pains to make a Latin Edition of St. *Baſil*'s Works. He revis'd and corrected the Verſions, and tranſlated ſome Books over again, and made a larger Latin Edition of St. *Baſil* than all the foregoing, which was printed at *Paris*, in 1566, and re-printed at *Antwerp*, in 1578, and at *Paris* by *Sonnius*, in 1603. This is the largeſt of all the Latin Editions of this Father's Writings.

The Firſt Edition in Greek and Latin was in the Year 1618. printed at *Paris* in three Volumes: In it the Greek Text was corrected by many Manuſcripts from *England*, and by ſome out of the King of *France*'s Library. At the End of the Third Volume there are the Notes of *Fronto Ducæus*, and of *Morellus*, with the various Readings, collected by *Schottus*. The laſt Edition of 1638, is not ſo fine and correct as the former: But it contains more by 200 Letters, than had ever been printed before.

Beſides theſe Editions of the moſt part or all St. *Baſil*'s Works, there are alſo ſome particular Treatiſes printed a-part, ſome in Greek and ſome in Latin, and their Editions are not to be neglected, becauſe commonly the great Editions are made from them; but 'tis difficult to gather them all together. Theſe are all that I could find. The Homilies of the Creation of *Euſtathius*'s Verſion, printed at *Paris* by *Badius*, corrected by *Faber* in 1520. Some Homilies tranſlated by *Volateranus*, printed at *Cologne* in 1531. The Aſcetick tranſlated by *Fumanus*, were printed by *Griphius* in 1540. The Rules in 1575 at *Cologne*, and all the Aſcericks in 1560. The Book of the Holy Spirit tranſlated by *Eraſmus*, at *Baſle* in 1532. The Homilies upon the Creation at *Leipſick*, in 1566. The Books againſt *Eunomius* of *Beza*'s Verſion, in 1520. The Diſcourſe of Faſting, at *Paris* in 1613, at *Rome* in 1532, by *Galeſinius*. The Homily upon the Nativity, and of Anger, in Greek, at *Paris*, in 1587. That of Drunkenneſs, at *Hanover*, in 1594. The Homily upon the 40 Martyrs, Greek and Latin, by *Stenius*, at *Heidelberg*, in 1604, and with the Notes of *Voſſius*, at *Mentz*, in 1614. The Letter of Communion is in the ſame Volume. The firſt Letter to St. *Gregory*, at *Paris*, in 1562, of *Budæus*'s Verſion. Some Greek Letters at *Venice*, in 1499. Some others, at *Paris* and *Haguenaw*, in 1528. Some ſelect Letters, by *Stehius*, at *Paris*, in 1531. A Letter to a Virgin upon her Fall, by *Cartenus*, at *Paris*, in 1574. The Canonical Epiſtles with *Balſamon*, in 1561. The Letters of *Julian*, at *Amſterdam*, in 1567. The Letter or the Treatiſe of Reading profane Authors, at *Strasburg*, in 1507; at *Baſil*, in 1532; at *Paris*, in 1533, and 1621; at *Rome*, in 1594. The Treatiſe of a ſolitary Life, at *Paris*, in 1631. The Liturgy in Latin, tranſlated by *Hervetus*, at *Venice*, in 1548, in *Octavo*: in Greek in the ſame City, in 1601, and 1620; at *Antwerp* and *Paris*, in 1560; that of *Maſius* by *Plantin*, in 1569; that of *Victorius Scialagh* the *Maronite*, at *Ausburg*, in 1604; the Grammar, at *Florence*, in 1513; at *Baſle*, 1562, and 1585, in *Octavo*. The Diſcourſes of St. *Baſil*, collected

by

by *Simeon Logotheta*, or *Metaphraſtes*, by *Morellus*, in 1556, 1558, and at *Franckfort*, in 1598. The Third Homily of Faſting, and the Homily upon the 8th Chapter of the *Proverbs*, publiſh'd by *Cotelerius* in his Firſt Volume of the *Greek Monuments*, and ſome Letters in the Third, [Dr. Hammond publiſhed a Prayer made by St. *Baſil*, *for Forgiveneſs from God to thoſe who have done us wrong*, in Greek, from a Manuſcript in the *Bodleyan* Library, in his *Practical Catechiſm.*] St. *Baſil.*

I have nothing further to do, but to ſpeak a word or two of the Tranſlators of the Works of St. *Baſil*. *Ruffinus* has made in Latin an Abridgment of his Aſcetical Rules. *Euſtathius* and *Dionyſius Exiguus* tranſlated his Homilies upon the Creation. After them *Argyropilus* tranſlated it a-new, and his Tranſlation review'd by *Tilmannus*, is that which is printed in the Greek and Latin Edition. The Homilies of Faſting, and thoſe upon *Iſaiah*, and the Books of the Holy Spirit, are of *Eraſmus*'s Verſion. The Tranſlation of the Firſt Homily againſt Covetouſneſs is by *Volateranus*. The Book of Virginity was tranſlated by *Ambroſius Camaldulenſis*.

Beza and *Georgius Trapezuntius* tranſlated the Books againſt *Eunomius*; the Aſceticks are tranſlated by *Fumancellus*; the Letters to *Amphilochius* by *Hervetus*; the Letter to *Chilo* by *Tilmannus*. The laſt Letters were tranſlated by *Hoëſchelius*. Father *Combefis* took care to print in 1674, the Tranſlation of St. *Baſil*'s Sermons; and it had been very happy if he could have ſpoken Latin as well as he underſtood Greek. The ſame Father before his Death made a Review of the Greek Text of all the Works of St. *Baſil*, and their Verſions, which was printed at *Paris* in 1679. This Work may be of great uſe for making a new Edition of St. *Baſil*: It would be very advantageous to the Church, and the Commonwealth of Learning, that any one ſhould undertake it. In general, one may ſay, That all the Tranſlations which we have mention'd are full of Faults, ſome more, ſome leſs: Some of them muſt be corrected exactly, and others done a-new; the Greek Text ſhould be review'd and corrected by many Manuſcripts, and the Books ought to be rang'd almoſt in the ſame Order that we have us'd in our Extracts, and ſome Notes added to explain the Text, and ſome Obſervations upon the Hiſtory and Diſcipline: 'Tis a Work that I would willingly undertake, if God ſhould give me Strength; if I could think that it would be well receiv'd by the Publick, and that ſome Printer would be willing to be at the Expence of it. We ſee every Day multitudes of little French Books appear in Publick, and ſcarce any Ancient Books printed, either in Greek or Latin. The Bookſellers indeed ſay, 'Tis not their Fault, but the Fault of the Publick, becauſe the former ſell well, and go off, and they are enrich'd by them; whereas the latter remain in their Shops, and ſo they are undone; the Fault therefore is to be attributed to the Giddineſs of Men in this Age, who have loſt all reliſh of Antiquity, and are pleas'd with nothing but Novelty: True and ſolid Learning is not in Faſhion in this Age, but Men ſatisfie themſelves with a ſuperficial Knowledge of things: The Study of any thing that is ſolid is laid aſide; and Antiquity is learn'd from the Moderns, and 'tis rare for any one to go up to the Fountain-head. This is a moſt deplorable unhappineſs to Learning in general, and 'tis to be fear'd that this ſuperficial Study of things, will throw us into a worſe State, than the Ignorance and Barbariſm of the preceding Ages. But ſince French Books ſell well, the greateſt part of the Letters and Moral Homilies of St. *Baſil*, ought at leaſt to be turn'd into French, which would be no leſs uſeful, and more pleaſant than the Aſcetical Books which have been tranſlated by Monſieur *Hermant*, who has alſo written in French the Life of this Saint after a moſt Exact and Learned manner.

St. GREGORY NAZIANZEN.

ST. *GREGORY* of *Nazianzum*, was born in this City, in the Year 318. [He was born at *Arianzum*, a ſmall Village near *Nazianzum*, where his Father had an Eſtate.] His Father, call'd *Gregory*, had been engag'd amongſt ſome Hereticks, who were call'd *Hypſiſtarians*, becauſe they profeſs'd to worſhip only the moſt High God, and yet they obſerv'd ſome Ceremonies of Pagans and Jews. His Wife *Nonna* converted him, and cauſed him to be baptiz'd by *Leontius* Biſhop of *Cæſarea* in *Cappadocia*, about the time that the Council of *Nice* was aſſembled. Soon after he was choſen to be Biſhop of *Nazianzum*, and govern'd that Church for the ſpace of 45 Years. His Son *Gregory* applied himſelf to the Study of humane Learning; he begun his Studies in *Paleſtine*, and from thence went to *Alexandria*, where he ſtudied Rhetorick, and at laſt to perfect himſelf, he went to *Athens* about the End of the Year 344. After he had ſtay'd there ſome time with St. *Baſil*, he departed from thence after him to return into his own Country; where he was baptiz'd, and took Care of his Father's Affairs. After this he retir'd with his Friend St. *Baſil* into ſome ſolitary Places in *Pontus*; but he was oblig'd to leave this Retirement to return home to his Father's Aſſiſtance. The old Man being ſurpriz'd had ſign'd the *Conſtantinopolitan* Creed; whereupon the Monks and other Catholicks of his Biſhoprick ſeparated from his Communion, and the Diviſion had continued, if St. *Gregory*, the Son, had not come to *Nazianzum*, and reſtor'd Peace there. In this Journey 'twas, that he was ordain'd Prieſt by his Father; and after he had reconcil'd their Minds, he return'd again to his Retirement, out of which, nevertheleſs, he ſometimes came to preach unto the People. St. *Gregory Nazianz.*

St. *Baſil* being Biſhop of *Cæſarea*, ordain'd him, as we have already ſaid, Biſhop of a little City call'd *Saſima*, but he was quickly diſguſted with ſo tedious a Habitation, and departed from it in great Anger againſt his Friend. [Dr. *Cave* ſays that he never went to ſee it.] He return'd to *Nazianzum*, where he was oblig'd to take Care of that Church in Conjunction with his Father, and to be as it were his Coadjutor; which he did upon Condition, that he ſhould not be his Succeſſor: And therefore his Father being dead, he withdrew from *Nazianzum*, leſt he ſhould be detain'd there by Force.

He

St. *Gregory Nazianz.*

He went to *Seleucia*, and from thence to *Conſtantinople*; where he arriv'd about the Year 376, and found the City full of *Arians*, who ſtirr'd up the whole City into an Uproar againſt him. He enter'd into the Church of *Anaſtaſia*, which was the only Church then remaining to the Orthodox; he aſſum'd the Government, and took Care to inſtruct them, and to preſerve this little Flock. Being very Eloquent, he converted in a little time a great number of *Arians*, and encreas'd the Number of Catholicks. *Peter*, Biſhop of *Alexandria*, underſtanding this good Succeſs of his Labours, wrote to him very honourable and candid Letters, and confirm'd him in the Biſhoprick of *Conſtantinople*. While things were in this Condition, one *Maximus*, a *Cynick* Philoſopher, attempted to get himſelf made Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*; and finding a Prieſt that join'd with him, he gain'd *Peter* of *Alexandria*, who Ordain'd him Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*. Thither he came afterwards in the Year 379, with ſome Mariners, accompanied by ſome Biſhops of *Egypt*, and enter'd by force into the Church. The Clergy and People having a great Affection for St. *Gregory Nazianzen*, run into the Church, and drove *Maximus* out of it, who went to wait upon the Emperour *Theodoſius*; but not being receiv'd favourably by him, he was forc'd to return to *Alexandria*, where he did all that lay in his Power to uſurp the See of that City. But having no better Succeſs there than at *Conſtantinople*, he retired into the Weſt, and preſented himſelf before the Council of *Aquileia*, where he ſhew'd the Communicatory Letters which he had from *Peter* of *Alexandria*; and the Weſt being perfectly govern'd in all Matters relating to the Eaſt by the Church of *Alexandria*, he was kindly receiv'd there, and the Council wrote in his Favour to the Emperour.

In the mean time St. *Gregory*, who lov'd Retirement, bid adieu to his People, recommending to them, that they ſhould keep the Doctrine of the Trinity, and remember him; but his People being reſolv'd not to ſuffer his Departure, he was forc'd to promiſe them, that he would continue at *Conſtantinople*, till the coming of the Biſhops, who were quickly to aſſemble there. The Emperour *Theodoſius* having made his publick Entry into *Conſtantinople*, in the Month of *November* 380, drove away from the Churches, *Demophilus* the *Arian* Biſhop, and order'd St. *Gregory* to enter into the great Church. The People urg'd him to take his place in the Epiſcopal Throne, but he would not do it; and to quiet the Tumult, and the Acclamations of thoſe that were preſent, he told them wiſely, that they muſt in the firſt place give thanks to God for the great Happineſs that had befallen the Church. After this he continued in the Government of the Church of *Conſtantinople*, and was confirm'd in this See by the Authority of the Firſt Council of *Conſtantinople*, whereof *Meletius* was Preſident. But after his Death, the Eaſtern Biſhops, who had hitherto maintain'd St. *Gregory*, begun to murmur againſt his Ordination, being diſſatisfied with his oppoſing the Ordination of *Flavianus* in the room of *Meletius*. When he heard them ſpeak of it, he propos'd to reſign, which Propoſal being receiv'd with greater Eaſineſs than he expected, he was forc'd entirely to reſign the Biſhoprick of *Conſtantinople*. When the *Egyptians* arriv'd he did it with a great deal of Generoſity, tho' he was extremely troubled to quit ſo dear a Church; for he never ſpoke of it afterwards but with Grief, and teſtified a kind of Indignation againſt thoſe Biſhops who forc'd him away from this See. He withdrew immediately to *Nazianzum*, where he died about the Year 389.

The principal Writings of this Father are his Diſcourſes or Sermons, which are compos'd with great Art and Eloquence. We have 55 of them extant.

The *1ſt.* is an Apologetical Diſcourſe, wherein he gives an Account of his retiring into *Pontus* immediately after he was ordain'd Prieſt, and of his return to *Nazianzum*. He fled for fear of being made Biſhop, and therefore in this Diſcourſe he blames thoſe who would all on a ſudden mount up into the Epiſcopal Throne, and carry on Intrigues to obtain that Dignity. *I am aſham'd*, ſays he, *of thoſe who being no more perfect than others, (nay, I pray God they be not worſe) dare with ſacrilegious Hands, and a profane Spirit approach the Holy Myſteries, and who endeavour to obtain the Sovereign Dignity of Prieſthood, when they are not in a Condition even to come near to Holy Things. They puſh forward and involve themſelves in much Trouble, that they may have acceſs to the Holy Table, not conſidering it is an Employment that engages them to Vertue, but as a means to live at their own Eaſe: In ſo much that they never think of Diſcharging their Office after an unblameable manner, but of exerciſing ſuch a Dominion as ſhall be ſubject to no body. Never did this Ambition reign more in the Church of Jeſus Chriſt than it does at preſent, I know it will be in vain for us to endeavour to put a ſtop to it, but I count it a Duty of Piety to teſtifie our Deteſtation and Shame of it.* Afterwards he deſcribes very eloquently, the Difficulties and Troubles of the Epiſcopal Office. He ſays, That this Office is more troubleſome and painful than can be imagin'd; That 'tis a moſt difficult thing to govern Souls; That 'tis the greateſt and rareſt thing in the World, to know how to command well; That nothing is more dangerous than an Obligation to anſwer for others; That a Biſhop ought not only to be free from Faults, but alſo to be very Vertuous; That he ought to be ſtill perfecting himſelf from day to day, and that Vertue ſhould be natural to him, for if it be forced it will not continue long; That the Science of governing Men without Violence and Fear is the Science of Sciences, *ars artium, ſcientia ſcientiarum*; That 'tis infinitely more difficult to cure Souls than to heal the Diſeaſes of the Body, becauſe the Cure of the Soul depends entirely upon the Will of the Sick; That the Phyſician of the Body has leave to uſe Iron and Fire, and the moſt violent Medicines, for recovering the Health of the Body; but the Love which Sinners have for themſelves will not allow theſe ſort of Remedies to be us'd, when their Souls are under Cure; That they ſhun them; That they are reſolv'd to continue in their Sins, and are ingenious to hinder their Recovery; That they hide their Sins to excuſe them, or elſe impudently defend them; That the Phyſicians of the Body know by ſenſible and external Signs, the Diſeaſes which they undertake to cure; but the Phyſicians of Souls have inviſible and hidden Maladies to heal;

That

That the End of the Phyſician for the Body is to reſtore Health, which puts Men in a Condition to enjoy the Good Things and the Pleaſures of this World; but on the contrary the Deſign of the Spiritual Phyſician is to withdraw Men's Affections from this World, and fix them upon God; That for this End God was made Man, and ſuffered ſo much upon Earth. From all this he concludes, That the Profeſſion of a Spiritual Phyſician is more difficult than the Practice of an ordinary Phyſician. He adds alſo to prove the ſame thing, the great Diverſity of Spiritual Diſeaſes, and the different Diſpoſitions of thoſe who are to be cur'd, who require an infinite number of different Remedies. "Some, ſays he, will be reform'd by Diſcourſe, and others by Example; Some muſt be puſh'd "forward and others kept back; Praiſes are uſeful to ſome, but others have need of Rebukes; Some "muſt be Exhorted, and others muſt be Chid; Some muſt be Reproved in Secret, and others in Pub- "lick; Some muſt be ſeverely Puniſh'd for ſmall Faults, and others muſt be gently Handled; Some "muſt be Frighted with the fear of the Judgment of the Great Day, and others muſt be Allur'd with "hopes of Mercy: In a word, Great Moderation muſt always be obſerved, and all Exceſs avoided. "Laſtly, He repreſents the Difficulties of diſcharging the Duty of Preaching as we ought, which he "calls the Firſt and Principal Employment of the Miniſters of Jeſus Chriſt." He ſays, That all the World undertakes to Preach, and yet 'tis a folly to believe that all thoſe who undertake it are capable of it; That this Sacred Miniſtry requires a ſublime Soul, a perfect Knowledge of the Doctrines of the Church, and a very good diſcerning Faculty. He declaims againſt thoſe who thruſt themſelves into this Miniſtry, before they have meditated long upon the Holy Scripture and ſtudied their Religion. He propoſes as a Pattern to Preachers, the great Apoſtle St. *Paul*; he collects together a great many Paſſages of Holy Scripture againſt Falſe Prophets, againſt Prieſts that are unworthy of their Function, and againſt thoſe that abuſe the Word of God: he does not forget the Charge which Jeſus Chriſt draws up againſt the Phariſees; That they were like painted Sepulchers which appear'd outwardly very Fair, but inwardly were full of Filthineſs; and then he makes this Important Reflection. "This, ſays he, is what I think upon Day and Night: Theſe are the Thoughts which macerate me, "which conſume and confound me. I am ſo far from dreaming of Governing others, that I think "of nothing but appeaſing the Wrath of God, and purifying my ſelf from my own Faults. One "ſhould be pure himſelf before he undertakes to purify others; he ſhould be fill'd with Wiſdom, be- "fore he attempts to Inſtruct others; he muſt have Light that he may be able to Communicate of it "to others; he muſt not be far from God, who would draw others to him; he muſt be Holy, that "he may Sanctify others; he muſt be Prudent that he may give them Advice. But when ſhall "we be ſo, will the People ſay that are always ready to undertake every thing, who build thoſe "Buildings ſlightly which preſently fall down again? When will you place your Lamp upon a Can- "dleſtick? When will you improve your Talent? This is what they ſay who have more Friendſhip "for me than Piety. You ask me when I ſhall be in a Condition to Guide others: I tell you, That "the oldeſt Age is not too long a Term to prepare ones ſelf for ſo Excellent and ſo Difficult an Em- "ployment? That 'tis better to be ſlow than forward in this Caſe; That tho' I have been Conſe- "crated to God from my Infancy, tho' I have Meditated from my Youth upon the Law of God, "tho' I have been Exercis'd in the Practice of Vertue; yet I acknowledge my ſelf altogether unca- "pable of Governing a Church, chiefly at a time when the beſt thing a Man can do is to ſhun it, "that he may eſcape the Tempeſt, wherein all the Members of the Church are divided, Charity "ſeems to be wholly extinguiſh'd, Biſhops have but the empty Names of Biſhops, all the World "publickly ſlights them, and ſome defame them; there is no Fear of God remaining, but Impu- "dence reigns every where, and 'tis counted a piece of Piety to treat others as Impious. Our "Judges are Enemies to God, Holy Things are trampled under Foot, and the Myſteries are laid "open to the Prophane; Strangers and Infidels, who were not permitted to enter into our Churches, "do now come even into the Sanctuary. The Gate is opened to Detraction and Calumny, and he "that Rails beſt at his Neighbour, paſſes for the honeſteſt Man. The Faults of others are obſerv'd, "not to bewail them, or bring a Remedy to them; but, on the contrary, to make ſuch bloody Re- "proaches as increaſe the Wickedneſs of thoſe who have committed them. Men are not judg'd Good or "Evil by their Vertues or Vices, but by the Friends they have on their ſide. The ſame thing is "prais'd to Day and blam'd to Morrow; ſome admire what others deteſt, and all their Sins are eaſily "pardon'd who are willing to embrace Impiety. This is the height of Iniquity to which we are "arriv'd: But 'tis not the People only who are thus diſorderly, but the Curſe of the Prophet ſeems "to be fulfil'd, *The Prieſt is become like the People.*" After this he deplores the Miſery of the Catholicks, who were divided, and contended about uſeleſs and trivial Queſtions. He obſerves, That one is oblig'd, when the Faith is the Matter under debate, both to ſeparate from thoſe who teach Impiety, and to ſuffer any thing rather than approve it; but that it is a folly to break the Peace, and ſtir up troubles about Queſtions which are not of Faith. At laſt he returns to his Subject, and having repreſented the Dangers which one runs in the Prieſtly Office, the Difficulty there is of diſcharging it well, and the terrible Judgments of God upon thoſe that perform it amiſs; he concludes, That he had reaſon to preferr a Solitary Life, Calm and Free from Cares, to a Life full of Troubles and Dangers. But after he has juſtified his Retiring, he gives the Reaſons why he returned into his own Country. The Firſt is the Affection and Friendſhip which he had for his Country-men. The Second is the Aſſiſting of his Father and Mother. The Third which he explains by the Compariſon of *Jonas*, is his Fear leſt he ſhould reſiſt the Will of God, who ſeem'd to call him to the Prieſtly Function. Here he gives two admirable Rules about the Conduct which Men ought to obſerve, either for avoiding or accepting of Sacred Orders. He ſays, We muſt be afraid of engaging our ſelves raſhly; but then we muſt alſo be afraid of refuſing the Call of God, and that we may keep the middle between

St. *Gregory Nazianz.*

St. *Gregory Nazianz.* theſe two Extremes, we muſt be of ſuch a diſpoſition, that we neither ſeek after Eccleſiaſtical Dignities, nor refuſe them when they are offer'd, if we know our ſelves capable. That 'tis Raſhneſs to ſeek after them, and Diſobedience to refuſe them; but we muſt neither Condemn thoſe who ſhun them for fear, not thoſe who accept them from a Principle of Obedience; That the Dignity of the Prieſthood aſtoniſhes ſome, and others truſt to the Aſſiſtance of him who calls them; That *Abraham* obeyed readily; That *Moſes* refuſed to obey; That *Iſaiah* immediately obeyed the Command of God, who ordered him to Propheſie, but *Jeremiah* excuſed himſelf from doing it by Reaſon of his Youth. " Theſe reaſons, adds he, charm me, they bend my Soul, they ſoften my Heart, I can no " longer reſiſt, but I humble my ſelf under the Almighty Hand of God, and accuſe my ſelf of Sloth " and Negligence: If there was any Fault in it I beg Pardon; I have been Silent, but I ſhall not al- " ways hold my Peace; I have now retired to conſider my ſelf, and to indulge a little to my Grief; " but I will now praiſe God in the Aſſemblies of his People; I will be yours, my Brethren; I will be " yours, O Holy Flock; I ſubmit to you, my Father, I offer you the ſacrifice of Obedience; but give " me your Bleſſing, guide me by your Prayers, lead me the way by your Judgment: Let us beg of God " all the Graces Neceſſary to Conduct the Flock together in the way of Eternal Salvation." He wrote this Diſcourſe at his leiſure time, about the Year 362.

The 2d. Diſcourſe of St. *Gregory Nazianzen*, is upon the *Nazianzenes* neglecting to come to hear him Preach, when upon their Invitation he had left his Solitude to live among them; he complains of their Negligence, and deſires them to behave themſelves anſwerably to the Affection that he had for them. St. *Gregory* preach'd this Sermon immediately after he was Ordain'd Prieſt in the Year 362.

The 3. Diſcourſe is againſt the Emperour *Julian*, where he employs all the Torrents of his Eloquence. He obſerves, That this Emperour did in vain endeavour to hinder the Chriſtians from Studying good Learning, and applying themſelves to the Liberal Sciences, ſince this could not hinder them from Confeſſing the Name of God. He bewails the Unhappineſs of thoſe who were overcome by the Perſecution of this Emperour; he praiſes the Providence of God who had deſtroy'd him. He relates that *Gallus* and *Julian* having undertaken each of them to build a Church in honour of the Martyrs, this laſt could not compaſs his Deſign, and that his Structure fell down while it was a-building, which St. *Gregory* does not fail to attribute to the Vengeance of God, who would not ſuffer the Martyrs to be honoured by him who was to make ſo many himſelf. He ſays, That while *Julian* follow'd the Study of Learning he diſcover'd what he had in his Mind; That he diſputed eagerly for the Pagan Opinions; That he loved every thing which alienated Men from the Chriſtian Religion, and that he did not conceal his opinions from thoſe that were inclined to the ſame Impiety with himſelf. That after his Brother *Gallus* was Created *Cæſar*, all *Aſia* was a School of Impiety to him; That he had the moſt pernicious and dangerous Maſters, that he could find out, and that he buſied himſelf in Magick.

St. *Gregory* declaims againſt *Conſtantius*, and accuſes him in a Rhetorical way for leaving the Empire to *Julian*. But he excuſes him afterwards, to whom he gives exceſſive Praiſes, by ſaying, That he was Surpriz'd; That he gave way too much to his own Goodneſs and Natural Eaſineſs; and that in ſhort, It was not in his Power to hinder *Julian* from being Emperour, who ſeized the Government againſt his Will; That he revolted from him, and that *Conſtantius* was troubled at his Death; That he had even raiſed *Julian* to the Dignity of *Cæſar*. He ſays, That after *Julian* had uſurp'd the Empire, he perfectly declar'd againſt Chriſtianity; That he effac'd his Baptiſm, by impure Blood, and profan'd his Hands by Sacrifices, as if it were to waſh and purify them from the unbloody Sacrifice of Chriſtians, by which they partake of the Body, the Divinity and Sufferings of Jeſus Chriſt. He relates, That one Day this impious Man while he was Sacrificing, ſaw a Croſs encircling the Entrails of the Sacrifices; That at another time, having entred into a ſubterraneous Place to Conſult with the Devil, being frighted with the Noiſe which he heard in the Cave, and the Spectres which he ſaw, he made the Sign of the Croſs without thinking of it; That at this Wonder-working Sign, all the Devils fled and the Noiſe ceas'd. Then St. *Gregory* deſcribes the Arts which *Julian* uſed againſt the Chriſtians. He ſays, That *Julian* being perſwaded that open Perſecutions did only encreaſe the Conſtancy of Chriſtians, and that the Martyrs did Honour to their Religion, he had recourſe to Impoſtures and Tricks; That he allow'd the People to Abuſe and uſe Violence to the Chriſtians, and reſerved to himſelf the ways of moderation to allure and perſwade them; That he changed his Court, and gain'd the Souldiers over to his ſide; That he removed Chriſtians from all Offices, that he entic'd ſome by Hope of Rewards, and ſeduc'd others; That he ſent ſome of them into Baniſhment, and in ſpite of his affected Gentleneſs he had exerciſed the greateſt Cruelties upon others. He adds, That this Tyrant had a Deſign to ſhut out Chriſtians from all Protection of the Law, and to forbid them to make uſe of it, alledging this for a reaſon, That their Law commanded them to bear Injuries patiently, and to render Evil for Good.

St. *Gregory* anſwers this Raillery, by ſaying, That if Chriſtians had a Law which oblig'd them to bear with Evil, yet there was no Law in the World which permited any to do it. And beſides that, there were among Chriſtians Two ſorts of Precepts; that ſome of them do ſo oblige, that it is abſolutely neceſſary to obey them; but there are others which do not oblige, but Chriſtians are free to fulfil or not fulfil them; that all the World cannot arrive at that perfection which conſiſts in the obſervation of Evangelical Counſels, and that one may be ſav'd, by obſerving only what is commanded as neceſſary to be done. In this place he makes a Digreſſion about the Moderation which Chriſtians obſerv'd when they were in Power, and this he oppoſes to the Cruelties which the Pagans have exercis'd. *There was a Time*, ſays he to the Pagans, *when we had the Authority in our Hands as well*

as

as you; but what have we done to those of your Religion, which comes near to what the Christians have suffer'd from you? Have we taken your Liberty from you? Have we stirr'd up the Fury of the Mobile *against you? Have we put Governours in places on purpose to condemn you to punishment? Have we attempted the Life of any Person? Have we remov'd any Body from the Magistracy, or from their Offices? In a word, Have we done any of those things to you which you have made us suffer, and which you have threatned against us*; I cannot conceive how St. *Gregory* could reconcile all these things with what he had said before, that *Constantius* did very ill to suffer *Julian* to live, and leave the Empire to him, because he was an Enemy to the Christian Religion, and was to Persecute it; and that in this, *Constantius* made a very ill use of his Gentleness and Goodness. Afterwards he speaks of the Prohibition which *Julian* had given to Christians, to study humane Learning. *It belongs to us*, says he, *to Discourse, it belongs to us to understand the Greek Tongue, as it belongs to us to Adore the Gods: But as for you, Ignorance and Barbarism is your Portion; and all your Wisdom consists in saying, I believe.* St. *Gregory* answers him, that the *Pythagoreans* who had no other Reason to give for what they Affirm'd, but the Authority of their Master, would not have jested in that manner, upon what the Christians answer when they are askt about their Doctrine, *This is what I believe*; that this only signifies, that 'tis not lawful to doubt of what is written by Persons Divinely inspir'd, and that their Authority is of greater force than all the Reasons and Arguments of the World; but that it does not follow from thence, that Eloquence, Terms, of Art, and Skill in Languages, belong only to those who profess to acknowledge many Gods: "For, says he, if this be so, either the Greek Tongue is confin'd to the Re- "ligion, or to the Nation: It cannot be said, that 'tis confin'd to the Pagan Religion; for, Where is "that Commanded? Who are the Priests that have enjoyn'd us to study humane Learning as an Acti- "on of Religion; Neither can it be said that 'tis confin'd to the Nations that profess to Adore false "Gods: For it will not follow, because the Greek Tongue has been us'd among those that profess the "Pagan Religion, that therefore it is so confin'd to them who profess that Religion, that others can- "not make use of it. This is as if one should say, that working in Gold cannot be exercis'd but by "Painters, because there were some Painters that were Goldsmiths likewise: He concludes, that "Languages cannot be confin'd to a Profession, nor an Art, nor a Religion, but that they are common to "all those that can make use of them." He adds several Curiosities about the Invention of Letters and Sciences, about the Origin of Sacrifices, about Pagan Ceremonies, and the infamous Actions which the Poets attributed to their false Gods. He occasionally answers an Excuse which the Pagans make to cover the Folly of their Poets, alledging, that they invented what they said concerning their Divinities to please the people, but that under these Veils there was a secret Sence and hidden Mystery. St. *Gregory* confesses, that there may be in Religion hidden Mysteries, and such Discourses as all the World does not understand; and he acknowledges, that there are some of this nature among Christians; but then he maintains, that the Veils, Representations, the Appearances, and the Figures which conceal these Mysteries and Truths, ought to have the Character of Honesty and not of Infamy: That otherwise this was to do like one that would conduct a Man to a fine City through a Bog, or that would bring a Man into Harbour, by leading him over the Rocks: And besides, that there was no Example produced by the Poets which excited to Vertue, but on the contrary, they inclin'd all Men to Vice, whereas the Christian Religion teaches nothing but Vertue and Perfection.

St. *Gregory Nazianz.*

The 4th. Oration is also an Invective against *Julian*. There St. *Gregory* represents the visible Judgments which God had made use of to punish his Impiety, as well as the sensible manner of protecting his Church, and defeating the Designs of this impious Man. He relates first, that when *Julian* would have had the Jews rebuild the Temple of *Jerusalem*, there arose such a Storm as drove away those that undertook the Work, and that having retir'd into a neighbouring Temple, there came forth a Fire which consum'd them. He adds, that there appear'd a Sign of the Cross in the Heavens, which was a Mark of the Victory which Jesus Christ had gotten over these Impious Men; and that all those who saw it, or spoke of it, found their Clothes mark'd with this Sign. He says, that this Miracle, was so publick, that many who saw it embrac'd immediately the Christian Religion, and were Baptiz'd.

But if the Power of God appear'd in this Miracle, his Vengeance clearly appeared in the miserable Death of *Julian*. Before he departed to march against the *Persians*, he made a Vow, That if he return'd Conqueror, he would reduce all Christians under the Power of the Devil: But God who confounds the Designs of the Wicked, did not suffer him to return from this Journey. For being unseasonably engag'd, he found himself incompass'd with the Army of his Enemies, and having mounted up into a high place to discover it, he receiv'd a stroke of which he died. St. *Gregory* says, that some reported that he was pierced thorow by a Dart from his Enemies, and others, that it was done by one of his own Souldiers, or that one of his own People thrust him thorough with a Sword. He observes, that at his Death he would have it believ'd that he was become a God, and that he order'd his most faithful Friends to throw his Body into the River, to make it believ'd that he was rank'd among the Gods; but this was not put in execution. St. *Gregory* afterwards makes a Comparison between the Funeral Pomp of *Constantius* and *Julian*; wherein he observes that the Funeral of *Constantius* was accompanied with the Ceremonies of the Church, with the Publick Prayers sung in the Night-time, with Wax-lights and the other Honours which Christians were wont to pay unto the dead. He excuses this Emperour, as to the Suspicion of *Arianism*, and throws all the Fault upon the Great Officers of his Court. He affirms also, that after his Death, Angelical Voices were heard to celebrate his Praises. He describes the Manners, the Temper, and the Vices of *Julian*. He says, that he always had a bad Opinion of him; he makes a very disadvantageous Representation of him; he admires the Providence of God, who reliev'd his Church, heard her Prayers, and confounded the Designs of the Pa-

St. *Gregory Nazianz.*

gans; yet he deplores their Miſery; he exhorts Chriſtians who enjoy Repoſe at preſent, to remember the time of their Affliction, and to conſider it as a Warning from God, that they ſhould ſin no more. Upon this Occaſion he deſcends to Morality, and exhorts the Chriſtians to whom he ſpeaks, to Celebrate the Feſtivals after a Chriſtian Manner, and to bear Injuries patiently. About the End of this Diſcourſe he returns to his Subject, and invective againſt *Julian*. Theſe Diſcourſes were written ſome years after the Death of *Julian*; and they contain more Strokes of Eloquence than Principles of Theology and Morality.

The 5th. Diſcourſe is an Apology addreſs'd to his Father upon his Retirement. He confeſſes, that he had retir'd for love of a ſolitary Life, but that the Friendſhip he had for his Father, and the Reſpect he ow'd to his old age, had oblig'd him to return. He ſays, that his Father call'd him back, that he might aſſiſt him in the Government of his Dioceſs, and for that end had given him the Unction of Holy Orders. This Diſcourſe was in the Year 362.

The 6th. Diſcourſe was ſpoken before St. *Gregory Nyſſen*, who was come to ſee St. *Gregory Nazianzen*, ſometime after he was ordain'd Biſhop of *Saſima*. He complains in the beginning of this Diſcourſe, that St. *Baſil* had in a manner violated the Laws of Friendſhip, by obliging him to accept of this new Biſhoprick. About the end, he exhorts thoſe that heard him, to purify themſelves from their Sins, and to ſubdue their Paſſions, in imitation of the holy Martyrs whoſe Feſtival they Celebrated. He ſays, that the beſt way of Solemnizing their Feſtivals, and the greateſt Honour they could do them, was to live Regularly and Holily. He declaims againſt the Exceſſes, and Buſineſs that was done at the Aſſemblies on theſe Feſtivals. He praiſes the Martyrs, and gives them the Title of Mediators. He concludes with praying to God, to perfect the great Flocks, and preſerve the little ones, and to comfort him by his Grace, and guide him by his Illumination, and aſſiſt him in feeding the Flock of Jeſus Chriſt. 'Tis plain, that this Diſcourſe was ſpoken by St. *Gregory* in the Year 371, at a ſolemn Feſtival of ſome Martyrs, after St. *Baſil* had Ordain'd him Biſhop of *Saſima* in the Year 371.

The following Diſcourſe which was ſpoken before St. *Gregory* the Father, and St. *Baſil*, was alſo at the ſame time, and upon the ſame Subject. He declares with what Difficulty he had accepted the Biſhoprick of *Saſima*, and prays them to aſſiſt him with their Prayers and advices in the Government of his Dioceſs.

In the 8th. Homily, he directs his Diſcourſe to the People of *Nazianzum*, about his Father's chooſing him to be his Coadjutor. In it he repreſents the Obligation that lies upon one to do Service to the Church, when he is capable of doing it; and repeats again the Rule which he had propos'd in his firſt Diſcourſe, That we ought not to ſeek after Offices, but neither ſhould we refuſe them, when we are call'd to them, and they do not exceed our Abilities. He adds, that he intended now to joyn with his Father, to take care of the Church of *Nazianzum*, but that he would by no means be oblig'd to ſucceed him, and that no body could ever force him to it. That thoſe who Command muſt do it voluntarily, as thoſe who Obey muſt obey willingly, *ut volentes volentibus præſint; which is moſt* neceſſary, ſays he, amongſt the Clergy, where we do not uſe Dominion, but Inſtruction. *Volentium enim non coactorum, pietatis ſacramentum eſt.* This Diſcourſe was in the Year 372.

In the 9th. Diſcourſe which was at the ſame time, he ſpeaks to the People of *Nazianzum*, in the preſence of a Magiſtrate, who took care to make an Aſſeſſment of the Taxes. In it, he firſt gives the Reaſon of his Silence, and then exhorts Chriſtians to withdraw their Affections from the things of this World, and to labour only for Eternity, by purifying themſelves with good Works. He recommends to Paſtors to take care of their Sheep; and to the faithful, to ſubmit themſelves to their Paſtors. He admoniſhes the Men of Learning, not to truſt to their Knowledge and Eloquence, not to affect Knowledge more than is neceſſary, not to graſp at all Learning, but only ſo much as may ſerve them for teaching Truth and Righteouſneſs.

After this, he addreſſes himſelf to the Judge, and tells him, That *we muſt render to Cæſar the Things that are Cæſar's, and to God, the Things that are God's*; that's to ſay, that we muſt render to *Cæſar* the Tribute that belongs to him; and to his Miniſters, the rewards which the Law has appointed them; and that more than that does not belong to them. He prays him in particular, to treat his People with Gentleneſs and Humanity in the Aſſeſſment which he was to make. He makes a pleaſant Obſervation, that Jeſus Chriſt came into the World at a time when a Tax was made, or an Aſſeſſment of all the Inhabitants of the Earth, to ſhew that God is always preſent at thoſe Actions; that he was made Man, and did himſelf pay Tribute to comfort thoſe that are in Bondage, and to teach them to bear it patiently: But withal, that by thus abaſing himſelf, he taught the Kings and Potentates of the Earth, to treat thoſe that are ſubject to them with Mildneſs and Moderation: That Servitude it ſelf was a Burden heavy enough, which ſhould not be encreas'd by Rigour; that Tribute was an effect of the firſt Man's Sin, becauſe War which occaſion'd Tribute, was a Conſequence of the firſt Sin, and a juſt puniſhment of God; but that it ought not to be augmented by over-charging and ill uſing the Miſerable. He adds, that God makes in the other Life a Book, or, if it be lawful to uſe the Term, a Roll, where in all Men are ſet down, without any diſtinction of their State and Condition: That there Men ſhall be treated after the ſame manner, as they have treated others; and that if the Judge to whom he Addreſſes his Speech, would we favourably treated there, he muſt treat his People favourably and civilly. After he has ſpoken to him with this freedom, he beſtows many Commendations upon him; and prays him to exempt the Poor, the Clergy, and the Monks. *Theſe Men*, ſays he of the laſt, *who are no ways allied to this Earth, who have nothing but their Bodies, and do not ſo much as poſſeſs that entirely, who have nothing for Cæſar, and have all for God*, that's to ſay, *who can give nothing but Prayers, Hymns, Watchings and Tears, of which ſeizure cannot be made: Theſe Men, I ſay,*

who

who are dead to this World, that they may live to Jeſus Chriſt, who have crucified their Fleſh with Jeſus Chirſt, and even parted, as one may ſay, their Soul from their Body. This is an excellent Deſcription of the ancient Monks, which gives us a great *Idea* of their Poverty, and how much they were diſengaged from the World. St. Gregory Nazianz.

The 10*th.* Diſcourſe of *Gregory Nazianzen* is a Funeral Oration upon his Brother *Cæſarius*, wherein he relates his principal Actions, and makes a Panegyrick upon them. In it he commends him, and comforts his Father and Mother. He obſerves that the ſame Ceremony is renewed every Year for the Dead. Towards the end, he diſcourſes of the State of the Souls of the Juſt, from the time of their Death until the Day of Judgment. He ſays, that he was inform'd by the Diſcourſes of the Learn'd, that holy Souls which are acceptable to God, being deliver'd from the Bands of this Body, feel an ineffable Joy and Pleaſure, by conſidering the Bleſſedneſs which they are one day to receive; that they go directly to God, and that they know already, as it were in an Image and Repreſentation, the Happineſs they ſhall receive after the Reſurrection of the Body. He adds, That he had often ſeen in a Dream his Brother all over Glorious: *Whether it was*, ſays he, *that the Imagination repreſented him thus, or that this Apparition was real.* He concludes with a Moral Diſcourſe, wherein he ſhews, that we ought to be ſo far from Mourning for the Dead, that we ought rather to mourn for our ſelves, and ſigh, becauſe we continue ſo long upon Earth. He wrote this Diſcourſe ſometime after the Death of his Brother, which happen'd in 368.

The 11*th.* Diſcourſe is a Panegyrick upon his Siſter St. *Gorgonia*, who died ſometime after her Brother. In it he has given an excellent Deſcription of her Vertues, of her Prudence and Wiſdom in the Government of her Family; of her Humility, her Zeal, her Charity to the Poor; of her Care for Adorning Churches, her Mortifications, her Diligence in Prayer, her Submiſſion to the Will of God, her Conſtancy in her Sickneſs, and her Manner of Dying, which was worthy of a Chriſtian. He obſerves, that ſhe was baptiz'd a little before ſhe died; but that ſhe had led ſo holy a Life, that Baptiſm did not confer any Grace upon her, but was only the Seal of thoſe Graces which ſhe had receiv'd. Yet we muſt not believe that ſhe was not baptiz'd till her laſt Sickneſs; for St. *Gregory* ſays, that in a former Sickneſs, when ſhe ſaw that the Remedies which were us'd, gave her no Relief, ſhe went into the Church, and there having pray'd near the Altar, ſhe mingled with her Tears (what ſhe had reſerv'd of the Antitypes of the precious Body and Blood of Jeſus Chriſt) and that ſhe was cur'd immediately. This Action, which St. *Gregory* calls a *pious piece of Impudence*, ſhews that ſhe was baptiz'd ſome time before her laſt Sickneſs. Towards the end of this Panegyrick, he deſcribes the happy State of juſt Souls which are departed out of this Life; he makes no doubt but they enjoy the Company of Angels, and a moſt perfect Knowledge of the Three Perſons of the Holy Trinity. This Diſcourſe was ſpoken about 370.

The following Diſcourſe is about the Reconciliation of the Monks of *Nazianzum* with his Father, which was made, as we have ſaid, about the Year 363. He congratulates their Re-union, and proves the Uſefulneſs and Neceſſity of Peace. See how he deſcribes the Habit of Monks, and the Auſterity of their Life. "All that I have ſeen, ſays he to them, brings to my Remembrance upon the account "of this Fraternal Diviſion, your Watchings, your Faſtings, your Prayers, your Tears, your Knees "harden'd with bearing the weight of your Bodies, your beating of your Breaſts, your deep Sighs, "your Tears ſhed in ſinging forth continually the Praiſes of God, your Hair cut ſhort and neglected, "your naked Feet, your Habits which have nothing of Pride, your Girdle which adorns without be"ing an Ornament, your ſhort Cloaks button'd back, that bold Gate, that modeſt Eye, that plea"ſant Smile, that calm Diſcourſe, that Silence which is more inſtructive than all Diſcourſe, thoſe re"gular Auſterities, thoſe Riches in Poverty, that Glory under Contempt.

The 13*th.* Diſcourſe is alſo about the Benefits of Peace. In this, as well as the preceding Diſcourſe, he makes ſome Digreſſions about the Faith of the Church againſt Hereticks, and he concludes this with a Prayer for their Converſion.

The 14*th.* is upon the ſame Subject, where he ſpeaks againſt the Errour of *Apollinarius.*

The 15*th.* was preach'd after a great Hail, which fell in *Pontus* in the Year 372, which wholly ruin'd the Country. In it he exhorts the People of *Nazianzum*, to acknowledge that this Judgment was a juſt Puniſhment of their Sins; that they ought to conſider God as full of Mercy, when they compare it with the Vengeance which God will inflict upon the Reprobate in the other World. He ſets down in particular, ſome of thoſe Sins which God has puniſh'd by this Scourge, as the Oppreſſion of the Poor, whoſe Goods were ſeiz'd upon either by Fraud or Violence, the Uſury whereby they had enrich'd themſelves and robb'd the Poor, their Forgetfulneſs of God, their Rigour towards the Poor, the Contempt which they had ſhown of the Exhortations of their Preachers, their vain Confidence in Riches, the Covetouſneſs of the Rich, which inclines them to keep up their Corn in their Granaries, that they may ſell it dear in a time of Scarcity, their ſumptuous Apparel and Houſhold Furniture. He exhorts them all to implore the Mercy of God towards 'em, by their publick Prayers, their Faſting, their Penance, and their giving of Alms. He ends this Diſcourſe with praying his Father to appeaſe the Wrath of God by his Prayers, and to beg of him Food for the Body, after he has pray'd for the Food of the Soul.

The 16*th.* Diſcourſe of St. *Gregory Nazianzen*, is a famous Oration of the Love of the Poor and of Poverty. He wrote it particularly in favour of the Poor in the Hoſpital, which St. *Baſil* had built in *Cæſarea*, and he ſpoke it at ſome ſolemn Feſtival about the Year 363. He ſhews in this Diſcourſe that the Love of the Poor and Poverty is a moſt excellent Vertue: After this he deſcribes in a moſt pathetical manner, the miſerable State of the Poor and Sick: He propoſes very preſſing Motives with a great deal of Eloquence, for touching the Heart of the Rich, and inclining them to aſſiſt the Poor and Sick; and he urges with much Clearneſs and Strength, the moſt convincing Reaſons for perſwading them

St. *Gregory Nazianz.*

them that they are oblig'd to it. He concludes with ſaying, that Alms-giving is not only a Duty of Piety, but of Neceſſity; that it is not only a Counſel, but alſo a Precept.

The 17*th.* Diſcourſe is about ſome Differenees that happen'd at *Nazianzum*, between the People and the Governour. St. *Gregory* appeaſes the People in the firſt part of this Diſcourſe, and exhorts them to ſubmit without fear to the Orders of the Governour; and in the ſecond part, he ſpeaks to the Governour with a wonderful Frankneſs, to incline him to Mildneſs and Clemency. He tells him, that he ſhould not take it ill that he ſpoke to him with freedom; that the Law of God ſubjects him to the Commandment of his Biſhop. "For, ſays he, the Church has an Authority of her own, which is "far greater and more excellent than that of Princes, unleſs you will ſubject the Spirit to the Fleſh, "and Heaven to Earth. He adds, that he did not doubt but he would take in good part the Liberty "wherewith he ſpoke, ſince he was one of the Sheep of his Flock. I will not therefore, ſays he, make a "long Diſcourſe. You command by Jeſus Chriſt; 'tis by him that you exerciſe your Authority; 'tis he "who has given you the Sword that you carry; but he has not given you ſo much Power for any other "end, but to terrifie the Wicked, and threaten them with Puniſhments. Take care then that you "preſerve this Truſt with Purity: You are the Image of God, but ſo are all Men in ſome ſenſe. They "are all your Brethren, have compaſſion on them, imitate the Mercy of God, join Mildneſs with Ter-"rour, temper your Threatnings by giving ſome hopes; many times Men compaſs their Deſigns bet-"ter by Gentleneſs than by Violence." He uſes many other Arguments of this Nature, to mollifie the Wrath of this Governour, whoſe Threatnings had frightned the People of *Nazianzum*. At laſt, he ſays, that if theſe Reaſons did not move, but ſtill he ſhould want ſome more powerful Motive, that he would take the Boldneſs to offer him Jeſus Chriſt, and thoſe Myſteries of Salvation which he communicated with the ſame Mouth with which he now deſired this Favour: In ſhort, he conjures him to grant this Favour to the Church of Jeſus Chriſt, and to conſider, that God will treat him after the ſame manner, as he ſhall treat thoſe who are ſubject to his Dominion. This Diſcourſe is a Maſterpiece of Eloquence, which ſeems to have been recited in the Year 372.

The 18*th.* Sermon is the Panegyrick of St. *Cyprian*, the Martyr. There are in this Panegyrick ſome things that relate to the Life of St. *Cyprian*, Biſhop of *Carthage*, as what concern'd his Studies, his Learning, his Accompliſhments, his Baniſhment and his Death: But there are other Circumſtances which cannot agree to him, as when he obſerves, that he of whom he ſpeaks was a Senator, who made Love to a Chriſtian Lady of Quality, call'd *Juſtina*; that he would have made uſe of Magick to corrupt her; but this Lady having recourſe to Jeſus Chriſt, and the Virgin *Mary*, to be deliver'd from this Perſecution, the Devil entered into the Body of St. *Cyprian*, who was not diſpoſſeſs'd till his Converſion. 'Tis certain that this Accident, and ſome others which St. *Gregory Nazianzen* relates in this Diſcourſe, happen'd not to the Biſhop of *Carthage*: And yet he does expreſly declare, that he of whom he ſpeaks was Biſhop of that City. It muſt therefore be owned, that St. *Gregory* compos'd this Panegyrick out of ſome falſe Memoirs, wherein theſe Circumſtances were added to adorn the Life of this Holy Martyr by a pleaſant Story: Howſoever, St. *Gregory* greatly values this Hiſtory, and beſtows many Praiſes upon the Holy Martyr, whom he deſigns to commend. He ſays, that his Aſhes wrought abundance of Miracles, and he exhorts his Hearers to honour this Saint by their Vertues and their good Works. He concludes with a Prayer, which he addreſſes to him, wherein he deſires his Aſſiſtance and Protection for governing his Flock, and conducting thoſe of whom he had the Charge. This Diſcourſe ſeems to have been written when St. *Gregory* was Coadjutor to his Father, that is to ſay, about the Year 372.

The 19*th.* Diſcourſe of St. *Gregory Nazianzen*, is a Funeral Oration upon his Father, which he ſpoke in the preſence of his Mother and St. *Baſil*. He addreſſes his Speech to St. *Baſil* after this manner: "You cannot be come to *Nazianzum* but for Three Reaſons; To ſee us, to viſit the Flock, "and to provide a Paſtor for it. You will ſatisfie the firſt by your good Offices in comforting us with "a Funeral Oration, wherein you may celebrate the Vertues of my Father, and at the ſame time "ſhew us, that we muſt deſpiſe this Mortal Life, and look upon Death as an aſſured Harbour, which "ſhelters us from the Storms and Tempeſts of this Mortal Life. Thus you may comfort us: But "how will you comfort this Flock? You may do it, Firſt, by promiſing that you will take upon "you the Care of Governing it: Secondly, by ſhowing that we are not abandon'd by this good Paſtor, and by perſwading us that he is with us, that he is here preſent, that he ſtill watches over his "Flock, that he takes care of it, protects and defends it. For I do not doubt (they are his own words) "but he being now much nearer to God, does a great deal more for his Flock by his Interceſſion, than "he did upon Earth by his Teaching." After this he gives us an account of his Father's Life, and makes a Panegyrick upon his Vertues: Neither does he forget thoſe of his Mother *Nonna*, whom he comforts towards the end of his Diſcourſe, by letting her ſee that ſhe ought not to value this Life, nor fear Death, and by promiſing to aſſiſt her all the reſt of her Days. It ſeems that all St. *Gregory*'s Brethren were dead, and that he was left alone. There are many remarkable things in this Oration of St. *Gregory*, but chiefly what he ſays of his Father's Celebrating the Euchariſt, tho' he were ſick; and that one day when he was in his Bed, he conſecrated the Elements which were upon the Altar before the People, repeating as little of the Prayers as he could; and that having pronounc'd the Words of the Conſecration of the Euchariſt, and given the People the Bleſſing, he lay down upon his Bed again. What he ſays of Elections, is alſo of great conſequence to Eccleſiaſtical Diſcipline. He declares, that his particular Advice was, that for avoiding Conteſts and Canvaſſings, the Elections ſhould be reſerv'd to the principal part of the People, that is, to the Clergy, or at leaſt that they ſhould have the better ſhare in them. We muſt not forget the Deſcription which he has given of that Magnificent Church, which his Father built at *Nazianzum*. This Panegyrick was in the Year 373.

'Tho'

Tho' St. *Gregory* discharged very well the Offices of Natural Affection, by making Funeral Orations upon his Brother, his Sister, and his Father; yet one may say, That he excell'd himself in discharging the Offices of Friendship, by his Funeral Oration upon his Friend St. *Basil*, which is the 20*th*. of his Discourses. There he describes the Life, the Labours, and different Employments of this Saint exactly: He praises his Piety, his Faith and his Vertues, and forgets nothing of all that could be said to his Advantage. It may be observ'd in all the other Funeral Orations, That the Church in the time of St. *Gregory Nazianzen* believ'd, that the Martyrs and Saints enjoy'd already Eternal Happiness, and the Vision of God; that they took care of Men upon Earth, that they interceded for them, and that it was very profitable to pray to them for the obtaining of Spiritual and Temporal Favours. St. *Gregory* could not have spoken this Funeral Oration until after his Return from *Constantinople* in 381. St. *Gregory Nazianz.*

[By the Character which Mr. *du Pin* himself gives of St. *Gregory Nazianzen*, it appears that he was a Man of very great Warmth of Fancy; and so it is no wonder if when he believ'd that Saints were after Death receiv'd up into Heaven, that he should in some warmer parts of his Harangues, such as *Allocutions* to the Saints from their disconsolate Friends below, or *Prosopopœia's*, where they are introduc'd comforting or strengthning those whom they left behind, say several things that are not too severely to be scann'd. His εἰ τῆς αἰῶνος shews, that he question'd even in his highest flights, whether those Saints whom he was then commending, understood what he said. And the Consequences are then too manifest to be insisted upon; since no Man ever calmly taught, That the Blessed above can so far concern themselves as to intercede for the Faithful below, that Questions whether these happy Beings have any Knowledge of what is done upon Earth: Only this must be said, That the excessive Honors which were paid to Saints and Martyrs upon their Anniversaries brought in all those Corruptions which afterwards grew so very scandalous.]

The Panegyrick upon St. *Athanasius* was spoken at *Constantinople*. There he relates, with much Exactness and Eloquence, the principal Actions of St. *Athanasius*, and excites our Admiration of his Doctrine, his Constancy, his Firmness, his Zeal for Religion, his Love of Peace, and his other Vertues. This Discourse is the 21*st*. The precise time when it was spoken is not known; but 'tis certain that it was at *Constantinople*, which he designs clearly enough, when he says, That he was in a City very much corrupted, where there were Arches and Theatres.

The Discourse in praise of the *Maccabees*, follows after the Panegyrick of St. *Athanasius*. He observes, at the beginning of this Discourse, That tho' many did not honour the *Maccabees* as Saints, because they lived not since the Coming of Christ; yet they are worthy of the same Honour with the Martyrs who suffer'd after Christ; nay, and their Actions are more admirable. "For says he, "if they suffer'd Martyrdom before Christ's Coming, What would they not have done, if they had "come after him, and had had the Death of Christ for an Example? He adds, That no Man before "the Coming of Christ, was accomplish'd with all Vertues, without having Faith in Jesus Christ." He describes afterwards the Martyrdom of the Seven Brethren, and the Constancy of their Mother, and extols those Actions with the most beautiful Stroaks of Eloquence: Then he sends the Reader to the Book which *Josephus* wrote upon this Subject. The time is not known when this Panegyrick was recited.

The 23*d*. Discourse, which bears at present the Title of a Discourse in the praise of *Hero* the Philosopher, or barely of a Philosopher, was, according to St. *Jerome*'s Testimony, a Panegyrick upon *Maximus* the Philosopher, compos'd by St. *Gregory* before he had any difference with him. We have seen that St. *Basil* also commended this Philosopher in the Letters which he wrote to him. St. *Gregory* in this Panegyrick represents the Idea and Pattern of a Christian Philosopher: There he praises a solitary Life, and yet prefers Labour and Business before unprofitable Study. He observes, That the Church was become more Illustrious by Persecutions: He describes the Miseries which it suffered under the Emperours, *Constantius*, *Julian*, and *Valens*. He describes the horrible Tragedy that was acted in the Church of *Alexandria*, when *Lucius* invaded it, to force away *Peter* of *Alexandria*, the Successour of St. *Athanasius*, very particularly. He says, That this Philosopher was then torn with Scourges, and sent into Banishment. Towards the End he explains the Faith of the Church about the Mystery of the Trinity. This Oration must have been spoken or written at *Constantinople* in the Year 378.

The 24*th*. Discourse is address'd to the *Egyptians*, who were come to *Constantinople*. St. *Gregory Nazianzen* praises the Piety of the Faithful of *Alexandria*, testifies a great deal of Respect for the Memory of St. *Athanasius*, a great Esteem for his Successour *Peter*, who then possessed the See of *Alexandria*, and a great Love for the People of *Alexandria*, whom he makes no scruple to call his People. He declares, That he would willingly be united in Communion with the Christians of *Alexandria*, and because they made some Difficulty of joining with him, he expounds to them his Doctrine concerning the Mystery of the most Holy Trinity, and insists chiefly upon proving the Divinity of the Holy Spirit. This Discourse was spoken in the Year 379, before *Maximus* was ordained Bishop of *Constantinople* by the *Egyptians*.

The 25*th*. Discourse is against the *Arians*: He begins it with declaring, That they ought not to glory in their Multitude, nor despise his little Flock, because it preserved and maintained the Purity of the Faith. He represents in the following Discourse the Troubles and Confusions which the *Arian* Heresie produced, and charges them with all the Outrages and Cruelties, which they had exercised against the Catholicks. He shows that neither the Magnificence, nor Grandeur, nor Riches, nor Power of the *Arians* render'd their Cause more acceptable in the sight of God. He vindicates himself from the Reproaches thrown upon him of coming to *Constantinople* to make Disturbances: He says, That he did not come thither of his own accord, as those who now run after the Promotions

of

St. *Gregory Nazianz.*

of the Church; That he was call'd to the Place; That he only followed the Guidance of the Holy Spirit; and that after he came to *Conſtantinople*, he did not imitate thoſe who were inſatiably Covetous; That he had commenc'd no Law-ſuit againſt the *Arians*, neither for their Churches, nor for the Eccleſiaſtical Revenues, tho' they were unjuſtly poſſeſs'd both of the one and the other; That he had perſecuted no Body; That he had ſuffer'd patiently all manner of Injuries and evil Treatment. After he has ſhewn theſe things, he makes an elegant Compariſon between the *Arians* and the Catholicks of *Conſtantinople*. "They have, ſays he, the Temples, but we have the God that dwells in "them, and we our ſelves are the Temples; They have the People for them, we have the Angels "for us; They have for their Portion Aſſurance and Raſhneſs, we have the Faith on our ſide; They "have Threatnings, we have Prayers; They perſecute, and we ſuffer; They have Gold and Silver, "and we are in Poſſeſſion of the Holy Doctrine: But our Flock is little? Yes, but it does not go "to throw it ſelf upon Precipices; our Sheep-fold is narrow, but it is well-guarded againſt Wolves; "it does not lie open to Robbers, and Strangers cannot enter into it. This little Flock, which will "every day grow greater by the Grace of God, gives me no cauſe to fear. I ſee it, I count it eaſily; "I know my Sheep, and they know me; they hear my Voice, they anſwer me; I call them, and "they follow me, and they will not follow Strangers; they will not follow *Valentinus*, *Montanus*, "*Manes*, *Donatus*, *Sabellius*, *Arius*, *Photinus*; and they continue ſteadfaſt in the Faith of the Tri-"nity, in whoſe Name they were baptiz'd." This Diſcourſe was ſpoken by St. *Gregory*, ſome time after he was come to *Conſtantinople*.

In the 26*th*. Diſcourſe, he exhorts thoſe of his Party to obſerve Moderation in their Diſputes with Hereticks. He there lays down a great many very wiſe and uſeful Maxims. He obſerves, That Peace is the greateſt Good that can be enjoy'd; That Schiſms and Hereſies have been raiſed up by Men of great Wit, but turbulent and deſigning, That thoſe Men are the Cauſe of Wars, Seditions, and other Miſchiefs, both to the Eccleſiaſtical and Civil Society; That we ought neither to be too hot, nor too remiſs in the Defence of the Faith; That upon the whole Matter, the Order eſtabliſhed in the Church between the Paſtors and their Sheep, between the Clergy and the Laity, muſt be inviolably obſerved; That 'tis often much better to be ſilent than to ſpeak of Myſteries, becauſe it is very difficult to comprehend and explain them, and that 'tis very rare to find Ears fit to hear them, and Minds capable of bearing them; that when we are obliged to ſpeak, we ſhould do it with much Humility and Modeſty; That the common People ſhould content themſelves with believing, and leave Diſputes to the Learned; That Faith and Religion are for the Ignorant as well as for the Learned, and for the Poor as well as the Rich; That the Learned themſelves ought to ſhun uſeleſs Queſtions and Diſputes; That among the Hebrews, it was not allow'd to all the Jews indifferently to diſcourſe of the Law, but they choſe ſuch to do it as were judg'd capable of it; That ſome Men had one Gift, ſome another; in ſhort, That thoſe who take upon 'em to diſpute and teach others, being puſh'd on by a Zeal for the Faith, ſhould not condemn thoſe who by a reaſonable Precaution and wholeſome Fear are hindred from adventuring to do the like. He concludes all theſe Reflections in theſe Words: "If you will all obey me, as well Young as Old, as well Clergy as Laity, "as well Monks as thoſe that are barely the Faithful, you will give over this vain Oſtentation of "ſhowing your Knowledge by Diſputes, and you will rather take care to draw near to God by an up-"right and prudent Converſation, by the Purity of your Manners, by your edifying Diſcourſes, that "ſo at laſt you may obtain Eternal Life." 'Tis not neceſſary here to obſerve, that this Diſcourſe was ſpoken at *Conſtantinople*.

In the 27*th*. Diſcourſe, St. *Gregory* vindicates himſelf againſt thoſe who accuſed him of Ambition. In his *Exordium*, he enquires after the Reaſons, why the People of *Conſtantinople* were entic'd, and as it were charm'd by his Preaching. He ſays, That it could not be his Learning which allur'd them, for they were ſatisfied that he had but little of it; That it could not be the Doctrine which he taught them, ſince he was not the firſt who had preach'd it to them, neither had he preach'd any thing to them which they had not learn'd formerly from St. *Alexander* their Biſhop: "That neither can "they ſay, That he had gained them by Artificial and Flattering Diſcourſes, as for the moſt part, "ſays he, they do now-a-days who are of the Prieſtly Function, who have made an Art of Preach-"ing the Word of God, who have brought the Arts of the Bar into the Church, and the Ornaments "of the Theatre into the Chair of Truth. You know, adds he, and God is my Witneſs, That we are "ſo great Strangers to this Fault, that they rather accuſe me of Ruſticity, and of not knowing the "World, than of being a Flatterer, and ſeeking to pleaſe Men, ſince I ſometimes reprove too ſe-"verely, even thoſe who are moſt Affectionate to me, when they do any thing that I think not "reaſonable. You know how I mourn'd, how I cry'd, when ye plac'd me againſt my Will upon "the Throne, violating the Laws of the Church for the Love that you ſhow'd me. I uſed ſo great "Freedom with thoſe who appeared moſt zealous for me, that they withdraw in Anger, and "changed their ancient Friendſhip all of the ſudden into Hatred againſt me. Why then have you "ſo great a Paſſion for me, but only, firſt, Becauſe you choſe me your ſelves, and called me to "your Aſſiſtance; and ſecondly, Becauſe you have acknowledged, that I was neither Ambitious, "nor Fierce, nor Paſſionate, nor Proud, nor given to Flattery; and thirdly, Becauſe you have ſeen "how I have ſuffer'd for you all, both from thoſe that openly attack'd me, and from thoſe that ſo "cruelly laid ſecret Snares for me." After this he vindicates himſelf from the Charge which his Enemies drew up againſt him upon the account of his Eloquence. He ſays, That 'tis Envy which makes them ſpeak thus. He juſtifies himſelf alſo from the Ambition whereof he was accus'd; and ſhows, That he did not ambitiouſly aſpire after the See of *Conſtantinople*; That he had met with nothing there but Labour and Fatigue; That if he had been free to chuſe, he ſhould have preferr'd

his

his Solitude before ſo painful an Employment; That he was not engaged in it for any other Reaſon but only to aſſiſt the Church of *Conſtantinople*, which was then without an Orthodox Biſhop; That he would not trouble himſelf, tho' Men ſhould cenſure him for having other Motives than really he had; That God knows what his true Intention was; That he never ſought to pleaſe Men but God only; That he lov'd Goodneſs for Goodneſs ſake, without any proſpect of Wordly Intereſt. At laſt, He addreſſes his Speech to all Eſtates of Men, and makes this brave Remonſtrance to them: "You Kings "of the Earth have a reſpect for your Crown: conſider the Excellency of Power which is entruſted "with you: All the World is ſubject to your Empire, but the Heavenly things are above you; 'tis "God only who governs them: Be you as Gods with reſpect to your Subjects, make your Empire to "conſiſt in this, and not in Gold, in Silver, and in Arms. You Great Men of the Age, who poſſeſs "the moſt conſiderable Offices in the State, be not lifted up becauſe of your Power, look not upon "things Temporal as if they were Eternal: Be you faithful to the Emperours, but above all things be "faithful to God. You that are Perſons of Quality make your Manners anſwerable to your Nobility. "You Wiſe Men, you Philoſophers, you Orators, How can you pretend to Wiſdom and Eloquence, "if you do not Adore him who is the Author and Fountain both of the one and the other? You that "love Riches hearken to the Prophet, who admoniſhes you not to truſt to the Abundance of your "Riches, know that you rely upon a frail thing. You that ſpend your time in Diverſions, mortifie "your ſelves by refraining from ſome things, aſſiſt your ſick Brother with that which you have too "much of. In ſhort, All you that are Citizens of this Second City of the World, which hardly "yields to the Firſt, Govern your ſelves after ſuch a manner, that you may be the Firſt in Vertue, "and not in Debauchery and Licentiouſneſs." This Diſcourſe was ſpoken ſome time after *Theodoſius* and the People had forc'd St. *Gregory Nazianzen* to aſcend the Epiſcopal Throne of *Conſtantinople*, at the End of the Year 380. St. *Gregory Nazianz.*

The following Diſcourſe was ſpoken after *Maximus* had endeavour'd to render himſelf Maſter of the Epiſcopal See of *Conſtantinople*. St. *Gregory* had retir'd for ſome time into the Country to refreſh himſelf: When he return'd being certainly inform'd of all that was done againſt him in his Abſence, he made a Diſcourſe to his People againſt this Philoſopher: And Firſt, in the Exordium of his Diſcourſe, he declar'd the Joy he had upon his Return to his Flock, from which he had been ſeparated, and then he falls very ſeverely upon *Maximus*, and ſhews, that he was unworthy of the Epiſcopal Throne which he aſpir'd to: Afterwards he draws a Portraiture of a True Philoſopher to ſet it againſt that which he had made of *Maximus*, and deſcribes the ſeveral Offices of all Conditions. He returns to his Subject again, by ſaying, That he fear'd not his Enemies in the leaſt: "For what "will they do to me, ſays he? How will they provoke me? They ſay that I am ignorant: I know "no other Wiſdom but the Fear of God, and the keeping of his Commandments. They blame me "for Poverty; alas, would to God, that I could even part with that little which I poſſeſs. They "force me away from my Biſhoprick; but did I ever think it a Happineſs to be a Biſhop? They will "take from me one of the Chief Sees, and one of the Principal Churches in the World. But is it "not at this time a Piece of Prudence to ſhun great Dignities, ſince upon their Account all "Churches are embroil'd and overthrown, and upon their Account the whole Earth is divided? Alas, "Would to God, adds he, that there were no places of Dignity in the Church, no Precedencies, no "Tyrannical Prerogatives, and that none would diſtinguiſh us but by our Vertue. But at preſent, "what Miſchiefs do the Diſputes about Prerogatives and Place, bring upon the Church! How many "People are Deſtroy'd for theſe Conteſts? I ſpeak not only of the Laity, but even of the Biſhops. "What more will they do unto me? They will hinder me from approaching to the Altars: But I "know another Altar, whereof this is but a Figure which can neither be demoliſh'd nor broken. "Will they drive me away from my Houſe? Will they hinder me from diverting my ſelf? Will they "alienate my Friends from me? I have no other Houſe but that which the Piety of another *Shuna-* "*mite* offer'd me. As to what concerns pleaſures, all the Evil that I wiſh to thoſe that deſign Evil "to me, is, That they may enjoy no other Pleaſures than what I take. As for my Friends, I have "ſome that will not forſake me, even tho' they ſhould be ill intreated upon my Account. "There are others whoſe Pride I have endur'd for a long time. *Peter* has deni'd me, and it may "be has not yet bewail'd his Fault." He concludes with deploring the Miſery of his Church.

The 29th. Sermon begins with a Declamation againſt thoſe who thruſt themſelves into places of Governing the People, and Preaching the Word of God without being capable. Afterwards he explains the Myſtery of the moſt Holy Trinity very exactly. Above all things he recommends to them that Chriſtians ſhould hold to the Simplicity of Faith, without endeavouring to fathom and comprehend its Myſteries. This Sermon was preach'd at *Conſtantinople:*

The 30th. Sermon is about the Election of *Eulalius* Biſhop of *Doaza*. This Diſcourſe is ſhort and contains nothing remarkable: It was ſpoken about the Year 372.

In the 31ſt. Diſcourſe, having ſpoken of the Myſtery of the Incarnation, he explains the Anſwer of Jeſus Chriſt to the *Phariſees* in *Ch.* 19. of St. *Matthew*'s Goſpel, concerning Divorce. He ſays upon this place, That Jeſus Chriſt condemns the Cuſtom which permits Husbands to forſake their Wives, and does not permit Wives to forſake their Husbands, becauſe in the Sight of God there is no Inequality between the Man and the Woman. He obſerves, That a Bill of Divorce permitted Huſbands to ſend away their Wives for all ſorts of Reaſons; but that Jeſus Chriſt did not permit it except only in caſe of Adultery. He ſays, That Marriage is commendable, when the Parties are contracted with a deſign of having Children; but he preferrs Virginity to Marriage. He explains in what Sence 'tis ſaid, That all Perſons are not capable of embracing Celebacy. Tho' he owns the Free-will of Man, yet he confeſſes, that God muſt give a Will to do Good, and enable us to obtain the

St. *Gregory Nazianz.*

Victory. He occaſionally rejects the Opinion of *Origen* concerning the Pre-exiſtence of Souls. Laſtly, He exhorts his Auditors not only to preſerve the Purity of Faith as well as of their Bodies, but alſo to Contribute according to their Power to the Eſtabliſhment of Sound Doctrine. He addreſſes himſelf chiefly to the Emperour, and tells him, That if he thought that he did great Service to God, by hindering Murders, Adulteries, and Robberies by his Edicts, he might yet do him greater Service by making an Edict in Favour of the Catholick Faith. This Diſcourſe was in the Year 380.

The 41ſt. Diſcourſe is an Oration which he made to the Biſhops of the Council of *Conſtantinople* in the Year 382. Where, after he had made his Apology for governing the Church of *Conſtantinople*, by deſcribing the wonderful Effects he had produc'd in that Church, he prays them to grant him a Succeſſor, with as much Earneſtneſs, as others deſire the Greateſt Sees.

The Reaſons which he alledges for obtaining Permiſſion to retire, are Firſt, his great Age, the Quarrels of Churches and Biſhops, the Envy that ſome bore to him, the Diviſion of the Eaſt and the Weſt, and his Love of Retirement and Solitude. He adds ſome other Reaſons which tend to the Confuſion of his Enemies, ſuch as the Perſecutions which he had endur'd with Patience, his Frugality, his Modeſty, his Humility. At laſt, He conjures them to create another Biſhop who ſhould be more agreeable to the reliſh of the World. Here he repreſents very naturally, the Luxury, Ambition, and Arts which were but too common among the Biſhops of the Great Sees. At laſt, He bids Adieu to his Dear *Anaſtaſia*, to the other Churches of *Conſtantinople*, to the Council, the Clergy, the People, and to the Court. Theſe Adieu's are pathetical to thoſe that had an Eſteem of him, and are very picquant to thoſe that were his Enemies, and wiſh'd that he would abdicate his Charge. 'Tis plain that this Diſcourſe is the laſt of thoſe which he ſpoke at *Conſtantinople*.

The Five following Diſcourſes are Entitled, *Of Theology*, becauſe St. *Gregory Nazianzen* explains there what concerns the Divine Nature, and the Trinity of Perſons: There he treats of the Rules which ought to be obſerved in the Adminiſtration of the Word of God. He ſays Firſt, That this Function does not ſuit all Men; That he who diſcharges it muſt be pure in Heart and Mind; That he ſhould not apply himſelf to it but with a ſedate Temper; and Laſtly, That he ought not to treat of thoſe Matters before Pagans, nor before thoſe who have no ſenſe of Religion, and who think of nothing but Pleaſures. He adds many fine things about the Diſpoſitions and Qualifications that are neceſſary to a Divine. He blames thoſe who having their Hands tied, that is, who do no Good Works, yet have a wonderful Itch to prate, and thoſe who think to be great Divines, becauſe they underſtand the Subtilties of *Ariſtotle*'s Logick; and the *Gentile* Philoſophy, which they make uſe of nothing to the purpoſe when they Diſcourſe about Myſteries.

In the 2d. Diſcourſe he enquires what may be conceiv'd concerning the Nature of God. He ſays, That his Exiſtence is known by the Creatures; That his Immenſity, Spirituality, and his other Attributes are known; but that it does not follow from hence, that his Eſſence and Nature can be comprehended; which he proves againſt *Eunomius* in the ſecond Diſcourſe of Theology, which contains many great Notions concerning the Nature and Attributes of God.

In the 3d. he proves the Equality of the Three Perſons of the Divinity and the Son, and anſwers the moſt part of *Eunomius*'s Sophiſms. The 4th. continues the ſame ſubject; and in the 5th. he proves, That the Holy Spirit is a Divine Perſon diſtinct from the Father and the Son, That he proceeds from the Father, and that he is not begotten as the Son, tho' he be of the ſame Subſtance and the ſame Nature. He obſerves towards the End of this Diſcourſe, That under the Old Teſtament the Father only was diſtinctly known; That the Son is clearly Reveal'd in the New; That in it alſo there are found Paſſages enough to prove the Divinity of the Holy Spirit, but that it was fully clear'd by the Tradition of the Church. Theſe Diſcourſes ſeem alſo to have been ſpoken at *Conſtantinople*. And thus we are come to the 38th. Sermon upon the Feſtival of the Birth of Jeſus Chriſt. In it St. *Gregory* admires the Wonders of the Myſteries of the Incarnation: He deſcribes the Fall of the firſt Man, which he ſuppoſes to have been the Cauſe of the Incarnation of Jeſus Chriſt, and reckons up the Advantages which Mankind receiv'd by this Myſtery. At laſt, He teaches Chriſtians to Celebrate the Feſtival of Chriſtmas, by purifying themſelves from their Sins, by imitating the Vertues of Jeſus Chriſt, and particularly his Patience and Humility.

The 39th. Diſcourſe is a Sermon upon the Feſtival *Of Lights*, that is, upon the Feaſt of *Epiphany*, on which alſo the Solemnity of the Baptiſm of Jeſus Chriſt is obſerv'd. There he ſpeaks of the Wonderful Effects of this Baptiſm, which had the Vertue of purifying us. He diſtinguiſhes many ſorts of Baptiſm; *viz.* The Baptiſm of *Moſes*, the Baptiſm of St. *John*, the Baptiſm of Jeſus Chriſt, the Baptiſm of the Martyrs, and the Baptiſm of Penance, which he calls a Laborious Baptiſm; and taking occaſion from this laſt he Diſcourſes againſt the Errour of the *Novatians*. Laſt of all, He adds alſo to this Baptiſm which we have already mentioned, the Baptiſm of Fire, wherewith he ſays one may be baptiz'd in another Life.

The following Diſcourſe was ſpoken the next Day. 'Tis an Inſtruction about Baptiſm to thoſe that are to be baptiz'd: There he obſerves the Excellence of Baptiſm and its marvellous Effects. He ſets down and explains the different Names that are given to this Sacrament. He obſerves, That it conſiſts in Two Things, the Water and the Spirit; That the waſhing the Body with Water, repreſents the Operation of the Spirit in purifying the Soul. He ſays, That Baptiſm is a Compact which we make with God, by which we oblige our ſelves to lead a New Life; That 'tis very dangerous to break the Promiſe which we made at Baptiſm, for there is no more Regeneration, nor perfect Renovation to be hop'd for afterwards; That we may indeed cover the Wound by a multitude of Tears and Sighs, but that it would be much better not to need this Second Remedy, becauſe it is very

very difficult and troublesome; and that we can have no assurance but Death may surprize us before our Penance be finish'd. *You*, says he, addressing himself to the Ministers of Jesus Christ, *you can, as the Gardener mention'd in the Gospel, pray the Lord to excuse the barren Fig-tree yet a little longer, you can desire him that he would not cut it down, and that he would permit you to dung it, that's to say, to impose as a penance upon it Weeping, Watching, lying upon the hard Ground, Corporal Mortifications and making humble Satisfaction; but what certainty have you that God will pardon him? Wherefore, my Brethren, being buried by Baptism with Jesus Christ, let us rise with him, let us descend with him into the Waters, that we may ascend with him into Heaven.* He proves afterwards, that we ought not to delay the Receiving of Baptism, and refutes the vain Pretences of those who delay it. He says, that Infants are to be Baptiz'd to consecrate them to Jesus Christ from their Infancy. He distinguishes Three Sorts of Persons that are Baptiz'd; the First, are those who do Evil wilfully and with Delight; the Second, are those who commit Sin with some reluctancy, and without approving it; the Third, are those who live well before they are Baptiz'd, either because they are naturally inclin'd to Vertue, or because they would prepare themselves for Baptism. He distinguishes also Three Sorts of Persons among those that do not receive Baptism. Some are Impious and Malicious, who live in the greatest Excesses, and have no Veneration at all for Baptism: Others have a great deal of Respect for this Sacrament, but they delay to Receive it, either through carelessness, or that they may still have the greater liberty to sin: The last are those who cannot receive it, *either because of their Infancy*, or because of some sudden accident. As to the first, he makes no doubt but they shall be most grievously punish'd, not only for their other Crimes, but also for despising Baptism. As to the Second, he says they shall be less punish'd because they are not kept from Baptism by Malice, but by Negligence or Folly. As to the last, he says, that they shall never partake of Glory, but neither shall they suffer the Punishments of Hell: because tho' they were not Baptiz'd, yet they were free from Sin, and it may be said of them, that they rather suffer'd the Loss than were the Cause of it. He says also in the following Discourse, that Infants must be Baptiz'd, tho' there be no danger of their death. After this he enlarges upon the Effects of Baptism, and upon the divine Fire which purifies us. He concludes according to this Custom, with an Explication of the Trinity. In this Discourse he mentions Unction, and some other Ceremonies of Baptism. These Three Discourses were spoken at *Constantinople* in 381. St. Gregory Nazianz.

The 41st. Sermon is the First Sermon upon the Feast of *Easter*, which is very short and contains nothing remarkable. It was spoken at *Nazianzum*.

In the 42d. Sermon upon the same Festival, having repeated some part of what he had said about the Incarnation of Jesus Christ, in his Oration upon the Feast of *Christmas*, he explains the Ceremonies of the Jewish Passover, which he applies to the Passion of Jesus Christ. This place shews that his Allegories are very far fetch'd. The rest of his Discourse is a Repetition of what he had said in his Sermon upon the Nativity, concerning the Impiety of Hereticks, and an Exposition of the Faith of the Church. 'Tis thought that this Sermon was compos'd by St. *Gregory* at *Nazianzum*, after he return'd from *Constantinople*.

The 43d. Discourse was spoken at the Feast of the Dedication of the Church of St. *Mamas*, which was near *Nazianzum*. There he Discourses of this Dedication which he calls *the New Sunday*. He exhort his Auditors to Vertue, and concludes with saying something of the Life of St. *Mamas*. This Discourse was made when St. *Gregory Nazianzen* was Coadjutor to his Father.

The 44th. Sermon of Pentecost begins with an Instruction about the manner of celebrating these Feasts, after which follow his Commendations of the Number *Seven*: The rest of the Discourse is, about the Holy Spirit and his Gifts.

These are all the Sermons of St. *Gregory Nazianzen*. The following Treatises are not Sermons but Letters.

The 45th. is a Letter written to a Monk call'd *Evagrius*; who could not conceive how the Divine Nature or Substance could be simple, being compos'd of Three Persons. St. *Gregory* resolves this Difficulty, by saying, That the Essence of God is most simple, and that the Persons tho' distinct yet are not separated, nor really distinguisht from the Divine Essence, which is common to the Three. He explains this by many Examples.

The 46th. is a Letter to *Nectarius* who was his Successor in the Throne of the Church of *Constantinople*; where he bewails the unhappiness of the Church which is attack'd by an infinite number of Hereticks. He writes particularly against *Apollinarius*, whose Errors he relates as they were taken out of one of his own Books. He accuses him of teaching, That the Word assum'd Flesh from all Eternity; of affirming, That the Divinity of Jesus Christ supplied the place of a Humane Soul, and that it may be said to have Suffer'd and to Die as well as the Humanity. After this he observes, that it is not lawful to assemble at the Publick Prayers with Persons of these Opinions: Then he exhorts *Nectarius* to Act vigorously against the Hereticks, and to pray the Emperour that he would suppress the Liberty which they now had of Meeting and Preaching.

The 47th. Discourse is an Allegorical Explication of the Four Animals mention'd in the First Chap. of *Ezekiel*. The Greeks doubt whether this Book be St. *Gregory*'s: And indeed the Stile is very confus'd, and every thing is handled without any Order or Design, and it seems to be patched up of various pieces; which makes me believe, with *Jacobus Bilius*, that this Discourse is unworthy of St. *Gregory*.

The 48th. Sermon attributed to St. *Gregory*, is a Discourse in praise of the Martyrs, publish'd by *Leunclavius*, which is in Greek in the last Edition. This Discourse seems not to me to have St. *Gregory*'s Stile. Some have attributed it to St. *Chrysostom*.

St. Gregory Nazianz.

The 49th. Diſcourſe of Faith, which is ſaid to be a Tranſlation made by *Ruffinus* from the Text of *Gregory Nazianzen*, is the Work of ſome Latin Author, who quotes the Holy Scripture according to the old Latin vulgar Verſion. The Prologue of *Ruffinus*, which is at the beginning, is a Preface to the Apologetick, and the Seven Diſcourſes of this Author, and not to the Verſion of the Treatiſe of Faith. The ſame Judgment is to be given of the following Treatiſe, concerning the Faith of the Council of *Nice*, which is not to be found in many Manuſcripts. The Firſt Treatiſe is quoted under the name of St. *Gregory* by St. *Auſtin* in his Third Letter; but it muſt certainly be another *Gregory* than this of *Nazianzum*: For undoubtedly this Work is a Latin Author's, ſince in two Places he ſpeaks of the Greeks, as not being one himſelf. *The Reaſon, or the Word*, ſays, he, *is call'd by the Greeks* λογὸς; and in another place, *This is what the Greeks call Homouſion.* This Treatiſe therefore muſt be ſome Latin Author's who was call'd *Gregory*: And there is none to whom it agrees better than *Gregory* of *Batica*, of whom we have already ſaid, that he wrote a Treatiſe of Faith. Some have attributed it to St. *Ambroſe*, others to *Vigilius Tapſenſis*; but the Citation of St. *Auſtin* ſhows that it could not be written by this laſt, and that it was not written by the firſt. The following Treatiſe is alſo the ſame Author's, being written to explain the former, as Monſieur *Queſnel* has ſhown in his 14th. Diſſertation upon the ancient Code of the *Roman* Church, where this Treatiſe is inſerted.

The 51ſt. and 52d. Treatiſes are Two Letters to *Cledonius*, which St. *Gregory* wrote againſt *Apollinarius*, after he return'd to *Pontus*, as is obſerv'd by the ancient Author of his Life. In the firſt of theſe two Letters, St. *Gregory* complains of *Apollinarius*, that he and his Diſciples publiſh'd new Doctrines, and that they boaſted of their being received by a Synod of Weſtern Biſhops, tho' they were condemn'd in it, and explains the Faith of the Church about the Incarnation, and plainly rejects not only the Errors of *Apollinarius*, but alſo thoſe that have been ſince publiſh'd by *Neſtorius*, by *Eutyches*, and by all the other Hereticks. He gives to the Virgin, the Name and Title of, *The Mother of God.* Afterwards he refutes the Objections of *Apollinarius*, and obſerves another Error of this Author concerning the Trinity. He affirms, towards the end of this Letter, that we ought not to communicate with this Heretick. In the 2d. Letter he diſcovers the Tricks and Subtilties which the *Apollinarians* uſed to make People believe that they were Orthodox. Towards the end of this Letter he has theſe excellent Words: "O ſtrange folly! He pretends to preach that Wiſdom "which has been diſcover'd ſince Jeſus Chriſt. What pity 'tis! For if the Goſpel was not known till "about 30 Years ago, then the Goſpel was of no uſe, for 400 Years that the Church has been eſta- "bliſh'd: In vain have Chriſtians believ'd and ſo many Martyrs ſuffer'd; in vain have ſo many Holy "Biſhops govern'd the Church.

The Paraphraſe upon *Eccleſiaſtes* was written by St. *Gregory Thaumaturgus*, as we have obſerv'd in ſpeaking of this Father's Works. But we muſt add hear to what we have ſaid in that place to prove it, that not only *St. Jerom* teſtifies in his Book of Eccleſiaſtical Writers, that St. *Gregory Thaumaturgus* wrote a Treatiſe upon *Eccleſiaſtes*, but that he cites this Treatiſe as his, in his commentary upon the 4th. Chapter, where he quotes a Paſſage which is Word for Word in the 4th. Chapter of this Paraphraſe.

The Poems of St. *Gregory Nazianzen* were the Fruits of his laſt Retirement; he wrote them in the laſt Years of his Life: In them is to be found all the Fire and Vigour which one would deſire in the Works of a Young Man, and all the thoughts which the practice of Vertue, for the ſpace of many Years, could inſpire into an old Man of conſummate Piety.

The 1ſt. is a Poem which contains the Hiſtory of his own Life from his Birth, till his departure from *Conſtantinople*. There never was any thing of this Kind written more pleaſantly, more Elegantly, and more naturally than this Life is. In the firſt part he deſcribes his publick and known Actions, where he ſays many things which are very uſeful to explain the Hiſtory of the Council of *Conſtantinople*, and the Diviſions of the Eaſtern and Weſtern Churches; and there alſo he diſcourſes againſt the Ignorance, the Pride, and the corrupt Manners of the Biſhops of his time.

In the 2d. Part, he deſcribes the Diſpoſitions of his Mind: The former part relates to Hiſtory, and this to Morality; and as there are in the former part many Circumſtances that belong to Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory; ſo this contains many Chriſtian and Moral Thoughts. The former is written in Iambick Verſe, the latter in Hexameters.

In his Poem of the praiſe of Virginity, he handles with much Wit and Eloquence, the Queſtion about the Preheminence of Celibacy above Marriage; and that he may explain this Queſtion the more pleaſantly, after he has enlarg'd upon the Praiſes of Virginity, he makes an excellent *Proſopopœia*, wherein he brings in married Perſons, and thoſe who obſerve Celibacy, ſpeaking for both their Opinions; each of them ſays all that can be ſaid on their ſide in favour of their State, but the latter have the better.

The 3d. Poem contains many Precepts for Virgins; he recommends to them Silence, Modeſty, Retirement, Labour, and other Vertues neceſſary for a Virgin. Theſe Two Poems are in Hexameter Verſe.

In the 4th. Poem he bewails in general the Miſery of Mankind, caus'd by the Sin of *Adam*, and relates ſome Circumſtances of his own Life. This is in Elegiacks.

In the 5th. having deſcribed the Croſſes and Sickneſſes which he had endur'd in his Life, he ſubmits himſelf to the Will of God, and offers to him the remainder of his painful Life.

The 6th. is upon the Vanity and Uncertainty of this Mortal Life.

In the 7th. he bewails his Miſeries, and prays to God to deliver him from them.

The 8th. is upon the ſame Subject.

In

St. Gregory Nazianz.

In the 9*th.* he deſcribes a Dream, which he had about the Church of *Anaſtaſia.*

In the 10*th.* after having deſcribed the Likeneſs and Hypocriſie of the Biſhops of his time, he congratulates himſelf upon his departure from *Conſtantinople.*

The 11*th.* Poem deſcribes the Vices of wicked Biſhops, and deplores the Diviſion of the Church; there he obſerves, that Perſecutions encreaſed the Church; but Abundance and Riches have done it great Prejudice.

In the 12*th.* which is addreſſed to the Biſhops of the Council of *Conſtantinople*, he deſcribes after what manner he was forc'd away from that City, and teſtifies his Joy, for that God had recall'd him to his Retirement.

In the 13*th.* he deſcribes the Miſery and Weakneſs of Humane Nature.

He continues the ſame Subject in the 14*th.* wherein he deſcribes the Miſeries of Life, and the Horrour of Death, to teach Men to love nothing but Jeſus Chriſt, and to have no Affection for any thing but the Treaſures in Heaven.

The 15*th.* is alſo upon the ſame Subject, wherein he repreſents the Uncertainty and Inſtability of this Mortal Life, and of Worldly Riches, to convince Men that there is nothing Solid here below, but the Love of Jeſus Chriſt.

The 16*th.* contains the Beatitudes of the Goſpel, and the Rules of a Chriſtian Life.

In the 17*th.* he wiſhes many Imprecations upon himſelf, if he ſhould wander from the Faith of Chriſt, and the Precepts of the Goſpel.

The 18*th.* is againſt the Deſires of the Fleſh.

The 19*th.* is againſt the Devil.

The 20*th.* is an Exhortation which he made to himſelf, to ſtir himſelf up to Converſion.

The 21*ſt.* is an Imprecation upon the Devil, and an Invocation of Jeſus Chriſt.

The 22*d.* is a Prayer to God, to be delivered from this Life of Sin and Death.

The 23*d.* is a Reflection upon the Uncertainty of Life, and the Contempt we ought to have of it.

The 24*th.* and 25*th.* is upon the Weakneſs and Miſery of our Nature.

The 26*th.* is of the Deſire of God.

The 27*th.* and 28*th.* is a Lamentation upon the View of his own Miſeries and Sins.

The 29*th.* is a Prayer to Jeſus Chriſt.

The 30*th.* is a kind of Epitaph.

The 31*ſt.* is a Prayer of a Penitent Perſon.

The 32*d.* is a Farewell to the Devil.

In the 33*d.* he makes a Catalogue of the Books of the Holy Scripture. He diſtinguiſhes thoſe of the Old Teſtament, into Hiſtorical, Poetical and Prophetical; He reckons 12 Hiſtorical, *viz.* The Five Books of *Moſes*, *Joſhua*, *Judges*, *Ruth*, the Two Books of *Kings*, the *Chronicles*, and *Ezra*. He reckons 5 Poetical, the Book of *Job*, the *Pſalms* of *David*, *Eccleſiaſtes*, the *Proverbs*, and the *Song* of *Solomon*; and 5 Prophetical, which are the 12 leſſer Prophets that make but one Book only, *Iſaiah*, *Jeremiah*, *Ezekiel* and *Daniel*; which in all make the Number of 22 Books, according to the Number of the Hebrew Letters. Afterwards he reckons up the Books of the New Teſtament, which are the Four Evangeliſts, upon whom he has this Obſervation, That St. *Matthew* wrote for the *Hebrews*, St. *Mark* for the *Greeks*, St. *Luke* for the *Athenians*, and St. *John* for thoſe who penetrate into the moſt ſublime Things. He joins with the Four Evangeliſts the Fourteen Epiſtles of St. *Paul*, thoſe of St. *James*, the two Epiſtles of St. *Peter*, and the Three of St. *John*, and that of St. *Jude*. He concludes with ſaying, *That theſe are all the Books of the Holy Scripture, and all that others are Apocryphal.*

In the 34*th.* he deſcribes the Plagues of *Egypt*.

In the 35*th.* he turns the Decalogue into Verſe.

In the 36*th.* the Names of the 12 Patriarchs are put in Verſe, and thoſe of the 12 Apoſtles.

In the 37*th.* and 38*th.* he reconciles the Two Genealogies of Jeſus Chriſt, by explaining the Opinion of *Africanus*. 'Tis a very ſurprizing thing, that he could put this Critical Queſtion into Verſe, and make all the Names of the Genealogies of Jeſus Chriſt come into Feet, and yet he has done it, and handſomely enough.

In the following Poems, as far as the 46*th.* he turns ſome part of the Hiſtories of the Goſpel into Verſe.

In the 46*th.* he prefers a Monaſtical Life to an Hermetical.

In the 47*th.* He prays *Hellenius* to eaſe the Monks of Taxes.

In the 48*th.* he exhorts one *Julianus*, a Magiſtrate, to Alms-giving.

The 49*th.* is written in the Name of *Nicobulus* the Son, who deſir'd of his Father, that he would ſend him to ſome famous Academy to follow his Studies there.

The 50*th.* is an Anſwer made in the Name of this Father, who exhorts his Son to ſtudy.

The 51*ſt.* is written on the Name of the Son of *Vitalianus*, to appeaſe the Anger of his Father.

The 52*d.* is againſt a lewd rich Man.

The 53*d.* is a Prayer of St. *Gregory* as he went into the Fields.

The 54*th.* is of the Silence which he kept during the time of Faſting: There he deſcribes the Miſchiefs which too great deſire of Speaking produces, and the Advantages of Silence.

The 55*th.* is a Hymn to Jeſus Chriſt upon the Feaſt of *Eaſter*, after he had kept ſilence all the time of Lent.

In the 56*th.* he gives to one *Olympias*, a Woman ready to be married, ſome very uſeful Precepts for her good Behaviour in Marriage.

The

St. Gregory Nazianz.

The 57th. is upon his Departure from *Conſtantinople.*

In the 58th. he proves the falſhood of Humane Vertue, and ſhows, That without the Grace of God, all our Endeavours are unprofitable to our Salvation. *Without the aſſiſtance of Jeſus Chriſt,* ſays he, *a Man cannot walk in the way of Salvation: Therefore we muſt take heed that we do not attribute to our ſelves what does not belong to us; we muſt not truſt our own ſtrength, how enlightned ſoever we be; we muſt not deſpiſe thoſe who appear to be leſs advanc'd than we in the way of Vertue, as if we were nearer the Deſign and End of our Courſe.* He adds many other Reflections, very proper to beat down the Pride of Man, and to humble him under the Almighty Hand of God.

The 59th. is a bitter Satyr againſt the Monks, who live diſagreeably to the Rules of that State, tho' they wear the Habit.

The 60th. is an excellent Prayer in a time of Sickneſs.

In the 61ſt. he exhorts *Nemeſius* Governour of *Cappadocia*, to forſake Paganiſm, and embrace the Chriſtian Religion.

The 62d. is a Collection of very uſeful Chriſtian Thoughts and Maxims for the Conduct of our Lives.

The 63d. is againſt the Pomps, the Ornaments, and ſumptuous Dreſſes of Women; and particularly he applies himſelf to condemn their Painting.

The 64. is an Epitaph upon St. *Baſil.*

After this there are ſeveral Sentences or Moral Thoughts, which contain the principal Offices of Life.

A Deſcription of Humane Life, and ſeveral Rules or Maxims of Morality.

The following Poem is Dogmatical. St. *Gregory* explains the principal Articles of the Chriſtian Religion; and he treats of the Unity of God, of the Trinity, of the Divinity of the Son and the Holy Spirit, of the Creation of the World, of Angels and Devils, of the Nature and Origin of the Soul, of the Two Teſtaments, of the cauſe and Effects of the Incarnation of Jeſus Chriſt, and of the Baptiſms of Water and Blood. After this comes a Treatiſe in Verſe upon Virginity, many exhortations to his own Soul, and Prayers to God.

There are beſides 33 Poems written in Iambick Verſe upon different Subjects, a Treatiſe againſt *Apollinarius*, and ſome other ſeparate things: The Tragedy, entituled *Chriſt's Suffering*, wants very much of the Beauty, the Judgment and the Gravity of St. *Gregory*'s Pieces, and ſo 'tis not without reaſon that the Criticks Judge it unworthy of him.

We have in the Second Volume of St. *Gregory Nazianzen*, at the end of his Poetical Works, a Diſcourſe of this Saint about Biſhops; and tho' we have it now only in Latin, yet 'tis plain that 'tis a Tranſlation of a Genuine Treatiſe of St. *Gregory*'s. There he relates after what manner he came to *Conſtantinople*, and the Troubles he ſuffer'd there for the Eſtabliſhment of the Faith, he complains of the Ingratitude of the Biſhops who forc'd him away from thence; and then he gives a very diſadvantageous Character of them, wherein he repreſents them either Ignorant and Stupid, or Proud and Ambitious, or Covetous, who think of nothing but heaping up of Riches by all kind of Ways, or Hypocrites who under the appearance of Vertue conceal the greateſt Immoralities.

There is in the greateſt part of St. *Gregory Nazianzen*'s Letters, more Wit, Learning and Eloquence, than Doctrine concerning Religion and the Diſcipline of the Church; yet there are ſome of them, wherein he purſues ſome Moral Thoughts with a great deal of Eloquence; as in the 17th. wherein he reproves *Cæſarius* becauſe he ſtaid in *Julian*'s Court.

The 18th. wherein he Diſcourſes of the Inconſtancy and Frailty of humane Life.

The 19th. and 20th. concerning the Reconciſiation of St. *Baſil* with *Euſebius* his Biſhop.

The 22d. and 23d. are written in the Name of his Father to procure the Election of St. *Baſil* to be Biſhop of *Cæſarea.*

The 26th. is about the Calumny that had been raiſed againſt St. *Baſil*, for his diſguiſing his Opinion about the Divinity of the Holy Spirit.

The 31ſt. and 32d. wherein he complains that St. *Baſil* had made him Biſhop of *Saſima.*

The 37th. wherein he Comforts St. *Gregory Nyſſen*, upon the Death of his Brother.

The 38th. to a Lady who would force a Biſhop away from his Biſhoprick, under Pretence that he ow'd her very conſiderable Sums of Money, having formerly managed her Eſtate.

The 43d. wherein he reproves St. *Gregory Nyſſen*, becauſe he applied himſelf more to the Study of humane Learning than of the Holy Scripture.

The 55th. wherein he declares, That he was afraid of all Eccleſiaſtical Aſſemblies, *Becauſe I never ſaw,* ſays he, *the End of a Council which was happy and pleaſant, and which did not rather encreaſe the Evil than diminiſh it.* But this Cenſure which he wrote when he was vex'd with the Council of *Conſtantinople*, which had not treated him very favourably, ought not to paſs for a Rule, but only for a Teſtimony of his reſentment which came from St. *Gregory* in his Paſſion.

The 59th. and 71ſt. wherein he exhorts his Brother and *Poſthumianus* to make Peace between the Biſhops.

The 63d. wherein he exhorts a Particular Perſon to embrace the Chriſtian Philoſophy, and to deſpiſe the things of this World.

The 64th. 66th. 67th. and 70th. wherein he exhorts another Perſon to bear his Pains and Sickneſs patiently.

The

The 81ſt. is an Excellent Exhortation to Patience, and ſome others. But the moſt conſiderable of them all is the 219th. to *Theodorus* the Biſhop of *Tyanea*, which might be plac'd amongſt the Canonical ones: The Biſhop to whom he writes had conſulted him about an Oath, or an Aſſeveration made in Writing in a certain Affair: He who made this Agreement not willing to hold it longer, cited him with whom he had agreed, before a Judge, and made void the Compact in Court. Now it was ask'd whether this Man ſhould be treated as a perjur'd Perſon, ſince he had not made a Solemn Oath, according to the ordinary Forms. St. *Gregory* anſwers in this Letter, That he is not at all of their Opinion, who think that no Oaths but thoſe which are made with the Mouth, and according to the uſual Forms, by laying their Hands upon the Holy Goſpels, do oblige in Conſcience, and that Aſſeverations made in Writing do not bind after the ſame manner: "For ſays he, If Contracts made in Writing do more bind a Debtor than bare verbal "Promiſes, Why ſhall not Oaths ſet down in Writing have at leaſt as much Force, as thoſe "which are ſpoken with the Mouth? In a word, Is an Oath any thing elſe, but the Affirmation of "him who promiſes, or who aſſures any thing?" From whence he concludes, That this Man who had brought his Action in Law, to have this Compact diſſolv'd, which he was obliged by Oath to fulfil, tho' he gain'd his Cauſe, yet was guilty of Perjury, and ought to do Penance for his Sin. This is a very uſeful Admonition in our time, wherein there is ſcarce any heed given to Oaths and Affirmations that are made in Writing, as if they were nothing but mere Formalities of Law, and not truly and properly Oaths. St. *Gregory* teaches the ſame thing in the Poem made againſt thoſe who Swear often, where he ſays upon this Subject, *Is one leſs oblig'd by writing than by his Words? And tho he ſhould not have touch'd the Goſpels, yet does he owe ever the leſs Reverence for God?*

St. *Gregory Nazianz.*

[By *Canonical Epiſtles* here, thoſe are meant which were written to determine ſome particular Queſtion in Diſcipline, as the Canons of Councils uſually did: Of this Nature were St. *Baſil*'s Letters to St. *Amphilochius* mentioned above.]

The Letters of St. *Gregory* are in number 242, if we comprehend in that number the 10 laſt publiſhed by *Sirmondus*; but there are ſome of St. *Baſil*'s which are mix'd among them, as the 30th. the 206th. and 207th. His Teſtament tho' Ancient and Genuine relates only to his Domeſtick Affairs, and contains nothing but the Diſpoſal of his Eſtate. This is all that we have to ſay in particular of the Works of *Gregory Nazianzen*: The Judgment which may be made of them in general is this:

It cannot be doubted, but this Author won the Prize of Eloquence from all the reſt of his Age; for he does certainly excel them for the Purity of his Words, the Nobleneſs of his Expreſſions, the Ornament of his Diſcourſe, the Variety of his Figures, the Juſtneſs of his Compariſons, the Beauty of his Reaſonings, and the Sublimity of his Thoughts. St. *Jerome* and *Suidas* ſay, That he imitated an ancient Author call'd *Polemon*, but we may ſay, That his Stile approach'd very near to that of *Iſocrates*. How lofty ſoever it be, it is Natural, flowing gently and pleaſantly; his Periods are full, and hold up to the End; he has a wonderful abundance of Words, an unparallel'd eaſineſs of Expreſſion, and a moſt agreeable turn of Wit. His Orations are compos'd with much Art and Method, for in them he uſes ſuch Characters as are moſt agreeable to his Subject and his Auditors; ſo that one may ſay of him, That he was one of the moſt perfect Orators of *Greece*; yet he affected too many Antitheſes, Alluſions, Similitudes, Compariſons, and certain other Fineneſſes of Oratory, which ſeem to render it Effeminate. Sometimes alſo his Thoughts and Reaſonings are falſe; but then 'tis cover'd with the ſparkling of his Expreſſions, and involv'd in the multitude of his Words. He is extremely Copious, and ſays but few things in many Periods. There are great numbers of Philoſophical Thoughts interwoven in his Sermons, and they are full of Illuſtrations taken from Hiſtory and Fables. He teaches Morality in ſuch a manner as is more proper for Philoſophers than the common People; but he is very Sublime and very Exact in the Explication of Myſteries, a Quality which made him deſerve the Name of *The Divine* by way of Excellency. He had much Piety, but little skill in Managing of Buſineſs. He was ſo paſſionate a Lover of Retirement, that he could not for a conſiderable time apply himſelf to any Employment that hindred him from it. He eaſily undertook great things, but he quickly repented of his Undertakings. He had in his Life-time three Biſhopricks, and yet it cannot be ſaid that he was lawful Biſhop of any one of them. For he would not have that of *Saſima* to which he was Ordain'd; and he did not accept of that of *Nazianzum*, but only for a time, to be Coadjutor to his Father, but upon Condition that he ſhould not ſucceed him. When he came to *Conſtantinople*, he had no deſign to be Biſhop of that Church, neither did he take the Title upon him. 'Tis true that he was afterwards plac'd upon the Epiſcopal Throne by the Emperor and ſome Biſhops; but he was at laſt forced to leave it. He was of a Moroſe and Satyrical Humour; he lov'd Raillery and ſpar'd no body; but chiefly the Biſhops that were not worthy of their Miniſtry, or that did not lead a Life agreeable to their Holy Orders.

Theſe are the Editions of the Works of this Father. In the Year 1504, *Aldus Manutius*, a Printer at *Venice*, publiſh'd one part of his Greek Poems; In the Year 1516 he publiſh'd Sixteen Orations, and Nine more in 1536. Afterwards all the Works of St. *Gregory Nazianzen* were collected together and printed in Greek at *Baſle* by *Hervagius* in the Year 1550. The ancient Verſion of *Ruffinus* was printed at *Leipſick* about the Year 1522, without any Name. The Tranſlation of *Billibaldus Pircheymerus* was printed at the ſame time with the Greek at *Baſle* by *Hervagius* in 1550. In 1571 *Leunclavius* tranſlated 19 Orations which were printed by the ſame Printer. But all theſe Verſions being very imperfect, *Jacobus Billius* Abbot of St. *Michael* of the Hermitage, who was one of the ableſt Men of the laſt Age in the Greek Tongue, made a New Verſion of St. *Gregory*'s Works, which was firſt printed at *Paris* in 1569, and at *Cologne* in 1570; but the Edition of the ſame Verſion which *Genebrard* publiſhed at *Paris* in 1583, and Dedicated to Pope *Gregory* the

St. *Gregory Nazianz.*

the XIII. is much more large and more exact. 'Tis this Verſion which has the Greek Text on one ſide, in the *Paris* Edition in Two Volumes, made by *Morellus* in 1609. Then there follow'd in the Edition of the Greek Text, the Corrections and Notes which *Billius* made on the Margin of St. *Gregory* at *Baſle*, and it was review'd by many Manuſcripts. The Firſt Volume contains the Life of St. *Gregory Nazianzen*, written by *Gregory* the Prieſt, the Orations and Letters of St. *Gregory*, together with an Addition, which contains the Greek Text of the Oration to the praiſe of the Martyrs, ſome Letters, and the Greek and Latin Teſtament of St. *Gregory*, with the Notes of *Morellus*, and ſome Critical Obſervations upon the Text, the different Readings and many Corrections. The Second Volume contains the Poems which had been already publiſh'd by *Billius*, with his Verſion in Verſe, and ſome others tranſlated by *Morellus*, the Treatiſe of Biſhops, and the Latin Commentaries of *Elias Cretenſis*, *Nicetas Serronius*, *Pſellus*, *Cyrus*, and *Billius* upon all the Works of St. *Gregory Nazianzen*. This Edition is one of the faireſt in Greek and Latin, that was ever printed at *Paris*: In it the Greek Text is printed very Neatly and Exactly, the Latin Verſion is Noble and Elegant. The Beauty of the Latin Verſe is little inferior to that of the Greek, and the Diſcourſes are rang'd in a very good Order; yet there are ſome Faults in the Text. The Verſion is not always Literal and Faithful enough, and the Order of time is not exactly obſerv'd, neither in the Letters, nor in the Orations. There remains now nothing for me to do, but to take notice of the particular Editions of ſome diſtinct Pieces of his Works. We have his Theological Orations tranſlated by *Moſſellanus*, printed at *Paris*, by *Chevallon*, in 1532; 38 Orations of *Pircheymerus*'s Verſion, printed at *Baſle* in 1551. ſome others tranſlated by *Gabriellius* at *Antwerp* in 1575; ſome Greek Sermons at *Ausburg* in 1587; three Sermons with Corrections upon the Text of St. *Gregory Nazianzen*, printed at *Antwerp* in 1573; the Homily of *Whitſunday*, Greek and Latin, at *Leipſick* in 1582; the Oration of *The Love of the Poor*, tranſlated by *Zinus* in 1550, printed by *Vaſcoſanus*; the ſame Oration with the Apologetical Diſcourſe, and the Sermon upon the Birth of Jeſus Chriſt by *Eugubinus*, printed by *Plantin* in 1513. The Two Invectives againſt *Julian*, and ſome other Works at *Eaton*, in 1610; the Sermon upon *Eaſter*, tranſlated by *Oecolampadius*; the Oration upon St. *Athanaſius* at *Paris* in 1627; ſome Select Poems printed at *Rome* in 1592 and 1599; the Tetraſtick Verſes at *Venice* in 1562; the Poems tranſlated by *Billius*, with the Notes of *Cyrus* at *Paris* in 1562; the Poems about Definitions tranſlated and publiſhed by *Hoëſchelius*, with the Tranſlation of *Leunclavius*, in the Printing-Houſe of St. *Andrew* in 1591; ſome Poems by *Plantin* in 1556; the Poems of the Rules of Life collected by *Sambuçus*, by *Plantin* in 1568; the Poems about Principles at *Amſterdam* in 1568; the Poem of his Life with the Tranſlation of *Billius* in 1598; the Poem of the Canonical Books at *Paris* in Latin in 1561; ſome Odes in 1603; the Tragedy *Of Jeſus Suffering*, in Greek, at *Rome* in 1542, and at *Louvain* in 1544: His Letters printed with thoſe of St. *Baſil*, and tranſlated by *Comanus*; Two Letters to *Themiſtius* printed apart; the Letter to *Nicobulus* printed alſo apart in 1597; the Teſtament publiſh'd by *Leunclavius* at *Frankford* in 1596, at *Eaton* in 1610; by *Briſſonius* in his Forms, by *Baronius* in his Annals; and Laſtly, by *Sirmondus*, at the End of the Edition, Greek and Latin, of 1609.

St. GREGORY NYSSEN.

St. *Gregory Nyſſen.*

ST. *GREGORY* Biſhop of *Nyſſa* a City of *Cappadocia*, Brother of St. *Baſil*, was born about the Year 339. He did not embrace a Solitary Life, as his Brothers *Baſil*, *Peter* and *Naucratius* did, but continued in the World, and Married a Wife call'd *Theoſebia*. (*a*) He profeſs'd at firſt Rhetorick, and with much Difficulty quitted that Employment to enter into Orders. (*b*) He was made Biſhop ſome time after St. *Baſil* in the Year 371. But he did not continue long in peaceable Poſſeſſion of his See; for he was quickly perſecuted by the Emperour *Valens*, and forc'd away from his Church in 374, by *Demoſthenes* who ſubſtituted in his room a ſad Wretch, as we have already obſerv'd in the Life of St. *Baſil*. He return'd with the other exil'd Biſhops in the Year 378, and was reſtor'd to the Poſſeſſion of his Epiſcopal See. He appear'd after this with Splendor at the General Council of *Conſtantinople* in the Year 382, where he was choſen to make a Funeral Oration upon *Meletius* the Patriarch of *Antioch*, and delegated to be one of thoſe Biſhops who ſhould viſit the Dioceſs of *Pontus*, as appears by the Law of the Emperour *Theodoſius*, and as St. *Gregory* himſelf teſtifies in his Epiſtle to *Flavianus*. 'Tis believ'd that he was preſent alſo at a Council held in this City in the Year 383, and that he ſpoke there the Diſcourſe againſt the *Anomæans*, which is entitled, *A Diſcourſe about* Abraham, *or, Of the Divinity of the Son and Holy Spirit*. In 385, he preach'd alſo at *Conſtantinople* the Funeral Oration of the Empreſs *Placilla*. In ſhort, his Name appears in the Liſt of Metropolitans in the Council held at *Conſtantinople* for the Dedication of the Church of *Ruffini* in the Year 394. But it is certain he died ſoon after.

This Father wrote many Books which are Commentaries upon Scripture, Dogmatical Treatiſes,

(*a*) *He married a Wife call'd* Theoſebia.] In the Oration of St. *Gregory Nazienzen* in Commendation of St. *Baſil*, he very clearly obſerves, That St. *Gregory Nyſſen* was he of the Four Brethren that was engag'd in Marriage; and the ſame St. *Gregory* in *Ep.* 95. comforts St. *Gregory Nyſſen* upon the Death of *Theoſebia*, wherein he ſpeaks of his Wife.

(*b*) *With much Difficulty quitted that Employment to enter into Orders.*] St. *Gregory Nazianzen* reproves him in *Ep.* 34. for that he having diſcharg'd the Office of a Reader in the Church, ſeem'd willing to embrace his ancient Profeſſion, addicting himſelf wholly to the Study of Rhetorick and Humane Learning.

Sermons

Sermons upon the Myſteries of Religion, Diſcourſes of Morality, Panegyricks upon the Saints, Funeral Orations, and ſome Letters concerning Diſcipline.

St. Gregory Nyſſen.

The Firſt Book upon the Scripture is a ſmale Piece upon the Creation, wherein without inſiſting upon the Queſtions which St. *Baſil* had explain'd before, he endeavours principally to explain the Senſe of the Words of *Geneſis*, and the Order of the Creation.

The Second Book of St. *Gregory Nyſſen* is his Treatiſe about the Formation of Man, divided into Thirty Chapters, wherein he handles many Queſtions more curious than uſeful concerning the Creation of the World, the Formation of Man, the Nature and Origin of his Soul, concerning the Reſurrection, and the Structure of a Humane Body. There he teaches, That the Soul is a Spirit which is equally in all parts of the Body; he refutes the Opinion of *Origen* concerning the Pre-exiſtence of Souls before the Body, and maintains that they are form'd in the ſame moment with the Body. He thinks, That in the State of Innocence there would have been no Generation, but that Men would have multipled by ſome other means.

The Two following Homilies about the Formation of Man are St. *Baſil's*, as we have already obſerv'd. There is alſo a Homily in the Second Volume upon the ſame Subject, wherein he explains all the Senſes in which it can be ſaid, That Man was created after the Image and Likeneſs of God. We may place among the number of Commentaries upon the Old Teſtament, the little Tract of the Witch of *Endor*, wherein he explains a part of the 28th. Chapter of the Firſt Book of *Samuel*, and proves that it was not truly the Soul of *Samuel* that appear'd to *Saul*, but that it was the Devil, who aſſum'd the Likeneſs of this Prophet.

The Book of the Life of *Moſes* is an Alegorical Explication of all the actions of this Lawgiver to the Jews, from whence he draws either Moral Inſtructions, or ſome Reflections upon Religion; upon which account 'tis alſo entitled, *Of a perfect Life.*

The Two Treatiſes upon the Inſcriptions of the Pſalms, are more uſeful than the preceding. In the Firſt, he treats of the End, the Order, and the Diſtribution of the Pſalms. He affirms, That their End is to teach the way of Vertue which leads to Happineſs; That they are uſeful and delightful to all ſorts of Perſons, in what State and Condition ſoever they be, and whatſoever their Diſpoſition be. He divides the Pſalms into Five Parts, the Firſt ends at the 40th. Pſalm, the Second at the 71ſt. the Third at the 88th. the Fourth at the 105th. and the Fifth continues to the End of the Pſalms. He is of Opinion that the Pſalms contain'd in the Firſt Part were compos'd to diſſuade Men from Vice, and induce them to Vertue; That thoſe which are in the Second, repreſent the Thirſt and Ardour of thoſe who have any Knowledge of Vertue, and any reliſh of its Sweetneſs; That thoſe of the Third Part deſcribe the State of thoſe Perſons who are advanc'd to the Knowledge of Divine Things; That thoſe of the Fourth raiſe Men's Minds above all things in this World; That thoſe of the Fifth elevate a Man to the Higheſt top of Perfection. There is more Wit than Solidity in theſe Reflections, as well as in the Interpretations of the Titles or Inſcriptions of the Pſalms, which he has given in his Second Part, and are almoſt all of them Allegorical. The ſame Judgment ought to be made of his Homily upon the 6th. Pſalm which follows this Treatiſe.

The Eight Homilies upon *Eccleſiaſtes* are leſs forc'd, more uſeful and more natural: Thoſe upon the Canticles are wholly Allegorical; but this Book cannot otherwiſe be explain'd. He wrote alſo upon the Proverbs, as he teſtifies at the beginning of the Homilies upon *Eccleſiaſtes*; but that Commentary of his is loſt. *Poſſinius* has promiſed his entire Commentary upon *Eccleſiaſtes*.

The Firſt Diſcourſe of Prayer is concerning the neceſſity of it, and the manner wherein we ought to pray. The Four other Diſcourſes are an Explication of the Lord's Prayer, as the following Treatiſe is an Explication of the Beatitudes: He always interweaves his Moral Reflections with a multitude of Allegories, Compariſons, and Hiſtories, which render them leſs profitable and more tedious.

In the Homily upon the Words of Chap. 15. of the 1ſt. Epiſtle to the Corinthians, *When all things ſhall be ſubdued unto God even the Father, then ſhall the Son himſelf alſo be ſubject unto him*, which is the Firſt in the Second Volume; he refutes the Conſequences which the *Arians* draw from this Paſſage, and ſhows, That by the ſubjection of the Son, we muſt not underſtand a State of Servitude, but the Immortality and Happineſs of the Humane Nature of Jeſus Chriſt.

The Longeſt and moſt Excellent of all the Dogmatical Works of St. *Gregory Nyſſen*, is his Treatiſe againſt *Eunomius*, divided into Twelve Books (*c*) wherein he refutes a part of what this Heretick had aſſerted in his Apology in anſwer to St. *Baſil*. St. *Gregory* compos'd this Book after the Death of this Father, as we learn from the Letter at the begining of it, which is addreſs'd to his Brother *Peter* of *Sebaſtea*. At the beginning of the Firſt Book he defends the Perſon and Conduct of St. *Baſil* againſt the Calumnies of *Eunomius*: He deſcribes the Life of this Heretick and that of his Maſter *Aetius*, and afterwards refutes the Impious Reaſonings of this Heretick, and explains the Paſſages of Scripture which he alledges to prove his Errors. *Photius* aſſures us, That in this Book St. *Gregory* did far excell the other Two Authors which have written againſt the ſame Book of *Eunomius*, as well for the Beauty and Sweetneſs of his Eloquence, as for the Strength and Multitude of his Arguments. He particularly praiſes the laſt Book which in his time was conſider'd as a diſtinct Treatiſe.

His great Catechetical Diſcourſe is an Excellent Treatiſe of the Manner, in which the Jews, Pagans,

(*c*) *His Treatiſe againſt Eunomius, divided into Twelve Books.*] There are ſome who have reckoned Thirteen; but they have inconveniently divided the Fifth Book into Two. Theſe Books are quoted according to the preſent Diviſion by *Theodoret*, and the Sixth Council. St. *Jerom* in his Catologue Teſtifies, That St. *Gregory Nyſſen* read this Diviſion of his Treatiſe to him.

St. *Gregory Nyſſen.*

and Hereticks are to be Inſtructed, to Convince them of the Truth of our Religion. St. *Gregory Nyſſen* obſerves in the Preface, That the Reaſons which are to be uſed againſt Pagans, who deny the Unity of God, are different from thoſe that muſt be alledg'd againſt the Jews who oppoſe the Trinity, and that the Method which is to be follow'd in refuting the Hereticks who oppoſe the Divinity of One of the Three Perſons, ſhould be different from that which is obſerved in proving the Trinity againſt the Jews: That in diſputing both againſt the one and the other, we muſt uſe Principles agreeable to Reaſon, in which they and we are agreed; That when one Diſputes againſt an Atheiſt, he muſt prove the Exiſtence of a God by the Creation of the World; and when he has to do with a Pagan who admits many Deities, he muſt prove to him that there is but One, becauſe God muſt be abſolutely perfect, and there can be no more of this Nature but One. With reſpect to the Jew, he would have us endeavour to make him underſtand the Divine Word, by comparing it with the Word of Underſtanding, or the Reaſon that is in Men, and give him alſo ſome Idea of the Holy Spirit, by comparing him to the Breath that is in us, and then after that he would have us to prove the Exiſtence of the Divine Word by the Teſtimonies of Holy Scripture. To make the Incarnation appear probable to the Jews and to the Gentiles, he ſhews them, That Man has fallen from the State wherein he was created; That his Nature is corrupted by Sin; That it cannot be ſaid, that God is the Author of Evil; That therefore Man muſt have fallen by his own Fault, and by abuſing his Liberty; but that Man being once fallen, muſt be raiſed up again by him who created him; and thus it was reaſonable that the Word who created him, ſhould come himſelf to raiſe him from his Fall, and ſave him from his Shipwrack. Afterwards he anſwers all the Difficulties which are propos'd againſt the Incarnation; he ſays, That it was not unworthy of God to be born of a Virgin, to Eat, to Drink, to Die, and to be Buried, becauſe theſe things are neither criminal nor diſhonourable; That the Divinity being united to the Humane Nature did not loſe its Divine Perfections, as the Soul does not loſe its Spiritual Perfections by being united to the Body; That the Union of Soul and Body to compoſe a Man is no leſs incomprehenſible than the Union of the Divine and Humane Nature in Jeſus Chriſt; That the Miracles of Jeſus Chriſt, his extraordinary Birth, and his Reſurrection, are evident Proofs of his Divinity; That the Reaſon which mov'd him to become Man, was his Good-Will towards Men, and his Compaſſion towards Mankind; That his Divinity always continued impaſſible and incorruptible; That the Incarnation of Jeſus Chriſt was the moſt natural Remedy for us miſerable Sinners, and moſt agreeable to the Goodneſs, the Juſtice, the Wiſdom and Power of God; That he came at ſuch a time when Wickedneſs was arriv'd to its higheſt pitch; That he called all Men, but by calling them to the Faith he did not take away their Liberty; and this was the reaſon why many of them ſtill periſh'd; That Men ought not to be compell'd and forc'd to do good, for this would take away the praiſe of good Actions, and the blame of bad ones; That Chriſt ought to die, that he might be wholly like unto us, and that he might confirm our Reſurrection by his own; That all that he did after his Reſurrection firmly proves his Divinity. Afterwards he ſpeaks of Baptiſm and the Euchariſt: He ſays of Baptiſm, that there are Three Things in this Sacrament which conduct us to Immortal Life, Prayer, Water and Faith; That the Regeneration which is wrought in Baptiſm ought not to be attributed to the Water, but to a Divine Virtue; That by dipping the Perſon under Water Three Times, the Death and Reſurrection of Jeſus Chriſt is repreſented; That without Baptiſm no Man can be waſh'd from his Sins, becauſe by it the Divine Vertue is rendred effectual, in conſequence of that which he believes to depend upon Free-will; That as the Soul is united to God by Baptiſm and by Faith, ſo the Body is united to God by the Euchariſt. This is the Doctrine of St. *Gregory Nyſſen*, who ſays, That the Body of Jeſus Chriſt entring into us, is an Antidote or Preſervative againſt Sin; That it changes and transforms us into him, and communicates unto us Incorruptibility. Afterwards he enquires, "How it is poſſible, that this Body which is diſtributed alone to ſo many Millions "of the Faithful over all the Earth, ſhould be entire in each of theſe, and in each part which they re- "ceive, and yet not ceaſe to remain ſtill entire in it ſelf: And he anſwers, That the Body of Jeſus "Chriſt having been the Habitation of the Word of God, was chang'd into a Divine Dignity: And "therefore I have reaſon to believe, ſays he, that to this Day the Bread being Sanctified by the Word "of God, is chang'd into the Body of the Word of God: For here the Bread is Sanctified by the Word "of God and Prayer; not that 'tis preſently turn'd into the Body of God by eating it, but becauſe "it is transform'd and chang'd at the ſame time into his Body, as the Word has ſaid in theſe Words, *This is my Body*," He adds, That this Fleſh of Jeſus Chriſt is communicated to us, and is changed into us, by means of the Bread and Wine which God hath chang'd and transformed into his Body, by Virtue of the ſacred Benediction. He ſpeaks in the following Diſcourſe of Regeneration. He thinks that it depends in ſome manner upon our Will and Free Pleaſure; and ſhews that it is unprofitable, unleſs after we have received the Sacrament, we lead a Life free from Sin. At laſt, he Diſcourſes of the Reward of thoſe who have liv'd well, and the puniſhment of the wicked. He affirms, That the Fire of Hell is of another Nature than the Fire upon Earth. There are at the End ſome Periods added againſt the Heretick *Severus*. Some Proteſtant Criticks have call'd this Book in Queſtion, whether it was St. *Gregory*'s or no; but the ableſt, as *Caſaubon* and *Albertin* have been forc'd to acknowledge it, becauſe they found it quoted oftentimes by *Theodoret* in his Dialogues, and taken notice of by *Euthymius Zigabenus*.

In the Book of Faith addreſs'd to *Simplicius*, St. *Gregory* treats of the Trinity. There he proves the Divinity of the Son and the Holy Spirit, and anſwers the principal Objections of the Hereticks.

The Diſcourſe which was formerly Entituled, *Of Great Abraham*, is now, *Of the Divinity of the Son and the Holy Spirit*; there he anſwers the *Anomœans*, whom he compares to the *Epicureans* and the

the *Stoicks*; he makes alſo a great Digreſſion in praiſe of *Abraham*, wherein he deſcribes the Sacrifice of his Son very naturally. St. Gregory Nyſſen.

In the Treatiſe addreſs'd to *Ablavius*, and Entituled, *That we muſt not ſay there are Three Gods*, he ſhews that the Three Divine Perſons cannot be call'd Three Gods, but that they are One God only.

The Treatiſe to *Euſtathius*, and that of the Difference of *Hypoſtaſis* and Nature, are upon the ſame Subject; but they are found, as we have already ſaid, among the Letters of St. *Baſil*, and 'tis probable that the Firſt was written by him.

The Latin Treatiſe which contains the Paſſages of the Old Teſtament, to prove the Divinity of the Son againſt the Jews, is not St. *Gregory Nyſſen's*, ſince St. *Chryſoſtom*, who liv'd after St. *Gregory*, is cited in it.

The Treatiſe *of Common Notions* addreſs'd to the Greeks, is a Scholaſtical Treatiſe about the Tearms, by which the Ancients us'd to explain the Myſtery of the Trinity.

There are two little Tracts of St. *Gregory Nyſſen's* againſt *Apollinarius*; the one very ſhort in the Firſt Volume, which is probably nothing but a Fragment; the other a little longer in the Second Volume. There he refutes ſome Objections of this Heretick; and proves, that 'tis the ſame Word which appear'd to the Patriarchs, and which aſſum'd real Fleſh in time, and which is ſo intimately united to the Humane Nature, that what agrees to God is attributed to Man.

In the little Tract *againſt the Manichees*, St. *Gregory* proves againſt theſe Hereticks, that Evil is not an uncoruptible and uncreated Nature, no more than the Devil who is the Author of it. He demonſtrates this by Ten Syllogiſms.

In the Treatiſe *of Diſtiny* he particularly diſputes againſt Judicial Aſtrology, which makes our Actions depend upon the Courſe and Influence of the Stars.

In the Treatiſe *of the Soul*, which is in the Second Volume, he firſt relates the different Sentiments of Philoſophers and Hereticks concerning the Original and Nature of the Soul, and then proves that it is a Spiritual and Immortal Subſtance which is united to the Body, which penetrates, and actuates it. He compares this Union to that of the Divine and Humane Nature in Jeſus Chriſt, and rejects the Opinion of *Origen* concerning the Aſcenſion and Deſcent of Souls.

The Second Treatiſe *of the Soul and the Reſurrection*, which is in the Third Volume, is a Dialogue which St. *Gregory* is ſuppos'd to have had with his Siſter *Marcina* after the Death of St. *Baſil* their Brother. There he proves the Immortality of the Soul. He is of Opinion, that it will diſtinctly know its Body at the Day of Judgment. He explains the Story of the wicked Rich Man and *Lazarus* Allegorically. There he refutes the Tranſmigration of Souls, and proves the Reſurrection.

In the Treatiſe addres'd to *Jerius* concerning the untimely death of Infants, he endeavours to anſwer this Queſtion, Why God ſuffered Infants to Die before they come to the Uſe of Reaſon? The moſt general Reaſon that he offers is, That he does it to prevent thoſe Sins that theſe Infants would have commited, if they had come to the Age of Diſcretion. And becauſe it may be objected to him, Why then does God permit ſo many wicked Perſons to live, who had been more happy if they had never been, or if they ſhould have died ſooner? He Anſwers, That God permits it, Firſt, becauſe he draws Good out of the Evil which they do; Secondly, becauſe their Puniſhment ſerves for an Example of God's Juſtice.

Some Criticks have queſtioned whether the Book *of Virginity* was St. *Gregory Nyſſen's*. The only Reaſon which they alledg'd for caling it in queſtion, is, becauſe the Author was Married: But this Reaſon is ſo far from proving what they intend, that it rather proves the contrary, ſince 'tis certain that St. *Gregory Nyſſen* had a Wife, as we have already ſhown. He deſcribes in this Treatiſe the advantages of Virginity, and the Inconveniencies of Marriage; nevertheleſs he does not deſign to condemn Marriage. He adds, that the Chriſtian Virginity does not only conſiſt in the Purity of the Body, but alſo in the Purity of the Soul. He recommends Temperance, and the ſhuning of Pleaſures and Voluptuouſneſs, and gives many Rules and Examples of Chriſtian Vertues.

The Sermons or Homilies *of the Myſteries* have much of the nature of Dogmatical Treatiſes. Thus in the Sermon upon the Nativity, having exhorted the Faithful to celebrate this Feſtival with joy, he explains ſome Queſtions about the Incarnation, and clears up ſome Circumſtances about the Nativity. He follows the ſame Method in the Five Sermons upon *Eaſter*, which are fill'd with many Allegories. In the Sermon of the Aſcenſion of Jeſus Chriſt, he explains the 23d. and 24th. Pſalms.

In that of *Whitſunday*, he exhorts Men to make themſelves worthy to Receive the Holy Spirit.

In that upon the Feſtival of the Baptiſm of Jeſus Chriſt, he treats of the Spiritual Regeneration which is wrought by Baptiſm, and exhorts thoſe that are newly Baptiz'd, to lead a pure Life and free from Sin.

In the Diſourſe of the preſenting of Jeſus Chriſt in the Temple, of the Purification of the Virgin, and of *Simeon*, he makes many Allegories upon theſe Myſteries.

The Diſcourſes of Morality are leſs Allegorical, and more uſeful than thoſe that we have ſpoken of already. The Subject of thoſe which we now have is as follows.

In the Oration upon his Ordination, St. *Gregory* diſcourſes of the Miſeries of the Church, and the little Faith which was to be found among the Chriſtians of his time. He condemns the Diviſions which were in the Church, and the Sophiſms that were us'd about Myſteries. He exhorts Men to pray for the Gifts of the Holy Spirit, and to diſpoſe themſelves to receive them.

St. *Gregory Nyſſen.*

In the Diſcourſe againſt thoſe that delay Baptiſm, he exhorts the Catechumens to receive Baptiſm preſently without delaying it from day to day, as many Catechumens do. He invites them to draw near to Baptiſm, that they may be deliver'd from their Sins. He terrifies them with the fear of Death, the time whereof is uncertain. He makes them aſham'd of continuing ſo long in the Rank of Catechumens. He inſpires them with a Deſire of receiving Baptiſm, by repreſenting to them the Graces which it conveys, and the wonderful Effects which it produces. He thinks that it would be better to ſin after Baptiſm, than to die without it. He refutes the Pretence of thoſe who delay to receive Baptiſm, becauſe they find themſelves ſtill inclin'd to ſin: He ſays, that they deceive themſelves, if they think that after they have ſpent their Life in Pleaſures and Debauchery, they ſhall be purified by receiving Baptiſm at the point of Death. He diſtinguiſhes, as St. *Gregory Nazianzen* did, three Sorts of Perſons with relation to another Life. The Firſt Sort are the Saints and Righteous who are happy; The Second, are thoſe who ſhall neither be Happy nor Miſerable; The Third, are thoſe who ſhall be puniſh'd for their Sins. He places in the ſecond Rank thoſe who delay their Baptiſm till the Point of Death. This is a ſingular Opinion of his, and does not agree with the Holy Scripture; which has made ſome believe that this Treatiſe was not St. *Gregory Nyſſen's*: But it has his Stile and Air, and is not much different from his Doctrine, nor from that of St. *Gregory Nazianzen* in the Diſcourſe which he made upon the ſame Subject.

The Diſcourſe of Penance (*d*) contains two Parts: The Firſt againſt thoſe who reprove their Brethren with much ſharpneſs, and condemn them upon ſlight Grounds; and the Second againſt thoſe Sinners who do no Penance, or do it very negligently. He proves by the Example of Jeſus Chriſt, who convers'd among Phariſees and Sinners, that Sinners are not to be treated with much Rigour, nor to be condemn'd raſhly. He adds, that by uſing them hardly we throw them into Deſpair; That we ought to conſider that we are all Sinners; That God invites all the World to accept of his Grace; That we ought to ſupport the Weak, according to the Example of Jeſus Chriſt; That the greateſt Sinners have obtain'd Mercy, and that God is always ready to pardon thoſe who are penitent. He ſhows afterwards, that Harſhneſs and Rigour, do not agree with the Laity, who by condemning others with too much Severity, condemn themſelves; nor with Biſhops and Prieſts, whoſe Character ſhould be Mild and Charitable, as he proves by the Examples of *Moſes* and Jeſus Chriſt. He obſerves, that a good Paſtor ſhould do as the Gardener mention'd in the Goſpel, who pray'd his Maſter to ſpare the barren Fig-Tree a little longer, and that he ſhould follow the Example of *Moſes*, who continually begg'd Pardon of God for the People of *Iſrael*; and whoſe Affection went ſo far, that he wiſh'd he might be blotted out of the Book of Life, if God would pardon the Sins of his People. He ſubjoins the Example of the Prodigal Son, and ſays, That from thence we ought to learn to open the Church to Penitent Sinners, and to treat them with Mildneſs and Charity. But after he has ſaid theſe things againſt the too great Severity of ſome Miniſters of the Church, who deſpis'd thoſe that came near them as Supplicants, who would not regard them in their Afflictions, who ſhunn'd and repuls'd them; he exhorts Sinners to Repentance by the Example of the Woman that was a Sinner, who is mention'd in St. *Luke*. He ſays, that they muſt imitate her Weeping, her Tears, her Humility and Penance. He declaims againſt thoſe Penitents, who liv'd after the ſame manner that they us'd to do before they were in a State of Penance. "They "have, ſays he, the ſame Gravity in their Countenances, the ſame Magnificence in their Apparel, they "fare as ſumptuouſly as they did before, they ſleep as well as they did, they mind the ſame Buſineſs "as before; in ſhort, they take upon them the Name of Penitents, and do no Actions of Penance. "They are by their own Fault debarr'd from the Sacred Myſteries, and from the Communion of Ho"ly Things, and they take no care, nor are any ways ſollicitous to be re-admitted to them; on the "contrary they ſeem to deſpiſe them, and look upon them as very vile things." After this he ſhews by the Compariſon of one who was debarr'd from a King's Table, and of one that being ſick, deſir'd to be heal'd, how great the Folly is of thoſe who never think of doing Penance. "You, ſays he, "whoſe Soul is ſick, Why do you not run to a Phyſician? Why do you not diſcover your Sins to "him by Confeſſion? Why do you ſuffer your Diſeaſe to encreaſe till it be inflam'd and deeply root"ed in you? Re-enter into your own Breaſts, reflect upon your own Ways. You have offended "God, you have provok'd your Creatour, who is the Lord and Judge, not only of this Life, but alſo "of the Life to come. If you be ſick with Pleaſures, you muſt cure your Diſeaſe with Faſting and "Abſtinence; if your Soul is ſick with Luſt, you muſt uſe Continence for a Remedy. Covetouſneſs is "like a Fever that conſumes us, drive it away by giving of Alms and by Liberality; this is the Re"medy of a Soul that loves Riches immoderately. Have you taken the Goods of another? Make "Reſtitution. Are you ready to periſh by Lying? Avoid the danger you are in by the Love of Truth. "You are in Error and Hereſie; blot out this Sin by embracing the Faith of the Church; for what is "doing Penance, but effacing and deſtroying the Evil we have done? Enquire into the Diſeaſe where"with you are ſeiz'd, be ſorry for it, afflict your ſelves, and communicate your Affliction to your "Brethren, that they may be afflicted with you, that ſo you may obtain the Pardon of your Sins. "Show me bitter Tears, that I may mingle mine with yours. Impart your Trouble to your Biſhop, "as to your Father, he will be touch'd with a ſenſe of your Miſery, as *Jacob* was when he ſaw the "Coat of his Son *Joſeph* ſtain'd with Blood; or as *David* was upon the Death of his Son *Abſalom*:

(*d*) *The Diſcourſe of Penance.*] This Diſcourſe as well as that of Faſting, and the Panegyrick upon St. *Stephen*, belong to *Aſterius Amaſenus*, to whom *Photius* attributes them in *Vol.* 27. of his Bibliotheque. See what we have ſaid of them, when we give an account of the Works of this Father, where we have retracted what we ſaid upon this Subject in the Firſt Edition.

"Diſcover

" Discover to him the most secret Corners of your Heart; show this Physician your most hidden " Wounds, he will take care of your Honour and your Health. The time of our Death is uncertain; " my Brethren, let us prevent the Hour of our Death by our Vigilance, as Men use precaution against " the Diseases of the Body before the Dog-days; let us endeavour to recover the Groat, which we " lost by our negligence. St. *Gregory Nyssen.*

The Discourse *of Benevolence and Liberality towards the Poor*, contains the most convincing Reasons, the most pressing Motives, and the most lively Expressions which can be employ'd to excite Men to give Alms to the Poor, and to help them in their Necessities.

In the Discourse *against Usurers*, he shews that Usury is forbidden by the Laws of Charity, especially when he to whom the Money is lent is poor.

In the Discourse *about Fasting*, which was preach'd at the beginning of *Lent*, he exhorts the Faithful to fast exactly during this time. In the Sermon *against Fornication*, he gives a frightful representation of that Sin.

The Discourse against those *who hardly endure Reproofs*, teaches that Humility and Submission wherewith they should receive the Chastisements of the Church. St. *Gregory* discourses there against those who despise Excommunication. He gives a frightful description of the Soul of an excommunicated Person; and says, that it cannot partake of Glory, nor enter into the Kingdom of Heaven; That we must not imagine that Excommunication is an Invention of the Bishops; That it is an ancient Law of the Church, the Custom of our Fathers founded upon the Scripture which first introduc'd it: He shews the necessity of it. Towards the end he observes, that he did not wonder that many were troubled to bear his Rebukes, and murmur'd against him; that this Abuse had been of a long time, but he was resolv'd to bear with patience the Reproaches of others.

We may place at the head of the Funeral Orations and the Panegyricks of St. *Gregory Nyssen*, the Discourse wherein he proves, That we ought not to be troubled at the death of the Faithful, because it delivers them from this Mortal and Miserable Life, that they may enjoy Immortal Life and Eternal Happiness.

In the Funeral Oration upon *Pulcheria* the Daughter of *Theodosius*, after he has aggravated the loss which he suffer'd by the death of this young Princess, he shows that they should comfort themselves, since she is now happy.

In the Panegyrick upon the Empress *Flaccilla*, he describes the Vertues of this Princess, and represents the Happiness which she enjoys in Heaven.

In the Panegyrick upon the Martyr St. *Stephen*, after he has given an Account of the History of his Martyrdom and prais'd his Constancy, he refutes the Enemies of the Divinity of the Son and the Holy Spirit.

There are Three Discourses of St. *Gregory Nyssen*'s in Honour of the 40 Martyrs, wherein he relates their Martyrdom, and praises their Constancy.

In the Panegyrick upon the Martyr *Theodorus*, (*e*) having described the Honours which the Church bestows upon Saints and Martyrs, and the Rewards which they enjoy, he relates the Martyrdom of *Theodorus*, and concludes with addressing a Prayer to him, for obtaining the Graces and Blessings of God by his Intercession.

In the Panegyrick upon St. *Gregory Thaumaturgus*, he praises the excellent Vertues of this great Saint; he relates many of his Miracles, whereof some are very extraordinary. *Suidas* names this Panegyrick among St. *Gregory*'s Works, and there is no reason at all to doubt of it.

The Panegyricks upon St. *Basil*, *Meletius* and St. *Ephraem*, contain nothing but the Life and Praises of those great Men. To these Orations we may joyn the Life of St. *Macrina* his Sister.

The Canonical Epistle to *Letoius* contains the Rules or Laws of Penance. St. *Gregory* there distinguishes Three sorts of Sins, which referr to the Three Faculties of the Soul, *Reason*, *Lust* and *Anger*. He says, that the greatest Sins are those which belong to the Spirit of a Man, such as Idolatry, Judaism, Manichæism and Heresie. He would have those that voluntarily fall into these Crimes be depriv'd of the Sacraments till the Hour of Death: But, he says, that those who have been forc'd by the rigour of Torments to commit some of these Crimes, ought not to be punisht more severely than Fornicators. He ordains also, that those who deal in Magick, Witchcraft and Divination of things to come, should be treated as wilful Apostates, if they have practis'd this Art through Infidelity; but he would have them treated as those who yield under the rigour of Torments, if they have used it only through too much Credulity, or in hope of some considerable Gain. He says, that as to what concerns the Sins of Lust, they may be referr'd to Adultery and Fornication; and that Fornication is a kind of Adultery. He referrs to Adultery the Crimes which are against Nature. He imposes Nine Years Penance upon simple Fornication, and double the time upon Adultery; yet he leaves to the

(*e*) *The Panegyrick upon* Theodorus *the Martyr.*] Some Criticks think that this Panegyrick is Supposititious. First, because the Author of this Discourse prays the Holy Martyr to hinder the Incursions of the *Scythians*: Now, say they, the *Scythians* had not made any Incursions into *Armenia*, till a 100 Years after the death of St. *Gregory*, under the Reign of *Anastasius*. Secondly, the Author says, that *Theodorus* was of the Country of *Job*, that is, of *Arabia*, and yet his is a Greek Name, and 'its said in the same Panegyrick that he was of *Amasea* in *Cappadocia*. But 'tis easie to answer the first Difficulty, for the *Scythians* had made Incursions into the *Roman* Empire in the time of St. *Gregory Nyssen*, as appears by St. *Jerom Ep.* 30. and by *Cedrenus*, who says that they entred into *Thrace* under the Reign of *Valens*. The second Objection has no Difficulty, for the Author of this Panegyrick does not say, that *Job* was of *Arabia*, nor that *Theodorus* was of the same Province with *Job*, but only that they were both of the East.

Bishop

St. *Gregory Nyſſen.*

Biſhop a liberty of Moderating or Lengthning the Penance according to the Diſpoſition of the Penitent; and he would have thoſe treated more gently who confeſs their ſecret and hidden Sins. In ſhort, as to the Sins which proceed from Anger, he ſays, That tho' the Scripture reproves all Sins ſeverely, yet the Fathers have made no Laws but againſt Murder. He impoſes 27 Years Penance for Wilful-Murder; and for involuntary Murders, the ſame ſpace of time as for Fornication; yet he allows this Penance to be diminiſh'd according to the Fervor of the Penitent. In general he obſerves, that all thoſe who fall ſick before they have perfectly finiſh'd their Penance, ſhould be reconcil'd at the Point of death, and be admitted to receive the Sacraments; yet upon condition that they fulfil their time of Penance if they recover their health.

As for Covetouſneſs, he ſays, That tho' this Crime be another kind of Idolatry, yet there are no Canons made to ſubject the Covetous to Penance; and therefore it is ſufficient to purifie them from this Crime, by Inſtruction and Prayer. As for Robbery, he ſays, there are Two ſorts of it; that which is done Publickly and by force of Arms, and that which is done Secretly; That thoſe who are guilty of the firſt ſort, ought to be put under the ſame Penance as Murderers; but as for thoſe who ſteal anothers Goods in ſecret, it was ſufficient that they ſhould reſtore them and give Alms to the Poor. He looks upon the Action of thoſe who dig up the Dead as a very great Crime, and puts them under the ſame Penance as Fornicators.

At laſt, he ſays, That tho' Sacrilege was one of the Crimes which was puniſh'd under the Old Law, by ſtoning the Perſon that was guilty of it; yet this Puniſhment was mitigated under the New Law, and that now ſacrilegious Perſons were treated leſs harſhly than Adulterers. He concludes with this Advertiſement to *Letoïus*, to whom he writes, that he ſhould chiefly conſider the Diſpoſition of the Perſon that does Penance, becauſe it is not the length of time, but the Converſion of the Perſon and change of his Life which cures the Sin.

Some Criticks have doubted whether this Letter was St. *Gregory Nyſſen's*; but there is no reaſon to reject it, and it has been been own'd by the Greek Church, as appears by the Council held in the Emperour's Palace which approves the Canons of St. *Gregory Nyſſen*, and by the Commentaries of *Zonaras* and *Balſamon*, who acknowledge it to be Genuine; and beſides 'tis ſufficiently evident that 'tis the Work of an ancient Author.

In the Letter of the Profeſſion of a Chriſtian, he ſhews that it conſiſts in imitating Jeſus Chriſt, and he explains in what ſenſe this can be done.

In the following Letter to *Olympius*, he explains particularly wherein Chriſtian Perfection conſiſts, and makes a particular Enumeration of all the Offices and Vertues of a perfect Chriſtian.

The Treatiſe concerning the End which Chriſtians ought to propoſe to themſelves is almoſt upon the ſame Subject. St. *Gregory* proves, That the End of all Chriſtians ſhould be to ſhun Vice, to practiſe Vertue, to purifie themſelves from their Sins, to beg the Grace of Jeſus Chriſt, to be Humble, to be Charitable, to be diligent in Prayer, to deſpiſe the World, and to fix their Affections upon God. This Treatiſe is addreſs'd to the Monks.

In the Letter to *Flavianus*, he complains of the evil treatment he had receiv'd from *Helladius* Biſhop of *Cæſarea*.

In the Letter concerning Pilgrimages to *Jeruſalem*, he diſſuades Chriſtians from undertaking lightly theſe kind of Journeys, becauſe of the Abuſes which happen in them. There have been great Diſputes occaſion'd by this Letter: Some have believ'd it ſuppoſititious; others have maintain'd that what is there ſaid reſpects only the Monks and the Nuns. But Firſt, there are no Arguments ſtrong enough to reject it, and the moſt learned Catholicks have acknowledg'd it as a Genuine Work of St. *Gregory's*: And in the Second place, ſome Reaſons which are us'd to diſſuade Men from Pilgrimages to *Jeruſalem*, reſpect all Chriſtians in general. In the mean time, 'tis no ways probable, that St. *Gregory Nyſſen*, who was ſo very much devoted to the Saints, ſhould abſolutely condemn the Piety of thoſe who travell'd upon a good Deſign to viſit the Holy Places, eſpecially ſince this Practice was Authoriz'd and Approv'd from the beginning of the Fourth Age of the Church. It muſt therefore be ſaid, that he did not condemn it but upon the account of the Abuſes and Superſtitions, which began in his time to creep into theſe kind of Devotions, of which he was a Witneſs in his Journey to *Jeruſalem*. Thus St. *Jerome* who was very much devoted to the Holy Places, in his 13th. Epiſtle, diſſuades *Paulinus* Biſhop of *Nola*, from a Journey to *Jeruſalem* upon the ſame Reaſon that St. *Gregory* uſes. And to ſhow that St. *Gregory* could have no other Aim or Deſign, one needs but compare this Letter with the following to *Euſtathia*, *Ambroſia* and *Baſiliſſa*, wherein he acknowledges, that 'tis a Happineſs to ſee the Holy Places, provided a Man repreſents the Death and Sufferings of Jeſus Chriſt by his own Actions to himſelf. He complains in this Letter, that the Church of *Jeruſalem* was no more exempt from Diviſions than other Churches, and explains towards the latter end the Myſtery of the Incarnation. There he teaches, that the Divinity was not chang'd into the Humanity, but that the Divinity was united to a Nature like to ours, that it aſſum'd a Body and a Soul, and was never ſeparated from them; that the Virgin ought to be call'd the Mother of God, and not the Mother of a Man. He rejects the Opinion of the *Millenaries*. He complains of ſome that would not communicate with him in the Journey which he made to *Jeruſalem*. At laſt, he exhorts thoſe to whom he writes, who were at *Jeruſalem*, to continue firm in the Faith of their Fore-Fathers, and not to preferr Novelties to the Ancient Doctrine receiv'd from their Fathers by Tradition.

St. *Cyril* in the Book written to *Evoptius*, quotes a Paſſage of St. *Gregory's* taken out of his Commentary upon the Epiſtle of St. *Paul* to the *Philippians*, which can be no other St. *Gregory* but this of

Nyſſa.

Nyssa. The Eight Books of *Nemesius*'s Philosophy have formerly been attributed to him; but now it is generally agreed that this was a gross Error. St. *Gregory Nyssen.*

Tho' St. *Gregory Nyssen* professed Rhetorick, and *Photius* assures us, That his Style is Lofty and Smooth; yet one may say, that he came not near the Eloquence of St. *Basil*, and St. *Gregory Nazianzen.* His way of Writing is affected, and his Style is no ways Natural; he speaks more like a Declaimer than an Orator; he is always abstruse either by Allegories, or abstracted Reasonings; he mingles Philosophy with Divinity, and makes use of the Principles of Philosophers, both in his Explications of Mysteries, and in his Discourses of Morality: Upon which Account his Works are more like the Treatises of *Plato* and *Aristotle*, than those of other *Christians.* He follows and imitates *Origen* in his way of Allegorizing, and there are also some of this Author's Errors in his Works, about the Nature of Souls, and the End of the Pains of the damned; but he rejects and refutes them expressly in other places: 'Tis very probable therefore that the places wherein these Errors are to be met with were added since, which *Germanus* the Patriarch of *Constantinople* shows in a Book, out of which *Photius* relates an Extract in Vol. 218. of his *Bibliotheca*; wherein he proves as well by what goes before those places, as by what follows after them, and by an infinite Number of contrary Passages, that those places which agree with the Doctrine of *Origen* concerning the End of the Pains of the damned, were either added, or corrupted by the Disciples of this Author. He observes also, That the like happened to the Conference about the Soul with *Macrina*, to the Catechetical Discourse, and the Book of the Perfection of a Christian: And he should have added also the Treatise about Infants who die before they come to the use of Reason. It may be said also, That St. *Gregory Nyssen* having his Head full of the Books and Principles of *Origen*, could not always be so careful but some of his Errors would slip unawares into his Reasonings, tho' he was not really of his Opinion; and he rejected them at other times when he was more attentive. Yet 'tis plain that there is an Addition at the End of the great Catechetical Discourse, wherein mention is made of the Heretick *Severus.*

'Twas a long time before the Works of St. *Gregory Nyssen* were all collected together into one Body. The First Editions have only the Eight Books of *Nemesius*'s Philosophy. In 1536, *Aldus Minutius* printed at *Venice* three Greek Orations, and in 1537, the Greek Text of the Book *of the Formation of Man*; and the Version of this Book made by *Dionysius Exiguus*, was printed with the Treatise *of the Life of* Moses, and the Eight Books of *Nemesius*, at *Cologne* in 1551. The Book *of the Life of* Moses, translated by *Georgius Trapezuntius*, was printed at *Basle* in 1521. In 1544 *Camerarius* publish'd a Version of the Homily upon *Abraham.* In 1550, *Zinus* publish'd a Version of some Moral Homilies, which was printed by *Vascosanus.* *The Conference about the Soul*, translated by *Augerius*, was printed at *Paris* in 1557. *Laurentius Sifanus* collected together and translated several Treatises of St. *Gregory Nyssen*'s, and caused them to be printed at *Basle* in 1562. In 1567, *Leunclavius* made a New Translation of the Book *of the Life of* Moses. In 1564, *Hoeschelius* caused the Greek Text of some Orations of St. *Gregory Nyssen* to be printed at *Ausburg.* In 1567, the Book *of Virginity* was printed at *Rome* translated by *Galesinus*, together with Five Orations; the same Book was also translated by *Livineius*, whose Version appear'd in 1574. The Discourse *of Purification and of the Soul* was printed at *Cologne* in 1568. The Edition of the Year 1562 was re-printed at *Basle* in 1571. There was added to it the Exposition upon the *Canticles* translated by *Leunclavius*, and the Letter to *Flavianus.* The Edition of *Nivelle* of the Year 1573 is larger, and contains the Version of almost all the Treatises of St. *Gregory Nyssen* which had been then publish'd: Since that Edition *Maximus Margurius*, caused the Version *of the Book of Perfection*, and of the Letter to *Letoius*, and of the Book upon *the Titles of the Psalms*, to be printed at *Venice* in 1585. The Letter to *Letoius* was also printed at *Venice* in 1589, together with the Notes of *Antonius Augustinus*, and at *Paris* with those of *Balsamon* in 1561; at *Ausburg* together with the Homily of the Divinity of the Son and Holy Spirit, translated by *Hervetus*, in 1591. The Book *of Perfection* of *Zinus*'s Translation, was printed at *Venice*, in 1575. In 1593, *Hoeschelius* printed in Greek at *Amsterdam*, the Book *of the Christian Profession*, and that *of the Life of* Moses, the Treatise against *Apollinarius*, and that *of Faith.* *Fronto Ducæus* printed in Latin at *Ingoldstadt* in the Year 1598, the Treatises against *Apollinarius*, of the Witch of *Endor*, the Discourse upon the Resurrection of Jesus Christ, that of St. *Gregory* upon his Ordination, his Book against the *Manichees*, the Treatise of Destiny, and the Oration against Usurers. The Book of the Titles of the *Psalms* in Greek and Latin, translated by *Gretser* was also printed at *Ingelstadt* in 1600, the Treatise *about the End of a Christian* was publish'd by *Morellus* in the Year 1606, the same Year appear'd in Greek and Latin the Letter about Pilgrimages to *Jerusalem*, and that to *Eustathia*, *Ambrosia* and *Basilissa*, the first printed by *Morellus*, and the last by *Robert Stephens* with *Casaubon*'s Notes; both the one and the other were printed at *Hanover*, the first in 1607, with the Notes of *Du Moulin*, and the second in 1611. In 1605, *Fronto Ducæus* printed a New Latin Edition of the Works of St. *Gregory Nyssen*, which contains all that had been publish'd. At last, in 1615 there came out a Greek and Latin Edition of the Works of this Father which was printed in Two Volumes by *Morellus*, with the Notes of *Fronto Ducæus*; but because in this Edition there was not the First Book against *Eunomius*, nor the Greek of the Moral Orations, therefore there was a Supplement made at the End of St. *Basil*'s Works printed in 1618. The last Edition in 1638 was Copy'd after this, where the same Version of the last Homilies is put twice, once by it self apart, and once over against the Greek. This Edition was done very negligently, and is very uncorrect.

St. CÆSA-

St. CÆSARIUS.

St. Cæſarius.

CÆSARIUS, the Brother of St. *Gregory Nazianzen*, after having finiſhed his Studies at *Alexandria*, came to dwell at *Conſtantinople*, and paſs'd the greateſt Part of his Life at Court in the Quality of Phyſician to the Emperour. He continued alſo ſome time with *Julian*, but finding himſelf ſollicited to quit the Chriſtian Religion, he retir'd into his own Country. After the Death of this Emperour he return'd to Court and came into Credit again under the Reign of *Valens*. He was honour'd with the Office of Treaſurer of *Bithynia*. He was like to have periſh'd in the Earthquake which happen'd at *Nice*, where he loſt part of his Goods. He died at Court in the beginning of the Year 369, and made the Poor his Heirs.

There is no great probability, that a Man who liv'd as *Cæſarius* did, ſhould compoſe Dialogues upon the moſt ſubtile Queſtions of Philoſophy and Divinity; yet Four of them are attributed to him, which ſome have thought were written in his Name by St. *Gregory Nazianzen*; but they can neither be the one's nor the others. For, Firſt, It is not credible, that *Cæſarius*, who ſpent his Life at Court, and was but a ſimple Catechumen, ſhould be the Author of thoſe Queſtions, which ſuppoſe the Writer of them to be very well vers'd in the moſt ſubtile Parts of Theology. Secondly, The Title of theſe Dialogues import that the Author of them was Secretary to the Emperour, and that he had taught Twenty Years at *Conſtantinople*; which cannot be ſaid of the Brother of St. *Gregory Nazianzen*, who was not Secretary, but Treaſurer, and who did not profeſs Theology at *Conſtantinople*, but Phyſick. Thirdly, St. *Gregory Nazianzen* in his Funeral Oration ſays not a Word of his Skill in Theology, nor that he had written about Religion. Fourthly, This Treatiſe has neither the Style nor Genius of the Writers of the Fourth Age. Fifthly, It cites St. *Gregory Nyſſen*, who died long after *Cæſarius*, and *Maximus* an Author of the Seventh Age. All which does plainly ſhow, That it can neither belong to *Cæſarius* nor St. *Gregory Nazianzen*, whoſe Style is as different from the Author's of this Dialogue, as the Style of *Demoſthenes* is from that of the Declamations of *Aphthonius*.

Photius ſays, That 'tis eaſie to perceive, that the Style of theſe Dialogues, is the Style of a Young Man who had learned ſome Rudiments of Rhetorick, and was proud of that little Knowledge which he had in Divinity and Philoſophy; That his Sallies of Wit are moſt of them unpleaſant; That he often makes uſe of Poetical Terms, and without any reaſon varies from the common Conſtruction; That his Style however is clear enough, and that there are few things to be blamed in his Doctrine. Theſe Dialogues contain 195 Queſtions and Anſwers about Matters of Theology and Philoſophy, more Subtile and Curious than Uſeful and Profitable. In *Photius*'s time, there were 220 of them. There are ſtill in many Manuſcripts thereabouts more or leſs, which plainly ſhows that theſe Queſtions were written by ſome Modern Greeks, who lov'd to buſie their Minds with theſe ſort of Queſtions, and to publiſh them under the Names of Ancient Authors. *Leunclavius* was the firſt who tranſlated theſe Queſtions, and his Verſion was printed at *Baſle* in 1571. Afterwards *Elias Elingherus*, Library-Keeper of *Ausburg*, publiſh'd in 1626, 78 of theſe Queſtions in Greek and Latin. Laſt of all, *Fronto Ducæus* publiſh'd the Greek Text and Verſion of 195 Queſtions and Anſwers, divided into Four Books, and thoſe were printed in the Addition to the *Bibliotheca Patrum* in 1624, and in the Eleventh Volume of the Edition in 1644.

St. AMPHILOCHIUS.

St. Amphilochius.

ST. *AMPHILOCHIUS*, an intimate Friend of St. *Baſil* and St. *Gregory Nazianzen*, was of *Cappadocia*. Having for ſome time profeſs'd Rhetorick, he afterwards attended the Bar, where he diſcharged the Office of an Advocate and a Judge (*a*.) Leaving this, he retir'd into a ſolitary place of *Cappadocia* call'd *Oziçala*, and after he had led there for ſome time a very Holy Life, he was in the Year 375 Ordain'd Biſhop of *Iconium*, the Metropolis of *Lycaonia*, a Province of the Dioceſs of *Aſia*, bordering upon *Cappadocia*. When he was Biſhop he took Care not only of his own Church, but alſo of the Affairs of the Neighbouring Churches. He was preſent at the Council of *Conſtantinople*, and there the Care of the Eccleſiaſtical Affairs of his Country was committed to him. About the Year 383, or 384, he held a Council at *Syda* againſt the *Maſſalians*, which *Photius* mentions in Vol. 52. *Theodoret* relates in *Ch.* 16. of *B.* V. of his Hiſtory, that St. *Amphilochius* petitioned the Emperour *Theodoſius* to prohibit the Hereticks to hold their Aſſemblies in Cities; That the Emperour judging his Petition too Rigorous, deny'd it; but *Amphilochius* returning ſome time after to the Place, and ſeeing *Arcadius* his Son cloſe by the Emperour *Theodoſius*, who had already been proclaim'd Emperour, he Saluted the Father without Saluting the Son; That *Theodoſius* thinking he had fail'd in his Duty through Inadvertence, commanded him to Salute his Son, to whom St. *Amphilochius* made anſwer, That it was enough that he had Saluted him. Whereupon *Theodoſius* fell into a Paſſion, and declar'd how much he was offended with him for his neglecting of his Son; That then *Amphilochius* diſcreetly told him, You cannot ſuffer an Injury to be done to the Emperour your Son, and do you ſuffer thoſe who diſhonour the Son of God? That the Emperour being ſurpriz'd with this Reply,

(*a*) *Advocate and a Judge.*] St. *Gregory Nazienzen* recommends to him the Affairs of his Friends in Letters 19, 106, 160. and it appears by Letter 106, that he was accus'd for not doing Juſtice.

made

made a Law; wherein he forbids Hereticks to hold their Aſſemblies any longer. *Theodoret* ſays, That this happen'd after *Theodoſius*'s return into the Eaſt; that is, about the Year 392. But 'tis much more probable, that St. *Amphilochius* ſpoke thus to the Emperour, ſometime after the Council of *Conſtantinople* in the Year 382, ſince it was then that the Law of *Theodoſius* was made againſt Hereticks, forbidding their Aſſemblies. The Year of *Amphilochius*'s Death is not certainly known. St. *Jerome* in his Book of Eccleſiaſtical Writers, written in 392, mentions him as one then living. There alſo he mentions a Treatiſe of the Holy Spirit, which St. *Amphilochius* had read to him a little while before, wherein he proves that the Holy Spirit was God, Adorable and Almighty. St. *Amphilochius.*

The Works of this Father have been quoted with Commendation by the Councils and the Ancients. The Councils of *Epheſus* and *Chalcedon*, produce ſome Teſtimonies out of them againſt the Errors of *Neſtorius* and *Eutyches*, but they do not tell us out of what Book they are taken. *Theodoret* in his Dialogues produces others which are taken out of the Homilies upon theſe Words of the Goſpel; *My Father is greater than I*; and upon theſe other Words, *The Son can do nothing of himſelf*; and out of a Homily upon theſe other Words of Jeſus Chriſt in St. *John*, Chap. 5. *He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that ſent me, hath eternal life*; and out of a Homily upon theſe Words of Jeſus Chriſt in St. *Matth.* Chap. 26. *My God, let me not drink of this Cup*; out of a Diſcourſe againſt the *Arians*, which is the ſame with that upon theſe Words, *My Father is greater than I*, as appears by *Leontius*; and out of another Sermon upon the Word, the Son of God. *Facundus* in Ch. 3. of *B.* XI. of his Treatiſe, cites Four Paſſages out of St. *Amphilochius*, whereof the Firſt is taken out of the Homily upon theſe Words, *My Father is greater than I*; the Second out of the Homily upon theſe Words, *He that believeth in him that ſent me hath eternal life*; the Third out of the Homily upon theſe Words, *I aſcend to my Father and my God*; and the Laſt out of the Homily upon theſe Words, *Let me not drink of this Cup.* The Seventh Council in Action Five, quotes a Fragment of St. *Amphilochius* againſt the Books written by Hereticks, who bear the Name of the Apoſtles. *Leontius* and *Anaſtaſius Sinaita* quote alſo ſome Paſſages of St. *Amphilochius*. St. *John Damaſcene* produces ſome Paſſages taken out of Two of his Letters, whereof one was addreſs'd to the *Suadrenſes*, and the other to *Seleucus*. There is alſo a Fragment and a Queſtion concerning the Fleſh of Jeſus Chriſt, which is thought to have been extracted by *Photius*, and another Fragment of a Letter written to the Deacon *Pancarius*. *Barlaam* has alſo collected ſome Paſſages taken out of the Letter to *Seleucus*, out of the Firſt Sermon upon theſe Words, *No Man knows either the day or the hour of Judgment*; out of another upon theſe Words, *The Child Jeſus grew*; out of another upon theſe Words, *Deſtroy this Temple.* Theſe Fragments have almoſt all been collected together by Father *Combefis*, who has alſo publiſh'd the entire Works, as many as could be found, under the Name of *Amphilochius*, and printed them at *Paris* in 1644.

Theſe are Eight Sermons, a Poem upon the Holy Books, and the Life of St. *Baſil.*

The 1*ſt.* Sermon is upon the Nativity of Jeſus Chriſt.

The 2*d.* is upon the Circumciſion, wherein he enlarges upon the Praiſe of St. *Baſil.*

The 3*d.* is upon the Purification of the Virgin the Mother of God, upon *Anne* and *Simeon.*

The 4*th.* is a ſecond Sermon upon the Virgin and *Simeon*, which is not written by St. *Amphilochius*, Biſhop of *Iconium*, the Friend of St. *Baſil*, but by another *Amphilochius* Biſhop of *Syda*, who was preſent at the Council of *Epheſus*; for this Sermon is written directly againſt *Neſtorius*, and is of a Style different from the former.

The 5*th.* is upon *Lazarus.*

The 6*th.* upon the Woman in the Goſpel that was a Sinner.

The 7*th.* which had been formerly printed at *Antwerp* in 1598, is of the Holy *Saturday.*

The *Laſt* is about Penance. This has not the ſame Style as the others. The Author ſpeaks againſt the Hereſie of the *Iconoclaſts*, and relates Fabulous Stories, from whence it appears that this Homily is the Work of ſome Modern Greek. It cannot be certainly known of any one of theſe Sermons, that it belongs to St. *Amphilochius* of *Iconium*, rather than *Amphilochius* Biſhop of *Syda.*

The Poem to *Seleucus* has the Style of St. *Gregory Nazianzen*, whatever Father *Combefis* ſays to the contrary: and it is very probable that it was written by this Father under the Name of *Amphilochius.* There he makes an Enumeration of the Canonical Books, which is not different from that which is in the 33*d.* Poem: For tho' he ſpeaks of the Book of *Eſther* and the *Revelation*, yet he does not put them in the rank of thoſe Books which all the World receives for Canonical; he only obſerves, that ſome have admitted them, and others have rejected them.

The Life of St. *Baſil* attributed to *Amphilochius*, tranſlated into Latin by Cardinal *Urſus*, whoſe Tranſlation was printed by *Roſwydus*, publiſh'd in Greek and Latin by Father *Combefis*, contains many Fables, and many particulars of the Life of St. *Baſil* contrary to the Truth of Hiſtory *(b)* ſo that it is plainly the Work of a Modern Greek. Father *Combefis*, who endeavours to maintain its Authority againſt the Opinion of *Poſſevinus*, *Baronius*, and *Bellarmin*, ſays, That ſome places in it are added and

(b) Contrary to the Truth of Hiſtory.] The Author of this Life ſuppoſes, that St. *Baſil* was Biſhop in the time of *Julian*, that *Libanius* was of *Julian*'s Retinue, that when this Emperour was kill'd, he was converted in a few Days after, and retired with St. *Baſil.* Now 'tis evident that St. *Baſil* was not Biſhop in the Emperour *Julian*'s time, and that *Libanius* was ſo far from being converted after his Death, that he wrote a Panegyrick in his praiſe. All the Hiſtories which are related in this Life are Fabulous, and do no ways agree with what the Ancients have ſaid of St. *Baſil.* In a word, No body can read this Piece but they may preſently diſcover its Impoſture.

St. *Amphilochius.*

corrupted, but that the Body of the Work is *Amphilochius*'s; which he does not prove at all, nor can it appear probable to thoſe that read it, who will neither find in it the Style, nor the Genius of the Fourth Age of the Church. The Life of St. *Amphilochius*, written by *Metaphraſtes*, is alſo of no great Authority: Wherefore one may ſay, That excepting the Fragments produced by the Councils of *Epheſus* and *Chalcedon*, by *Theodoret* and *Facundus*, all the other Diſcourſes publiſh'd by Father *Combefis* under the Name of *Amphilochius*, are either manifeſtly ſuppoſititious, or at leaſt very doubtful. But we muſt not ſay the ſame of the Letter publiſh'd by *Cotelerius* in his Second Volume of the Monuments of the Greek Church, *p.* 98. It is a Synodical Epiſtle written to the Biſhops of another Province. The Biſhops in whoſe Name St. *Amphilochius* wrote it, declare, That they wiſh'd St. *Baſil* had been preſent at their Synod; but he being detain'd by a grievous Sickneſs, they would be ſatisfied if he would ſend to them his Book of the Holy Spirit. They add, That they receive the Faith of the *Nicene* Council; but that tho' the Fathers of this Council had ſaid, that we muſt believe in the Holy Spirit, as in the Father and the Son, yet they had not explain'd the Divinity of the Holy Spirit, becauſe this Queſtion was not then diſputed. Afterwards they explain themſelves more clearly upon this Subject. They prove the Divinity of the Holy Spirit by Baptiſm; they ſay that we muſt acknowledge in God but one Nature only, and three Hypoſtaſes. At laſt, They exhort thoſe to whom they write to maintain the Faith and the Peace of the Church, and to ſing the Doxology, *Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghoſt*; and add, That 'tis in vain to reject the Communion of the *Arians*, if they do not believe the Divinity of the Holy Spirit. This Letter has relation to the 403 Letter of St. *Baſil*, wherein he writes to *Amphilochius* to ſend Deputies into *Lycia*, to inquire into the Faith of the Biſhops of that Country, who were for the moſt part Orthodox. Probably *Amphilochius* did as St. *Baſil* deſired him in this Letter, and theſe Deputies brought a Letter from the Biſhops of *Lycia*, to which St. *Amphilochius* anſwers by this.

MAXIMUS.

Maximus.

THis *MAXIMUS* was a Philoſopher of *Alexandria*, who procur'd himſelf to be Ordain'd Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, and did all that he could to force away from thence St. *Gregory Nazianzen*. He wrote a Book *of Faith* againſt the *Arians*, which he preſented to the Emperour *Gratian* at *Milan*; this he did in all probability, when he came into the Weſt after he had been driven away from *Conſtantinople* and *Alexandria*. St. *Gregory Nazianzen* gave him at firſt great Praiſes, but afterwards he blacken'd his Reputation in a wonderful manner. The Weſtern Biſhops protected him, but thoſe of the Eaſt declar'd his Ordination null, and made void all the Ordinations that he had made by the Fifth Canon of the Council of *Conſtantinople*.

EUSEBIUS VERCELLENSIS.

Euſebius Vercellenſis.

EUSEBIUS, born in *Sardinia*, was Reader of the Church of *Rome*, and afterwards Biſhop of *Vercelles*. Pope *Liberius* ſent him Delegate to the Emperour *Conſtantius* after the Fall of *Vincentius* of *Capua*. He was preſent at the Council of *Milan*, from whence he was baniſh'd into the Eaſt, and ſent away into *Scythopolis*, where he ſuffer'd very much from *Patrophilus* the *Arian* Biſhop of that City. He obtain'd his Liberty under the Reign of *Julian*, and was preſent at the Council of *Alexandria* held by St. *Athanaſius*. He was Delegated by this Council for reſtoring Peace to the Church of *Antioch*, but he could not compaſs his Deſign, becauſe of the Ordination of *Paulinus*, which was raſhly made by *Lucifer*; for this was an hinderance to the Reconciliation. And therefore having blam'd the Conduct of *Lucifer*, he return'd into *Italy*, where he took a great deal of Pains to re-eſtabliſh the Faith. He died in the Year 370. St. *Ambroſe* made a Panegyrick upon him. The Title of Martyr is commonly given to him: But St. *Ambroſe*, St. *Jerome*, St. *Gregory* of *Tours*, and all the Ancients give him no other Title but that of Confeſſor; and St. *Ambroſe* ſeems to preferr *Dionyſius* of *Milan* before him, becauſe he died in Baniſhment.

We have a Letter of this Biſhop written in the time of his Exile, and ſent to his own Church, together with a Proteſtation againſt all the Violences of *Patrophilus*. There is alſo among the Fragments of St. *Hilary*, a Letter to *Gregory* Biſhop of *Elvira*, written in 363, and a little Note that he wrote to *Conſtantius* before he went to *Milan*. St. *Jerome* teſtifies, That he tranſlated into Latin the Commentaries of *Euſebius* of *Cæſarea* upon the *Pſalms*. It is probable that he wrote it in his Exile, where he learned the Greek Tongue, and publiſh'd it after his Return.

MELE-

MELETIUS.

Meletius.

MELETIUS was of *Melitine*. He was at firſt engag'd in the Party of the *Acacians*, and ſign'd their Confeſſion of Faith in the Council of *Seleucia*. St. *Jerome*, *Socrates*, *Sozomen*, and *Theodoret*, ſay, that he was firſt Ordain'd Biſhop of *Sebaſtea*, a City of *Armenia*, in the Council of *Conſtantinople* in the Year 360. After that, if you will believe *Socrates*, he was Tranſlated to *Beræa*, and from thence to *Antioch*: But it is more probable, that he was never Ordain'd Biſhop of *Beræa*, and that when he could not be receiv'd at *Sebaſtea*, he retir'd to *Beræa*, from whence he was call'd to *Antioch*, after *Eudoxus* had quitted that See to go to *Conſtantinople*. The *Arians* thinking that he would be of their Opinion, propos'd him for Biſhop of that City in a Council held at *Antioch* in 361, and the Orthodox knowing him better than the *Arians*, conſented to his Election. Some time after the Emperour *Conſtantius*, who was then at *Antioch*, deſir'd thoſe Biſhops who were moſt able, to diſcourſe in Publick, to explain theſe Words of Scripture; *The Lord created me in the beginning of his Ways for his Works*; and Order'd their Expoſitions to be written down, that they might be oblig'd to make them the more exact. *George* Biſhop of *Laodicea* did firſt explain thoſe Words, and diffuſed all the Poiſon of his Errors. *Acacius* Biſhop of *Cæſarea*, did next give an Explication, which held the middle way between the Impiety of *Arius* and the Catholick Doctrine. But *Meletius* propos'd the Orthodox Doctrine of the Church. 'Tis alſo ſaid, that his Arch-Deacon having ſtopp'd his Mouth, he made known his Doctrine by Signs. The *Arians* aſſembled immediately to Depoſe him, and having Ordain'd in his Room an *Arian* named *Euzoïus*, they caus'd *Meletius* to be baniſh'd to the place of his Birth. Then the ſounder part of the People ſeparated themſelves from thoſe that were infected with the Error of *Arius*, and aſſembled in the Church of the Apoſtles, which was in the old City. But beſides the Catholicks, there were at *Antioch* a ſmall number of the ancient Orthodox, who after the Depoſition of *Euſtathius* continued without Biſhops. Theſe would not be re-united to *Meletius* and thoſe of his Party, tho' they had ſeparated themſelves from the *Arians*. *Lucifer* coming to *Antioch* after the death of *Conſtantius*, Ordain'd *Paulinus* for their Biſhop; but they were but few in number, and *Meletius*'s Congregation was more numerous. When all the Orthodox Biſhops, after the death of *Conſtantius*, had liberty to return to their Dioceſſes, *Meletius* return'd to *Antioch*; but *Euzoïus* continued Miniſter of the Churches, till the *Acacians* were reconcil'd to *Meletius* under the Reign of *Jovian*, and made Profeſſion of the Orthodox Faith in the Council of *Antioch* in the Year 363.

Under the Reign of *Valens*, *Meletius* was perſecuted again and ſent into Baniſhment, but he was no leſs odious to the Orthodox of the Weſt than to the *Arians*. For the Church of *Alexandria*, and the Churches of the Weſt, ſupported *Paulinus* and thoſe of his Party, and would have no Communion with *Meletius*. We have already ſeen the trouble and labour that St. *Baſil* underwent to reconcile *Meletius* to them, yet he could not compaſs his Deſign while he liv'd. But Nine Months after his Death, it was agreed between *Meletius* and *Paulinus*, that whenſoever one of them two ſhould die, no Perſon ſhould be Ordain'd in his Room, but the Surviver ſhould continue ſole Biſhop of the Place. *Meletius* coming in the Year 380. to the firſt Council of *Conſtantinople*, in which he preſided, died in that City to the great grief of all the Biſhops. After his death the Eaſtern Biſhops, without any regard to the Agreement made with *Paulinus*, choſe in his Room *Flavianus*. This Election renew'd the Schiſm of the Church of *Antioch*, which was not ended even at the death of *Paulinus*, which happen'd in the Year 389, for before he died he Ordain'd *Evagrius* for his Succeſſor. This Difference was carried to the Council of *Capua*, which nam'd *Theophilus* and the Biſhops of *Egypt* for Judges in this Cauſe. But *Flavianus* refuſing him, addreſs'd himſelf to the Emperour, whom he perſuaded of the goodneſs of his Cauſe. This Conduct of *Flavianus* very much diſguſted the Weſtern Biſhops, as St. *Ambroſe* informs us in the Ninth Letter of his firſt Book. However he had ſo much Intereſt, as to hinder the placing of a Biſhop in the Room of *Evagrius* who died in 393, and he reconciled himſelf to the Weſtern Biſhops in 398, by means of St. *Chryſoſtom* who perſuaded *Theophilus* to make up this Peace. Yet there were ſtill ſome obſtinate Perſons at *Antioch*, who notwithſtanding the Agreement of the whole Church, would keep up a Faction by themſelves, and would neither be reconcil'd to *Flavianus* nor to his Succeſſors; ſo difficult it is to bring thoſe back to the Church, who have gone aſtray through too much Zeal for Religion, and have made a ſeparation under pretence of Purity of Doctrine, and Strictneſs of Diſcipline. St. *Epiphanius* has preſerv'd for us in *Hæreſ.* 73. the Diſcourſe of *Meletius* which contains clearly the Doctrine of the Church, and the proofs of the Eternity and Divinity of the Word. We may attribute to him alſo the Creed of the Council of *Antioch* in the Year 393, related by *Socrates* Ch. 25. of the 3d. B. of his Hiſtory. Theſe Monuments are authentick Proofs that *Meletius* was a Catholick, which was acknowledg'd by almoſt all the Fathers, and even by St. *Athanaſius*. Neither can any one blame him for the Holineſs of his Life; but his Ordination for ſome time was encumbred with great Difficulties: Firſt, becauſe it was believ'd, that he was Tranſlated from one Church to another: Secondly, becauſe he was Choſen and Ordain'd by the *Arians*, to whoſe Party he was addicted. But as to the firſt Difficulty, beſides that we have in Antiquity ſome Examples of Tranſlations that have been approv'd of when they were made for the Good of the Church, as the Event did plainly ſhow this to be: It cannot be ſaid, properly ſpeaking, that *Meletius* was Tranſlated from one Biſhoprick to another. For tho' he had been Ordain'd Biſhop of *Sebaſtea* in *Armenia*, yet the People of that Church not being willing to receive him, he was oblig'd to withdraw immediately to *Beræa*. Now the Canons are ſo far from forbidding to give Biſhopricks

Meletius.

ſhopricks upon ſuch Occaſions to thoſe who could not take poſſeſſion of that which was deſign'd for them, that on the contrary they Ordain, That if it can be done, another Biſhoprick ſhould be given unto them as ſoon as poſſible. The other Difficulty is of much greater Conſequence, and upon it eſpecially thoſe grounded their Separation who would not Communicate with him. They ſaid that they could not acknowledge, for a lawful Biſhop, one that was Ordain'd by Hereticks. But it muſt be conſider'd that when he was Ordain'd, *Conſtantius* was Maſter of the Empire, and the Church of *Antioch* could have no Biſhop that was Ordain'd by others; that tho' *Acacius* of *Cæſarea* and the other Eaſtern Biſhops were in an Error, yet they were neither Depos'd nor Depriv'd of their Biſhopricks, and therefore they might act in ſuch Matters as concern'd the Government of the Church; that when the Biſhops Ordain'd by Hereticks return'd to the Church, ſhe left them almoſt always in poſſeſſion of their Sees; that the Orthodox had conſented to the Ordination of *Meletius*; that all the Catholick Biſhops of the Eaſt approv'd it; that *Euſebius* of *Samoſata*, and *Euſebius* of *Vercelles* acknowledg'd his Ordination to be valid; and in ſhort, that the Council of *Conſtantinople* put it paſt all doubt. But if we ought to approve the Ordination of *Meletius*, What can we ſay of that of *Paulinus*, but that it was done with much indiſcretion and raſhneſs? As to that of *Flavianus*, it cannot be altogether approv'd, ſince it was made contrary to an Agreement concluded between *Meletius* and *Paulinus*. Yet the Eaſtern Biſhops may be excus'd, becauſe perhaps they had no hand in this Agreement, and they fore-ſaw that the People of *Antioch* could never agree with *Paulinus*. In a word, the Ordination of *Evagrius* can be approv'd by no body, ſince it tended only to prepetuate the Diviſion and Schiſm in the Church of *Antioch*.

DIODORUS *Biſhop of* Tarſus.

Diodorus Biſhop of Tarſus.

DIODORUS a Prieſt and Monk of *Antioch*, the Scholar of *Silvanus* of *Tarſus*, Maſter of St. *John Chryſoſtom*, and *Theodorus* of *Mopſueſtia*, after he had acquir'd a great Reputation in *Antioch* by his Conduct and Prudence, was Ordain'd Biſhop of *Tarſus* in the Year 375. While he was yet but a Prieſt, he took care of the People of *Antioch*, in the abſence of *Meletius* who was then baniſh'd under the Reign of *Valens*, and maintain'd the Orthodox Faith in this Church. After he was Biſhop, he was preſent at the Council of *Conſtantinople*, and was one of thoſe that were choſen to take care of the Eaſtern Dioceſs. He was very skilful in the Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, and wrote Commentaries upon almoſt all the Books of the Bible. He was one of the firſt Commentators that apply'd himſelf to a literal Explication, without amuſing himſelf with *Allegories*. He was highly eſteem'd of by all the great Men of his Age, who wrote very obliging Letters to him, and have given very Authentick Teſtimonies of his Doctrine and his Piety. One part of theſe Letters may be ſeen in *Facundus* Ch. 3. of his 4th. Book. But in the following Ages Men did not give ſo favourable a Judgment of this Man's Doctrine, for he was accus'd of Teaching in his Writings the Errors of *Neſtorius*, as they were afterwards call'd. It may be for this Reaſon that none of his Works are preſerv'd. We have nothing but a very conſiderable Extract out of his Treatiſe *of Deſtiny*, produced by *Photius* in Volume 223 of his *Bibliotheca*, and the Argument of another Treatiſe *of the Holy Spirit* produced by the ſame Perſon in Volume 102. *Theodoret* alſo in his Commentaries upon *Geneſis*, *Queſt.* 20. *p.* 22. and *Queſt.* 21. *p.* 25. produces two other Fragments of this our *Diodorus*.

St. *Baſil* in Letter 167 ſpeaks of Two Books of this Author's Writing againſt the Hereticks, whereof the Second was compos'd by way of Dialogue. St. *Jerome* mentions his Commentary upon St. *Paul*. *Socrates* and *Sozomen* aſſure us, that he made Commentaries upon almoſt all the Books of the Bible. *Leontius* in his Third Book quotes a Book of this Author Written againſt the *Sunouſiaſts*, that is, againſt the *Apollinariſts*. *Suidas* has given us a Catalogue of his Works taken out of *Theodorus*, which is as follows. "An Explication of all the *Old Teſtament*, of *Geneſis*, *Exodus*, and upon the *Pſalms*, "and upon the Four Books of *Kings*, upon the *Chronicles*, upon the *Proverbs*; a Treatiſe of the Dif- "ference between Allegory and Contemplation; a Commentary upon *Eccleſiaſtes*, upon *Canticles*, up- "on the *Prophets*; a Chronicle wherein he has corrected ſome Faults of *Euſebius*; Commentaries "upon the *Four Goſpels*, upon the *Acts*, upon the Epiſtle of St. *John*; a Treatiſe to prove that there is "but One God in the Trinity; a Book againſt the *Melchiſedecians*, a Treatiſe againſt the Jews con- "cerning the Reſurrection of the Dead, one of the Soul againſt ſeveral Errors; a Treatiſe of De- "ſtiny againſt the Aſtrologers, where he ſpeaks of the Globe of the World, and of Providence; and "a Treatiſe wherein he proves that Inviſible things were made at the ſame time with the Elements, "tho' they were not made of them; a Tract to *Euphronius*, by way of Queſtion and Anſwer, againſt "*Ariſtotle*'s Syſtem." He ſays nothing in this Catalogue of the Book of the Trinity, nor of the Treatiſe againſt the *Apollinariſts*.

The Treatiſe *of Deſtiny* was divided into Eight Books and 53 Chapters. There he refutes all the Follies of Judicial Aſtrology, and ſhows that the World had a Beginning and was Created, that Man was endow'd with Free-will, that God was not the Author of Evil, and that the World is govern'd by Divine Providence. *Photius* makes a particular enumeration of the Subject of each Chapter in this Work, wherein he produces ſome part of his Reaſonings. He had reaſon to ridicule the Propoſition which this Author had advanc'd, That the Heaven was not round, ſuppoſing that if it were ſo, the Aſtrologers would have ſome good Ground for their Opinion of Fatality: For as he obſerves, the Figure of the Heaven has nothing in the World to do with this Queſtion.

Photius

Diodorus Biſhop of Tarſus.

Photius obſerves, that the Stile of this Author is pure and clear; but St. *Jerome* ſays, that it is not lofty, and that he could never reach the Eloquence of *Euſebius Emiſenus*, tho' he endeavour'd to imitate it, becauſe he was not skill'd enough in humane Learning. *Facundus*, who quotes this Paſſage of St. *Jerome*, ſays only *Euſebius* without adding *Emiſenus*. Now if one ſhould thus read the Text of St. *Jerome*, it would be more convenient to underſtand the Writings of *Euſebius* of *Cæſarea*, whom *Diodorus* rather imitated than thoſe of the Biſhop of *Emeſa*, becauſe the Works of *Diodorus* have no great relation to his Books, whereas they had a great affinity to thoſe of *Euſebius* of *Cæſarea*, either for the Matters which he treated of, or for the Manner of Stile wherein he treated of them. For the Extracts which *Photius* has produced out of his Treatiſe of Deſtiny, are very like to ſome Books of the Evangelical Preparation or Demonſtration of *Euſebius* of *Cæſarea*. The Judgment which St. *Baſil* has given of this Author's Stile may be ſeen in Letter 167, of which we have given an Abridgement in St. *Baſil's* Life. As to what concerns his Doctrine of the Incarnation, we could better judge of it, if we had his Books; but there is no great probability, that one who was prais'd, eſteem'd, and cheriſh'd by *Meletius*, St. *Baſil*, St. *Gregory Nazianzen*, St. *Epiphanius*, and even by St. *Athanaſius*, and his Succeſſors *Peter* and *Timothy* of *Alixandria*; who was alſo conſider'd in a General Council as one of the moſt Learned and moſt Orthodox Biſhops of all the Eaſt; and in ſhort, who was Maſter to St. *Chryſoſtom*, ſhould be guilty of ſo groſs an Errour as that of *Neſtorius*. 'Tis true that he had for his Scholar *Theodorus* of *Mopſueſtia*, and that he was Accus'd of the ſame Errour with *Neſtorius*; and that he was Condemn'd as Convicted of this Errour after his Death in the 5th. Council. But beſides that there have been ſome Perſons who have undertaken to juſtify him; Yet if it ſhould be granted that he was guilty of this Errour, it would not follow that he Learn'd it of his Maſter, ſince we dayly ſee Heretical Diſciples, who have had Orthodox Maſters. Should not the Faith of St. *Chryſoſtom* rather ſerve to juſtify *Diodorus*, than the Errour of *Theodorus* to condemn him?

HILARY *the Deacon.*

Hilary the Deacon.

HILARY of *Sardinia*, Deacon of the Church of *Rome*, was deputed by Pope *Liberius* together with *Lucifer* Biſhop of *Calaris*, and the Prieſt *Pancratius*, to go to the Emperour *Conſtantius*, after the Synod of *Arles*, in the Year 353. He was baniſh'd after the Council of *Milan*, and afterwards he join'd with *Lucifer's* Party, whereof he was one of the moſt zealous Defenders. 'Tis this *Hillary*, who is call'd in St. *Jerom's* Dialogue againſt the *Luciferians*, *The Deucalion of the World*, becauſe he would Regenerate and Renew by a Second Baptiſm, thoſe that had been baptiz'd by Hereticks.

Tho' there has been no Book printed under the Name of this *Hilary*, yet the Learned have attributed to him the Commentary upon the Epiſtles of St. *Paul*, which bears the Name of St. *Ambroſe*, and the Queſtions upon the Old and New Teſtament, which are at the end of the 4th. Tome of St. *Auſtin*. Theſe are the Reaſons which have mov'd them to attribute to him the Commentary upon St. *Paul's* Epiſtles. Firſt, St. *Auſtin* in Ch. 4. of the 4th. B. to *Boniface*, cites under the Name of St. *Hilary*, an Explication of this Paſſage of St. *Paul*. *'Twas from him that all Men Sinn'd*, which is taken Word for Word out of this Commentary. Now this *Hilary* whom St. *Auſtin* quotes, could neither be *Hilary* of *Syracuſe*, nor St. *Hilary* of *Arles*, ſince they were after St. *Auſtin*. No more can it be ſaid, that the Author of theſe Commentaries was *Hilary* of *Poictiers*, becauſe the Stile and the Verſion which he makes uſe of, are no ways like to the Stile and Verſion of theſe Commentaries; and there are ſome Opinions in the one, which are different from thoſe in the other. This Commentary therefore cannot be attributed to any but this *Hilary* of *Sardinia*. Beſides, the Time and Circumſtances agree wonderfully to him; for he ſays on Ch. 3. of the 1ſt. to *Timothy*, *That tho' all the World was God's, yet the Church whereof* Damaſus *at preſent was Governour, is call'd his Houſe*: Which plainly ſhows, that this Commentary was written by one Well-affected to the Church of *Rome*, who liv'd in *Damaſus's* time: And therefore it cannot with any Reaſon be attributed to *Remigius* of *Lyons*, but moſt probably was written by this *Hilary* whom we now ſpeak of.

Yet *Petavius* thinks that it cannot be attributed to him for Two Reaſons; Firſt, becauſe this Author ſpeaks in favour of *Damaſus*, and 'tis not likely that a Man engag'd in the *Luciferian* Schiſm, which favour'd *Urſicinus*, ſhould acknowledge *Damaſus* lawful Biſhop of *Rome*. Secondly, becauſe upon Chap. 1. of the 1ſt. Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*, he blames the *Novatians* and *Donatiſts*, who rebaptiz'd, and ſays, that to believe that the Grace of Baptiſm depended upon the Perſons who gave it, was injurious to the Baptiſm of our Saviour. Now the principal Errour of *Hilary* the Deacon, according to the Teſtimony of St. *Jerome*, conſiſted in this, That he would have thoſe Re-baptiz'd who had been baptiz'd by the *Arians*. This objection cannot be anſwered, but by ſaying, that this *Hilary* did at laſt return into the Boſom of the Church under the Pontificate of *Damaſus*; but this ſuppoſition is contrary to the Teſtimony of St. *Jerome*, who ſays in his Book againſt the *Luciferians*, that this Deacon died out of the Church. *This Man*, ſays he, ſpeaking of *Hilary* the *Luciferian*, *being dead, his Sect ought to dy with him, becauſe he being but a ſimple Deacon, could ordain no Perſon to ſucceed him.* Wherefore it muſt be granted that we have no abſolute certainty, that this Book belong'd to this *Hilary* of *Sardinia*.

The Commentary upon the Two Firſt Chapters of the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, is an Extract out of the Commentary of St. *Chryſoſtom*, which is not made by the ſame Author as that upon the other Epiſtles.

'Tis

Hilary the Deacon.

'Tis thought that the Queſtions upon the Old and New Teſtament, which have been formerly printed under St. *Auſtin*'s Name, in his 4th. Tome, were written by the ſame hand as theſe Commentaries. To prove it, 'tis ſaid, firſt, that the Author of theſe Queſtions liv'd at the ſame time as the Author of the Commentary; for he ſays in Qu. 44. that he wrote 300 Years or thereabouts, after the Deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*, and he ſpeaks of *Photinus* as an Author then living. He ſpeaks alſo of the Devaſtation of *Pannonia* which happen'd in 351, and the Famine of the Year 363, as Calamities which happen'd in his time. Secondly, 'tis thought, that he ſpeaks in Qu. 115 of *Sardinia* as his own Country: And in ſhort, ſome maintain that there is ſo great an agreement both in Stile and Doctrine between theſe Two Treatiſes (*a*), that it cannot be doubted but they are written by the ſame Author. Which muſt be underſtood of the 47 Queſtions upon the Old Teſtament, the 50 upon the New, and the 36 upon the one and the other, which are all written by the ſame Author, and not of the other following Queſtions, which are for the moſt part a repetition of what had been ſaid in thoſe that went before.

But whoever was the Author of theſe Queſtions they are full of Falſities and Errors (*b*), and almoſt all of them are of very little uſe. The Commentary upon the Epiſtle of St. *Paul* is better done, and has more ſenſe in it: It is clear, plain and litteral, and gives the meaning of the Text of St. *Paul* well enough; but it gives very different Explications from St. *Auſtin* (*c*), in theſe places which concern Predeſtination, Provocation, Grace and Free-will.

(*a*) *There is ſo great an Agreement both in Stile and Doctrine*, &c.] Compare Queſt. 7. with the Commentary upon Ch. 6. to the *Epheſians*; Queſt. 13. with Comment. upon Ch. 5. to the *Rom.* Queſt. 18. with Comment. upon Ch. 9. to the *Rom.* Queſt. 21. with Comment. upon Ch. 6 and 11th. of the 1ſt. *Ep.* to the *Corinth.* Queſt. 23. with the Comment. on the 7th. Ch. of the Ep. to the *Rom.* Queſt. 24. with the Comment. upon the 1ſt. Ep. to the *Corinth.* Ch. 11th. Qu. 113. with the Com. upon Ch. 1ſt. of the Ep. to the *Epheſ.* and on Ch. 1ſt. of the Ep. to the *Coloſſ.* Qu. 47. with the Com. upon the 2d. Ch. of the 1ſt. to the *Corinth.* and upon Ch. 5. of the 2d. to the *Corinth.* Qu. 99. with the Com. upon Ch. 10. of the 1ſt. to the *Corinth.* Qu. 102. with the Com. upon Ch. 11. of the Ep. to the *Rom.* and upon Ch. 2d. of the 2d. to *Timothy.* Qu. 108. with the Com. upon Ch. 3. to the *Philipp.* Qu. 109. and 25. with the Com. upon Ch. 8. to the *Rom.* Qu. 112. with the Com. upon theſe Words: I *ſee another Law in my Members*, &c. Qu. 113. with the Com. upon Ch. 2d. of the 2d. Ep. to the *Theſſalonians.* Qu. 134 with the Com. upon Ch. 3. of the Ep. to the *Epheſ.* and Qu. 115. with the 1ſt. Ch. of Com. upon the ſame Ep. Theſe two Authors make often uſe of the ſame Words, and in the ſame Senſe; as, *Diffidentia* to ſignify Incredulity, and the Words, *Prævaricandi, Meliorandi*, &c.

(*b*) *Full of Falſities and Errors.*] A Catalogue of them may be ſeen in the Cenſure which the Doctors of *Lovain* have prefix'd to this Work; one of the chief of them is their Opinion, that *Melchiſedeck* was the Son of God.

(*c*) *Different Explications from St.* Auſtin.] For this one needs only read almoſt all the places of St. *Paul*, which concern Predeſtination or Grace. Particularly the Commentaries upon the 5th and 9th. Chapters of the Ep. to the *Romans*, upon the 2d. of the Ep. to the *Philippians*, and the Queſtions, 13, 24, 47, 115, 223. where he propoſes Maxims which are a little *Pelagian.*

PRISCILLIAN *and* Matronianus, Tiberianus *and* Dictinius *his Diſciples.*

Priſcillian and his Diſciples.

PRISCILLIAN, whom St. *Jerome* places among the Number of Eccleſiaſtical Writers, was the Author of a Sect which was accus'd of many impieties. *Sulpitius Severus*, who knew more of the Hiſtory of the *Priſcillianiſts* than any Eccleſiaſtical Author whatſoever, gives this Account of them: That towards the End of the Fourth Century, one *Mark* originally of *Egypt*, being leaven'd with the Principles of the *Gnoſticks* and *Manichees*, came into *Spain* to ſpread his Errors there; That at Firſt he had for his Diſciples a Woman call'd *Agapa*, and one *Elpidus* a Rhetorician; and that theſe were the Perſons who inſtructed *Priſcillian*; That he was a Perſon of Quality, Rich, Powerful, Quick and Reſtleſs, but very Eloquent and very Learn'd: That he acquir'd much Learning by hard Study, and that he had a wonderful Eaſineſs in ſpeaking and Diſputing. *Happy had he been*, adds *Sulpitius Severus*, *if he had not corrupted his fine Parts by joining with a wicked Faction. He had many good Qualities of Body and Mind. He endur'd with eaſe, Watchings, Hunger, and Thirſt. He had no deſire to be Rich, and liv'd with much Frugality; but he was proud, and profane Learning had puff'd him up intolerably. 'Tis ſaid that he had formerly exercis'd the Art of Magick. This Man having, as we have ſaid, embrac'd the pernicious Doctrine of* Marcus *and* Elpidus, *drew many Perſons of his own Country after him, either by perſuading them with Reaſons, or flattering them with Careſſes. Women who naturally love Novelty, and have commonly much Curioſity, and but little Steadineſs, flock'd after him in great Multitudes, to be admitted among his Party. In a word, he procured the Love and Reſpect of all the World, by the ſhew of Humility which appear'd in his Clothes and his Countenance.* Spain *began to be infected with the Venom of this Hereſy, and even ſome Biſhops were corrupted with it. There were particularly two of them call'd* Inſtantius *and* Salvianus, *who were engag'd by Oath into the Faction of* Priſcillian. *But* Hyginus *Biſhop of* Corduba, *their Neighbour, underſtanding it, informed againſt them to* Idacius *of* Merida, *who kindled, as one may ſay, the Fire of Diviſion by the rigour which he us'd, and irritated Men's mindes without putting a ſtop to the growing Evil. In ſhort, after many Diſputes, the Synod of* Saragoza *was Aſſembled, at which the Biſhops of* Aquitaine *were preſent;*

preſent; and theſe Hereticks not daring to appear there were condemn'd for their Contumacy. Sentence was given againſt the Biſhops Inſtantius, Salvianus, *and againſt* Elpidus *and* Priſcillian. *'Twas alſo added, That all thoſe who ſhould receive them into Communion, ſhould expect the ſame Condemnation with them.* Ithacius, *Biſhop of* Oſſobona, *was entruſted with the Publication of this Sentence, and with the Management of the Excommunication againſt* Hyginus *the Biſhop, who being the firſt that oppos'd* Priſcillian *and his Diſciples, was afterwards himſelf corrupted, and received them into his Communion.* But *Inſtantius* and *Salvianus*, without any regard to the Judgment of the Council of *Saragoza* Ordain'd *Priſcillian* Biſhop of *Avila*. Then the Biſhops of the other Party had recourſe to the Authority of the Emperour, and obtain'd of *Gratian* an Edict, wherein the *Priſcillianiſts* were condemn'd to be driven out of the Churches, and to be baniſh'd out of the Cities where they dwelt. *Inſtantius* and *Salvianus* being chac'd away out of their own Countrey, went to *Rome* and *Milan*; but they were rejected by *Damaſus*, and St. *Ambroſe*. After which they had recourſe to the Emperour, and obtain'd of him a Reſcript, wherein he permitted them to return to their own Country, and ordain'd, that their Churches ſhould be reſtor'd unto them. They return'd into *Spain* with this Edict, and having gain'd the Proconſul, they forc'd away *Ithacius*. He fled into *France* and carried his Complaints to the Tyrant *Maximus*, who was entered as a Conquerour into the City of *Triers*: This Prince caus'd *Priſcillian* and his chief Diſciples to be carried to a Synod held at *Bourdeaux*, in the Year 384, in which *Inſtantius* was Depos'd; and when they would have proceeded to judge *Priſcillian* alſo, he appeal'd from them to the Emperour *Maximus*, who commited the Judgment of this Affair to the Prefect *Evodius*, who having Convicted *Priſcillian* of Witchcraft and Uncleanneſs, made his Report of the whole Matter to *Maximus*, who condemn'd him and his chief Followers, to have their Heads cut off, which was done in the Year 385. Some have thought that *Priſcillian* was Innocent, and that he was unjuſtly oppreſs'd by the Faction of *Ithacius*, whoſe Conduct was diſapprov'd by the moſt Pious Biſhops of that time. It ſeems that St. *Jerome* favours this Opinion in his Catalogue, where he ſpeaks of *Priſcillian* in theſe Words: Priſcillian *Biſhop of* Avila *was Executed in the City of* Triers *by the Commandment of the Tyrant* Maximus, *having been oppreſs'd by the Faction of* Hilatius (it muſt be read, *Ithacius,*) *and* Idacius: *He wrote many Tracts whereof ſome are come to our Hands. Some accuſe him even at this Day of the Hereſie of the* Gnoſticks, *of* Baſilides *and* Marcion; *but others vindicate him, and maintain that he held none of thoſe Errors that are charg'd upon him.* 'Tis true, that the ſame St. *Jerome* in a Letter to *Cteſiphon* ſpeaks of *Priſcillian* as a notable Heretick, which made Monſieur *Queſnel* think, that this place of St. *Jerome*'s Book of Eccleſiaſtical Writters was interpolated. This Conjecture, which is not founded upon the Authority of any Manuſcript, would be of ſome moment if it were not known that St. *Jerome* does often ſpeak differently of one and the ſame Perſon. Perhaps St. *Jerome*'s way of ſpeaking of him in his Catalogue, gave occaſion to put *Priſcillian* and his Diſciple *Matronianus* into ſome Martyrologies, and to rank them among the Holy Martyrs.

Priſcillian and his Diſciples.

St. *Jerome* ſpeaks of this laſt after this manner: Matronianus *of* Spain, *a learned Man, and one that was comparable to the Ancients for Poetry, was alſo put to Death with* Priſcillian, Feliciſſimus, Julianus *and* Euchrotia, *who were all of the ſame Party. We have ſome of his Works in Verſe, which are Evidences of his Wit and Parts. Sulpitius Severus* call'd this Diſciple of *Priſcillian*, *Latronianus*, for *Matronianus.*

Tiberianus of *Batica* was alſo an Author of this Sect, *who wrote*, ſays St. *Jerome*, *an Apology to vindicate himſelf from the Suſpicion of Hereſie, whereof he was accus'd together with* Priſcillian. *His Stile is ſwelling and affected. After the Death of thoſe of his Party, being overcome by the tediouſneſs of a long Exile, he married a Virgin conſecrated to Jeſus Chriſt.*

Dictinius was a Prieſt, who had been accus'd of the ſame Error, and condemn'd for it in the Council of *Langres*. St. *Ambroſe* wrote Letters in his favour to procure his Reſtauration; *But upon condition that he ſhould condemn what he had done, and that he ſhould continue Prieſt without being capable of riſing to a higher Dignity.* Nevertheleſs he did not perform theſe Conditions, for he continued ſtill in his ancient Error, and got himſelf Ordain'd Biſhop of *Aſturica Auguſta*. Being cited upon this Account to the Firſt Council of *Toledo* in the Year 390, together with *Symphoſius* who Ordain'd him, he did not appear before the Synod; but appearing afterwards at a Second Synod held about the Year 400, there *Symphoſius* declar'd, That he was forc'd by the People to Ordain *Dictinius*, and *Dictinius* himſelf made a Solemn Recantation of his Errors, whereupon they were both abſolv'd. He wrote ſome Treatiſes for the Error of the *Priſcillianiſts*, which are mention'd by St. *Leo*, in a Letter to *Turribius*. What we have ſaid of the Reſtauration of *Dictinius*, ſeems to be contrary to the Teſtimony of *Idacius*, who ſays, that *Turribius* was plac'd in the room of *Dictinius* after he was Depos'd for his Hereſie; but St. *Leo* declares very plainly in the Letter which we juſt now cited, that *Dictinius* died a Catholick. From whence it appears, that *Idacius*, (the Author of the Chronicle, who lived in the Fifth Age of the Church, and is different from him of whom we have now ſpoken) was deceived, and that *Turribius* ſucceeded *Dictinius* after his Death, and not after his Depoſition. For to ſay, as Monſieur *Queſnel* does, that the Acts of the Council of *Toledo* are falſified, or that *Dictinius* relaps'd a ſecond time after his Retractation, is to alledge that which has no Foundation, which is contrary to the Teſtimony of St. *Leo*, who affirms that this Biſhop died a Catholick, and that we may have a Veneration for his Memory after his Retractation.

ITHA-

ITHACIUS, *or* IDACIUS.

Ithacius or *Idacius.*

THis *IDACIUS* or *ITHACIUS*, Sirnam'd *Clarus*, Biſhop of *Oſſobona*, a City in the Province of *Bætica*, was, as we have already ſaid, one of the greateſt Enemies of the *Priſcillianiſts*. St. *Iſidore* of *Sevil* obſerves in his Book of Eccleſiaſtical Writers, That he wrote a Book by way of Apology, againſt the Deteſtable Doctrines of *Priſcillian*, wherein he diſcovers the Witchcraft and Infamous Crimes of thoſe Sectaries, and ſhews, That a certain Magician call'd *Mark*, a Native of *Memphis* in *Egypt*, was the Diſciple of *Manichæus*, and Maſter of *Priſcillian*. The ſame Author adds, That this *Idacius* was depriv'd of the Communion of the Church, together with the Biſhop *Urſacius*, upon the account of the Death of *Priſcillian*, whoſe Accuſers they had been; and that he being ſent into Baniſhment, ended his Days there under the Reign of *Theodoſius* and *Valentinian*. St. *Iſidore* makes no mention of the Books againſt *Varimadus*, which bear the Name of *Idacius*; and indeed they do not belong to this Author, but to *Vigilius Tapſenſis*, as we ſhall ſhew when we come to ſpeak of *Vigilius*: This Apologetick of *Idacius* is loſt. St. *Iſidore* obſerves that it was well written. [*Idacius* and *Ithacius* are not two different Names for the ſame Perſon, as here ſeems to be implied; for in *Sulpitius Severus* they are conſtantly divided.]

FAUSTINUS.

Fauſtinus.

GEnnadius aſſures us, that *Fauſtinus* a Prieſt (or a Deacon according to others) wrote to the Empreſs *Flaccilla* Seven Books againſt the *Arians* and *Macedonians*, wherein he refutes and confounds them by the very ſame Paſſages that the Hereticks uſe to eſtabliſh their Blaſphemies. This Work was a long time attributed to *Gregory* of *Bætica*; but at laſt the True Author of it was own'd, and it was printed under the Name of *Fauſtinus*, with a Letter to *Flaccilla*.

The ſame *Gennadius* ſays alſo, That this ſame *Fauſtinus*, wrote a Petition, which he preſented with the Prieſt *Marcellinus*, (or rather *Marcellianus*) to the Emperours *Valentinian* and *Theodoſius*, which ſhows evidently that he was engag'd in the Schiſm of the *Luciferians*. *Sirmondus* publiſh'd this little Piece in the Year 1656. Before the Petition there is a Preface written by the ſame *Fauſtinus*, wherein he gives a little Hiſtorical Abridgment in favour of his own Party. There he relates, That under the Reign of *Conſtantius*, almoſt all the Biſhops attempted to condemn St. *Athanaſius*; That *Liberius* of *Rome*, *Euſebius* of *Verſeilles*, *Lucifer* of *Calaris*, and St. *Hilary* of *Poictiers*, refuſing to approve this unjuſt Condemnation, were ſent into Baniſhment; That *Damaſus* who was then Deacon of *Rome*, pretended he would accompany *Liberius*, but returned again immediately; That the Clergy of *Rome*, in the preſence of the People took an Oath, not to receive another Biſhop while *Liberius* liv'd; That notwithſtanding this, in a little time after, the Clergy choſe the Archdeacon *Felix* to fill his Place; That *Liberius* having conſented to Impiety, [by ſubſcribing an *Arian* Confeſſion of Faith] return'd about three Years after, and was reſtor'd to the Poſſeſſion of his See, and that *Felix* was driven away from *Rome*; Upon whoſe Death, which happen'd Eight Years after *Liberius* came back, he received into Communion thoſe of the Clergy that had been of *Felix*'s Party; That he died alſo in a little while after, and then the Prieſts and Deacons who had been faithful to *Liberius* in his Baniſhment, choſe *Urſicinus* in his room; but the perfidious Party choſe *Damaſus* an ambitious Man, who had always aſpir'd to the Epiſcopal Chair; That this Man had committed all ſorts of Cruelties and Outrages againſt thoſe who adhered to *Urſicinus*, and at laſt had driven them all out of the City. That ſince this time thoſe of the Orthodox Party had been abus'd, diſpers'd, and baniſh'd, and that two of them call'd *Marcellinus* and *Fauſtinus* preſented this Petition to the Emperours *Valentinian*, *Theodoſius*, and *Arcadius*.

They complain in this Petition of the Perſecutions and Cruelties which they ſay they ſtill ſuffer from their Enemies; They affirm, That no Error nor Hereſie can be charg'd upon them, and then accuſed their Adverſaries of having been formerly Hereticks, or of having conſented to the Condemnation of the Faith of the Church. They deſcribe the Miſerable End of *Arius*, to beget a Horror of his Impiety; and they ſay, That God hath by this viſible Judgment approv'd all that was done in the Council of *Nice*. They relate afterwards what pas'd in the Councils of *Seleucia* and *Ariminum*, and how the Biſhops were forc'd to Sign the Heretical Confeſſions of Faith: They bewail their Unhappineſs, and praiſe the Faith and Conſtancy of *Paulinus* of *Triers*, of *Euſebius* of *Verſeilles*, of *Lucifer* of *Calaris*, and a very ſmall number of Biſhops, who choſe rather to ſuffer all things than do any thing againſt their Conſcience. They deſcribe the Defection of *Hoſius* Biſhop of *Corduba*, and ſay, That he died by a viſible Judgment of God, for pronouncing Sentence againſt *Gregory* of *Bætica*, who had always boldly defended the Faith. They ſay, That the ſame thing happen'd to *Potamius* of *Oſſobona*. They add, That theſe viſible Judgments of God do plainly ſhew, that thoſe who would not communicate with the Biſhops that were defil'd with theſe Crimes, are ſo far from being guilty of Impiety, that they do great Service to the Church; That the great number of thoſe who communicate with them, ought to be no Prejudice to others, ſince this Conduct is contrary to Scripture; That the Pretence of promoting Peace ought not to make us own Apoſtates for Lawful Biſhops; That the Inconſtancy of the Catholicks, has given occaſion to *Valens* to embrace the *Arian* Faction.

Faction. They represent afterwards in a most Odious manner, the Cruelties which they say were committed against their Party in different places of the World, and they conjure the Emperour to put a stop to this Persecution by his Edicts, *Not*, add they, *that we are afraid to Suffer, or to Die, being perswaded, that when we Die for a good Cause, we shall enjoy after our Death great Tranquility, and have a perfect certainty of our Blessedness. But we give you Notice of this Disorder, for fear lest the Blood of Christians, if it still continue to be shed, bring down the Wrath of God upon your Government.* Tho' the Complaints of these Two Priests were injurious to the Church, yet *Theodosius* was mov'd by them, and granted a Rescript in their Favour, address'd to *Cynegius* the Prætorian Prefect, wherein he testifies his Indignation against the manner of treating them, and ordains, That the Bishops *Gregory* of *Spain*, and *Heraclides* of the East, who are mentioned in their Petition, and all those who communicate with them be suffered to live in quiet. This Petition must have been presented after the Year 383, because *Arcadius* to whom it is address'd, was not admitted a Partner of the Empire till that Year, and the Rescript must be before 388, which was the Year wherein *Cynegius* died. It seems to have been presented while *Damasus* lived, who died in the Year 384. *Faustinus.*

There is some probability that *Faustinus* presented the Confession of Faith, which goes under his Name in the Roman Code, publish'd by Monsieur *Quesnel* at the End of the Works of St. *Leo*, along with this Petition. I know very well that this Learned Man pretends, that this Confession of Faith was made about the Year 379, before the Council of *Constantinople*; but his Conjectures are not convincing: He attributes to the Priest *Marcellinus*, the Confession of Faith which precedes this in the New Code; but this also is a Conjecture that is not absolutely certain.

The Style of *Faustinus*, in his Treatise of the Trinity, is very plain and simple: He contents himself with producing Passages of Scripture, from which he draws Consequences to prove the Doctrine of the Church, and with answering the Objections of the *Arians*; but the Style of his Petition is swelling and pathetical. In it you may see the Humour and Genius of all Reformers, who Glory in their small Number, who blame the Multitude, who rend in pieces the Reputation of those who are promoted to Dignities, who testifie their Indignation against the Higher Powers, who make a show of much Firmness and Constancy, of a great contempt of this Life, of Honours and Riches; who look upon themselves as unblameable, and attribute to the Divine Vengeance all the Fatal Accidents which happen to those that are not their Friends; who are always complaining of being Persecuted and ill used; who exaggerate the Evils which they justly suffer, and effect to show a great Zeal for Piety and Religion.

[Every Reader must needs see that these Reflections were inserted here more for the sake of the Protestants, than of the Luciferians: Either all Abuses ought always to be tolerated, or a Reformer is not to be blamed upon the score of his Office: And when Men set up for *Reformers*, the Cause only is to be considered, not the Pretences; which if it be just, they have no reason to be ashamed of any of these things here urged against them as Marks of Obloquy; if their Numbers are small, they ought to shew by a proportionable firmness of Mind, that they place their Confidence in a Being that is Superiour to any Powers here below; and if they find Fault with the Multitude, who do not joyn with them, they act according to their own Principles, since all Men who think themselves to be in the Right, must believe that their Adversaries are mistaken; their standing to their own Assertions cannot reasonably be interpreted to be injurious to Men in eminent Places: Constancy, Contempt of the World, of Life, Riches and Honours, are Vertues, which, when supported by a good Cause, are glorious Ingredients in the Characters of the greatest Saints; and therefore are favourable Prejudices for all those *Reformers* in whom they are to be found; if they are too apt to attribute the ill Successes of their Enemies to Divine Vengeance, they are not Singular, since all Parties, and even all Religions constantly practise it; if they are hardly used they may reasonably complain of their Usage; and Mr. *du Pin* knows that his Church has always taken very particular Care that her Adversaries should never complain against her for Persecuting without just Cause, whilst they believe themselves to be in the Right: *Reformers*, as all Men naturally do, will aggravate their Sufferings, that they may lay load upon their Persecutors; and last of all, every Man is tempted to think his Adversary's Zeal for Religion to be only Hypocritical.

If we consider what good Success these Two Luciferian Priests had in their Business, we ought not hastily to condemn them: *Theodosius* the Great always shew'd an unshaken Zeal for the Orthodox Faith; and his Carriage towards St. *Ambrose*, who censured him for his hasty and cruel Orders against the *Thessalonians*, was an Evidence how very much he Reverenc'd the Orders and Discipline of the Church; and besides, if we reflect upon the Accounts which *Ammianus Marcellinus* gives us of the Differences between *Damasus* and *Ursicinus*, they will seem to plead for *Ursicinus*'s Party. His being a Heathen, is no prejudice against him in this Matter, because he was not a Bigot against the Christian Religion; so that it rather gave him the Advantage which all Neuters have of judging impartially of both sides.]

PHILASTRIUS.

PHILASTRIUS Bishop of *Brescia*, flourish'd under the Elder *Theodosius*, and was one of the Bishops in the Council of *Aquileia*. St. *Austin* says, That he had seen him sometimes with St. *Ambrose*. We have his Life written, as is thought, by St. *Gaudentius* his Successor. He died before St. *Ambrose* about the Year 387 (*a*.) *Philastrius*

(*a*) *About the Year* 387.] The Author of this Life, says, That he died before St. *Ambrose*. In Heresie 63 'tis said, That he wrote in the Year 430, but 'tis plain that this was the Mistake of a Figure, and that they put a C for an L, which would make it just 380.

Philaſtrius

He wrote a Treatiſe of Hereſies, wherein he reckons 20 Hereſies before the Birth of Jeſus Chriſt, and 128 afterwards to the Year 380, in which he wrote, and tells in a few Words the principal Errors of each of them. St. *Auſtin* obſerves at the beginning of his Book about Hereſies, that it was a ſurprizing thing that *Philaſtrius*, who was much leſs learned and leſs exact than St. *Epiphanius*, ſhould reckon up many more Hereſies than he did; from whence he concludes, that theſe two Authors could not have the ſame Notions of Hereſie, becauſe indeed it is very difficult to give a juſt Definition of it. Wherefore, adds St. *Auſtin*, in giving the Catalogue of Hereſies, we muſt carefully avoid theſe two oppoſite extremes, whereof one is to make thoſe Hereſies that are not, and the other is to omit thoſe Hereſies which really are ſuch. 'Tis a rare thing for thoſe who make the Catalogues of Hereſies to fall into this laſt Fault; but the firſt is very common, and *Philaſtrius* was more ſubject to it than any body. For he feigns a multitude of Hereſies that never were (*b*,) and ſometimes he puts in the number of Hereſies thoſe Opinions that are true, or at leaſt problematically diſputed (*c*.) And therefore we need not wonder, that he made ſo numerous a Catalogue of Hereſies, which he alſo multiplied, by mentioning one and the ſame Hereſie many times.

The Style of this Author is mean and flat; he had no great Learning, and has committed many groſs Faults (*d*) in this little Tract, which is not written with any exactneſs: Yet there are ſome remarkable things in it (*e*.)

This Treatiſe was printed at *Baſle* in 1528; and at *Helmſtadt* in 1611, and in 1614, and with St. *Auſtin*'s Book of Hereſies, in ſeveral places, and in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*.

(*b*) *Hereſies that never were.*] As the *Nazareans*, the *Heliognoſts*, the Adorers of Mice, the *Muſcarommites*, the *Troglodites* in the Old Teſtament, the *Fortunatians*, the *Baalites*, the *Celebites*, the *Molochites*, the *Tophites*; making ſeveral Sects of Hereticks, of the Abominations committed by the Jews, and the Sacrifices of the People that were their Neighbours. But nothing is more pleaſant than his Invention of the Hereſie of the *Puteorites*, which he founds upon that paſſage of *Jeremy*. *They have forſaken me the Fountain of Living Water, to make to themſelves broken Ciſterns*. That which he founds upon the 8*th*. Ch. of *Ezekiel* is not better grounded. Never any but he mentioned the Hereſies of *Judas*, of the *Paſſalorinchites*, the *Rhelorians*, the *Diſcalceati*, and ſome others: Of one and the ſame Hereſie, he many times makes many; and in a word, he reckons the number of Hereſies, not by the Sects, but by every particular Opinion. In our days, he might have multiplied at a much greater rate the number of Hereſies, by counting as many Errors as have been invented by one or other..

(*c*) *He puts in the number of Hereſies thoſe Opinions that are true, or at leaſt problematical.*] As in *Hereſie* 26, that the Soul of *Samuel* was brought back by the Witch of *Endor*; in the 59th. the Error of the *Millenaries*; in the 79th. that the Elements ſhall not periſh; in the 88th. that the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews* may be St. *Luke*'s, or St. *Barnabas*'s; in the 63d. that there are more than 7 Heavens; in 94, that there is no other Earth but this; in 96, that the likeneſs of Man to God may be explain'd with relation to his Body; in 97, that the Breath which God inſpir'd into Man was his Soul; in 101, that Earthqnakes are natural Effects; in 102, and 111, that the Names of prophane Gods may be given to the Stars; in 110, that the number of years ſince the Creation is not certain; in 126, that *David* was not the Author of all the *Pſalms*; in 129, that the Stars are faſten'd to Heaven; in 137, and thoſe that follow, that we may follow another Verſion beſides that of the Seventy and ſome others; in the 56th. he condemns thoſe that admit *Eccleſiaſticus* as a Canonical Book.

(*d*) *Many groſs Faults.*] There are an infinite number of them in this Book; take ſome few of them. He places the *Ophites*, the *Gaïanites*, and the *Troglodites* among the Hereticks which were before Jeſus Chriſt, which is an Error in Chronology. He ſays, the *Samaritans* came from a King call'd *Samarius*, the Son of *Canaan*. What a ſtrange Miſtake is here! He ſays that *Mercurius Triſmegiſtus* came to the *Celtæ*, and taught them to adore the Sun. He affirms, that the God *Actaron* was a Fly. He ſuppoſes that not only *Simon Magus*, *Baſilides*, &c. but alſo *Cerdon*, *Marcion*, and many other Hereticks, publiſh'd their Errors while the Apoſtles were alive; a wonderful Miſtake in Chronology. There are many more in it of this Nature.

(*e*) *There are ſome remarkable things in it.*] He confirms in many places the Immortality and Spirituality of the Soul, and chiefly in Hereſie 122. In *Hæreſ.* 87. he admits as Canonical the Two Epiſtles of St. *Peter*, that of St. *Jude*, and the Three Epiſtles of St. *John*. He explains the Myſtery of the Trinity in *Hæreſ.* 91, 92. He diſcourſes of Grace in *Hæreſ.* 97. He ſays very curious things about the Diverſity and Gift of Tongues in *Hæreſ.* 103, 104. He rejects in 105, the Opinion of thoſe who thought that the Day of Judgment ſhould happen 363 Years after Jeſus Chriſt. In 106 he rejects the Opinion of thoſe who imagin'd, that the Sons of Men ſpoken of in *Geneſis*, were Angels. In the 112 he laughs at thoſe that ſay there are many Worlds. In *Hæreſ.* 116. he plainly admits Original Sin. In 121, he rejects the Opinion of thoſe, who believ'd that Jeſus Chriſt deſcended into Hell, and preach'd the Goſpel there to all the Damned, and that thoſe of them who believ'd in him were ſav'd. In 129, he explains the Eternal Generation of the World. In 124, he teaches that Men ought to run in the Ways of Vertue, and to deſire what is Good, but they ought not to do it with Pride and Haughtineſs, for they ſhould acknowledge that they cannot deſerve Salvation by their own Works, but by the Mercy of Jeſus Chriſt; that it is indeed in our Power to run, but we ought to hope for greater things from God; and therefore we ought not to magnifie our ſelves, and ſay, *I can be a Martyr, I can be an Apoſtle*, but we muſt add, *If Jeſus Chriſt will*: Becauſe it is from him that we obtain theſe Graces, and they are not to be acquir'd by a vain Preſumption. In *Hereſie* 144, he obſerves that the Church celebrates Four Solemn Faſts, before *Chriſtmas*, before *Epiphany*, before *Eaſter*, and before *Whitſunday*. I leave the other Obſervations to thoſe who will take the pains to read this little Tract, whoſe brevity is one of its beſt Qualities.

TIMO-

TIMOTHY *of* Alexandria.

Timothy of Alexandria.

TIMOTHY the Succeſſor of *Peter* of *Alexandria*, who was preſent at the Second Council of *Conſtantinople*, wrote the Lives of the Monks of *Egypt*, which is mention'd by *Sozomen*, Ch. 29. of B. VI. of his Hiſtory. *Facundus* in Ch. 2. of B. IV. cites a Letter of the ſame *Timothy*, addreſs'd to *Diodorus* of *Tarſus*.

We have now the Reſponſes or Canon-Laws of this Biſhop, upon which *Balſamon* has written Commentaries. The Queſtions that were propos'd to him, were Queſtions about Cuſtoms and Practices of the Church, and his Anſwers are very Judicious.

In the Firſt he ſays, That thoſe young Catechumens ought to be Baptiz'd, who being preſent in the Church, with the Faithful, had received the Eucharift.

The Second and Third concern thoſe that are poſſeſs'd by an Evil Spirit; he ſays, That thoſe Catechumens ought not to be Baptiz'd who are afflicted with this Evil, until the point of Death. As to the Faithful, he would have them permitted from time to time to approach the Holy Myſteries, provided the Devil do not ſeduce them to diſcover theſe Myſteries, or to blaſpheme them.

In the 4th. he ſays, That thoſe Catechumens may be Baptiz'd, who have loſt their Wits by Sickneſs.

In the 5th. He counſels married Perſons to abſtain from the uſe of Marriage, on that day in which they intended to receive the Communion.

In the 6th. and 7th. He would not have Women Baptiz'd, nor receive the Communion, but at certain times.

In the 8th. He exempts Women newly brought to Bed from the Faſt of *Lent*: *Becauſe*, ſays he, *Faſting was not appointed but to afflict the Body, and therefore where the Body is already afflicted, they may take what is neceſſary for it.*

In the 9th. he ſays, That the Clergy ought not to uſe the Publick Prayers in the preſence of the *Arians* and *Hereticks*, if they have a deſign to forſake their Hereſie: He takes notice, That the Deacon was wont to ſay with a loud Voice, before he ſaluted the People, *Let thoſe who do not Communicate withdraw.*

In the 10th. He exempts ſick Perſons from the Faſt of *Lent*, and permits them to eat Oyl in that time.

In the 11th. he ſays, That a Clergy-man ought not to marry Perſons contrary to Law.

In the 12th. He excuſes Nocturnal Illuſions, when they do not proceed from a voluntary Cauſe.

In the 13th. He would have Perſons that are Married abſtain from the uſe of Marriage on *Saturday* and *Sunday*, that they may be capable of receiving the Communion.

In the 14th. he ſays, That an Oblation may be offer'd for thoſe that kill themſelves through Madneſs, having loſt the uſe of their Reaſon; but becauſe this Pretence is often alledg'd to procure an Offering for thoſe that kill themſelves knowingly, therefore the Matter ſhould be well examin'd.

The 15th. Queſtion is of great Conſequence. It was ask'd, ſuppoſing a Wife to be perfectly Fooliſh and Mad, ſo that ſhe muſt be bound, Whether an Husband, who, ſays he, cannot contain himſelf, may lawfully marry another Wife? He anſwers, That this Action would be Adultery in him; and that nothing elſe is to be ſaid upon the Queſtion.

In the 16th. 'twas ask'd, Whether a Perſon that faſted in order to Communicate, having by chance ſwallow'd down a drop of Water, either in bathing himſelf, or in waſhing his Mouth, ought to Communicate or no? He anſwers, That he ought to do it ſo much the rather, becauſe 'tis the Devil that uſes this Artifice to hinder his receiving the Communion.

In the 17th. he ſays, That thoſe who hear the Word of God and do it not, are in ſome meaſure excuſable, if they be angry with themſelves for their Omiſſion, and accuſe themſelves of it.

In the Laſt, he ſays, That Men begin to ſin, when they come to the uſe of Reaſon, and ſo ſome begin to ſin at Ten Years of Age; ſome ſooner and ſome later.

NECTARIUS.

Nectarius

NECTARIUS who was choſen Arch-biſhop of *Conſtantinople* in the Year 382, after St. *Gregory Nazianzen* withdrew, paſſes for the Author of a Homily upon the Feſtival of the Martyr *Theodorus*, printed at *Paris* by *Nivelle* in 1554, together with ſome Homilies of St. *Chryſoſtom*. He diſcourſes in this Homily of Alms-giving and Faſting. *Nectarius* died in 397. He could not be very skilful in Divinity, having ſpent all his Life at Court, and being only a Catechumen when he was choſen to be Biſhop.

Gelaſius of Cæſarea.

GELASIUS *of* Cæſarea.

ST. *Jerome* places *Gelaſius* Succeſſor to *Euzoïus* Biſhop of *Cæſarea* in *Palæſtine*, amongſt the Eccleſiaſtical Writers. He aſſures us, That he had an exact and polite Style, but that he would not publiſh his Works. *Photius* in Vol. 89. aſſures us, That he read the Continuation of the Hiſtory of *Euſebius*, written by *Ruffinus*, tranſlated into Greek by this Author. He obſerves, That he was the Nephew of St. *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem*, and that this Father was his Fellow-labourer in the Tranſlation of this Hiſtory. *Theodoret* in his firſt Dialogue quotes with commendation a Paſſage of this Author, taken out of a Homily upon the Apparition of Jeſus Chriſt, which proves the diſtinction of the Two Natures in Chriſt.

SIRICIUS.

Siricius.

SIRICIUS ſucceeded Pope *Damaſus* in the Year 385, and govern'd the Church of *Rome* till the Year 398. The Letters of this Pope, are the Firſt Decretals which are truly the Pope's whoſe Name they bear.

The Firſt Letter he wrote ſoon after he was promoted to the Pontifical Dignity, in anſwer to *Himerius* Biſhop of *Tarracon*, upon ſome Queſtions which he had propos'd to *Damaſus* Predeceſſor to *Siricius*.

The Firſt Queſtion was, Whether the *Arians* muſt be Re-baptized who were re-admitted into the Church. *Siricius* anſwers, That this was by no means to be permitted, becauſe the Apoſtle forbids it, becauſe the Canons condemn it, and becauſe it was forbidden by the Conſtitutions of his Predeceſſor *Liberius*, which were ſent to all the Churches of the World, after the annulling of the Council of *Ariminum*. " Wherefore, adds he, in obedience to what was Ordain'd, by a Synod, We re-" concile them to the Church, as well as the *Novatians*, and other Hereticks by Invocation of the Ho-" ly Spirit, and by impoſition of Hands made by the Biſhops: This is the Method which all the Eaſt " and all the Weſt obſerves, and you cannot vary from this Practice, but you will deſerve to be ſepa-" rated from our Society by a Synodical Sentence.

The Second Queſtion propos'd by *Himerius*, was about the time wherein Baptiſm ought to be Adminiſtred. *Siricius* thinks, that in this we ſhould follow the Cuſtom of the Church of *Rome*, that this Sacrament ſhould not be Adminiſtred but at *Eaſter* and *Whitſontide*; yet he excepts Infants and ſuch as are in danger of their Life, who ſhould be reliev'd with all ſpeed. " For fear, ſays he, leſt " we be guilty before God of the loſs of thoſe to whom we have refus'd Baptiſm. He would have " this Law obſerv'd by all the Biſhops, and threatens thoſe who ſhall not obſerve it, to ſeparate them " from the Apoſtolick Rock, upon which Chriſt has built his Univerſal Church. Yet this Law was never punctually obſerv'd, neither in the Eaſt nor in the Weſt; and nevertheleſs the Biſhops who did not obſerve it, were never upon this Account ſeparated from the Apoſtolick Rock upon which Chriſt built his Univerſal Church.

The Third Queſtion is concerning thoſe who having receiv'd Baptiſm had faln into Apoſtacy. *Siricius* ordains, that if they acknowledge their Fault, they ſhould do Penance for the reſt of their Life; but that the favour of Reconciliation ſhould be granted them at the point of Death.

The Fourth Queſtion was, Whether a Man could marry a Woman that was promis'd to another. *Siricius* Anſwers, that we muſt not ſuffer it to be done, becauſe it was a kind of Sacrilege to violate the Bleſſing which the Prieſt or Biſhop gave to her that was to be married.

The Fifth concerns Penitents, who have relaps'd into the Sins of the Fleſh, after they had compleated their Penance, and were reconcil'd to the Church. *Siricius* ſays, that ſince they have no further the benefit of Penance, he thinks it convenient to give them leave to be preſent at the Prayers of the Church; but upon condition that they ſhall be kept back from the Holy Table, that is, from the participation of the Sacrament of the Euchariſt; yet he would have this *Viaticum* granted them at the point of Death. He Ordains that the ſame Method ſhall be obſerved towards Women that fall into Sins of this Nature. And in fine, as to Monks and Religious Perſons guilty of Uncleanneſs, he Ordains, that thoſe deteſtable Perſons ſhall be ſeparated not only from the Aſſemblies of the Church, but alſo from the Society of Monks, and that being ſhut up in Priſon, they ſhall bewail their Sin all the remainder of their Life, that ſo they may be capable of deſerving the Communion of the Church at the Hour of Death.

After this, he ſpeaks in the 7th. Canon againſt thoſe Perſons, who being in Orders do not obſerve Celebacy. And he declares, That if for the future any Biſhop, Prieſt, or Deacon ſhall not continue unmarried, he is to hope for no more Pardon, becauſe it was neceſſary to cut off with the Knife thoſe Sores that could not be cur'd by other Remedies.

The Eighth Canon is againſt thoſe who get themſelves Ordain'd after they have had ſeveral Wives.

In the Ninth, *Siricius* obſerves the ſeveral Degrees through which one muſt paſs before he arrives at the Prieſthood. He ſays, That he who devotes himſelf to the Service of the Church, ſhould be baptiz'd very Young, and plac'd among the number of Readers; that if he behaves himſelf diſcreetly till he be 30 Years Old, he may during that time be made an Acolyth and Sub-deacon, provided that he

he does not marry above once, and then he does not marry a Widow; that after he ſhould be Ordain'd Deacon, if he obliges himſelf to live unmarried; Five Years after the Order of Prieſthood may be conferr'd upon him; and that in fine at the end of Ten Years, he may be made Biſhop. Thus *Siricius* diſpoſes of their time who are deſign'd for the Clergy, from the Firſt Years of their Life: But for thoſe that would enter into Holy Orders when they are already come to Years, he ſays, in the Tenth Canon, that immediately after their Baptiſm, they ſhould be plac'd in the Rank of Readers or Exoriſts, and Two Years after they ſhould be made Acolyths and Subdeacons, at the end of Five Years Deacons, and ſome time after Prieſts, and afterwards Biſhops, if the People and the Clergy ſhould chooſe them. Theſe Rules are very fine in ſpeculation, but it was never ſeen that they were exactly obſerv'd, and indeed it had been very difficult to do it. *Siricius.*

In the 7th. he declares, that every Clergy-man who ſhall marry a Second Wife or a Widow, ſhall be turn'd out of Holy Orders, and reduc'd to Lay-Communion.

In The 12th. he obſerves, that no other Woman muſt be ſuffer'd to dwell with the Clergy, but thoſe whom the Council of *Nice* has allow'd.

In the 13th. he ſpeaks of the Ordination of Monks. "We wiſh, ſays he, and deſire, that thoſe "among the Monks who are recommended by the Holineſs of their Lives and the Purity of their "Faith, may enter into the Clergy, upon Condition that they paſs through the Inferior Orders, that "they be not Ordain'd Deacons or Prieſts till they come to a good Age, and that they do not aſcend "all of the ſudden into the Epiſcopal Chair, but only after they have continued the time preſcrib'd "in each of the Sacred Orders.

In the 14th. he ſays, that as a Clergy-man is not permitted to do publick Penance, ſo neither ſhould a Lay-man be allow'd, after he has done publick Penance, to enter into the Clergy. At laſt, he Ordains in the laſt Canon, that conſidering the greater part excuſe themſelves as not knowing theſe Laws, that their Ignorance be pardon'd; but upon condition that the Penitents and Bigamiſts, who have been Ordain'd, ſhall continue in that Order wherein they are, without being capable of aſcending higher. He concludes theſe Canons with threatning the Condemnation of the Holy See to all Metropolitans who did not obſerve theſe Laws; and ends his whole Letter with exhorting *Himerius*, to obſerve the Canons and the Holy Decrees, and to publiſh them in *Spain*.

The Second Letter of Pope *Siricius* furniſhes us with a good Example of the ancient manner of Judging us'd by the Holy Apoſtolick See: There he acquaints the Church of *Milan*, that having Aſſembled all his Clergy, he had condemn'd *Jovinian* and his followers, with the Advice and Conſent of the Prieſts, Deacons, and all the Clergy. *Omnium noſtrum tam Presbyterorum & Diaconorum, quam etiam totius Cleri una ſententia.*

The Third Letter of the Pope *Siricius* is addreſs'd to all the Orthodox; he exhorts them to obſerve the Canons of the Council of *Nice* in the Election of Biſhops; he recommends to them, not to give Biſhopricks to Perſons unknown, nor to Novices, nor to Lay-men, but to Clergy-men, whoſe Life was unblamable.

The Fourth Letter of *Siricius*, which is adreſs'd to the Biſhops of *Africa*, is ſuſpected of Forgery by the moſt able Criticks, who prove it by very ſtrong Conjectures (*a*) and it contains nothing remarkable.

The laſt Letter written to *Anyſius* of *Theſſalonica*, and other Biſhops of *Illyricum*, was for a long time attributed to St. *Ambroſe*, though he ſpeaks there of this Father in the Third Perſon, and was reſtor'd to *Siricius* by *Holſtenius*. The Biſhops to whom he writes had conſulted him about the Cauſe of *Bonoſus*, who was accus'd of ſaying raſhly, That the Virgin *Mary* had Children. *Siricius* anſwers *Anyſius* and thoſe Biſhops, that the Synod of *Capua* having ordain'd that the neighbouring Biſhops to *Bonoſus*, and chiefly thoſe of *Macedonia*, ſhould take cognizance of the Charge that was drawn up againſt him, it did no longer belong to him to judge of this Cauſe; that it belong'd to

(*a*) *By very ſtrong Conjectures.*] *Blondel* had before rejected this Letter, but with ſome Doubt, and without giving any convincing Reaſon; but Monſieur *Queſnel* has perfectly deſtroyed the Credit of it, by ſapping the foundation upon which it was built, which was the Council of *Telepta*, wherein this Letter is quoted, and by alledging many new Conjectures againſt this Letter. Theſe that follow are the chief. 1. The firſt Canon of this Letter has no ſenſe in what ever manner it be read or explain'd; for according to ſome it muſt be read, *ut ſine Conſcientia ſedis Apoſtolicæ Primatis, nemo audeat ordinare*, according to others, *ut extra conſcientiam ſedis Apoſtolicæ, i.e. Primatis, nemo audeat ordinare.* The firſt is rediculous: Firſt, becauſe the Popes never pretended to take cognizance of the ordinations of all the Metropolitans. Secondly, becauſe in *Africk* there was but one Primate only, all the other Eccleſiaſtical Metropolitans were the moſt ancient Biſhops of the Province. The Second is equally ridiculous: For what probability is there, that a Pope ſhould give to all the Metropolitan Churches the Title of the Apoſtolick See, which Pope *Leo* in Ep. 78. ſaid, could not be granted to the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*? Secondly this Letter is copied from that of *Innocent* to *Victricius*. Thirdly, the Author of this Letter ſays impertinently, That the Biſhops of *Africk* would have come to the Synod of *Rome*, if they had not been hindred by old Age or Sickneſs from coming thither. Fourthly, he makes *Siricius* ſpeak to the *Africans* with too much Authority. Fifthly, he only adviſes Prieſts and Deacons to Celibacy, as a thing that they were not oblig'd to; whereas 'tis certain that *Siricius* lookt upon it as an indiſpenſable Law. Sixthly, what this Author has not copied from the Letter of St. *Innocent* is barbarous and ill turn'd. Seventhly, the Subſcription of this Letter is ſingular, *Data Romæ in Concilio Epiſcoporum* 80. This is always put at the bginning and never at the end of Synodical Letters. In fine this Letter was never quoted in the *African* Councils, which have treated of the Continency of the Clergy, no more than that Council of *Telepta*, wherein it is pretended that it was quoted. 'Tis true that *Ferrandus* the Deacon has inſerted the Canons of this Council, as well as thoſe of this Letter, into his Collection; but he may be miſtaken as Father *Queſnel* proves in this Diſſertation, which is the 15th. of his Learned Diſſertations upon St. *Leo*.

them

Siricius. them to whom this Judgment was committed to give their Sentence, and that neither the Accuſed, nor the Accuſers could avoid it; That the Synod of *Capua* having choſen them to judge it, the Judgment which they ſhould give was to be lookt upon as the Judgment of the Council; That *Bonoſus* having conſulted St. *Ambroſe*, whether he could be readmitted to his Church, he had anſwer'd him, that he muſt attempt nothing unſeaſonably; but muſt wait for the Judgment of thoſe to whom the Synod of *Capua* had given Authority to determine this Affair: Yet in the following part of this Letter he does not omit to aquaint them with his thoughts of this Queſtion, and to refute the Opinion of *Bonoſus*; but he does it as a private Doctor and not as a Judge, declaring at the end of this Letter, that he waited for their Judgment upon this Affair: that he might follow it as his Rule. This is a very authentick Teſtimony of the Reverence which the Ancient Popes had for the Deciſions of Councils.

SABINUS.

Sabinus. SABINUS Biſhop of the *Macedonians* at *Heraclea* in *Thracia*, liv'd about the end of the Reign of *Theodoſius* the Great. He collected together the Acts of ſeveral Councils of the Fourth Century, which *Socrates* quotes ſeveral times; (*a*) tho' he wrote very ſpitefully againſt the Church, yet his Memoirs had been very uſeful for clearing up the Hiſtory of the Councils of that time, if they had come to our hands.

(*a*) *Quotes ſeveral times.*] *Socrat. lib.* 1. *c.* 8. and 9. *lib.* 2. *c.* 15, 17, 39. *lib.* 3. *c.* 10. 24.

AMBROSE *of* Alexandria.

Ambroſe of Alexandria. ST. *Jerome* ſpeaks of this Author in his Catalogue of Eccleſiaſtical Writers after this manner: "*Ambroſe* of *Alexandria* the Scholar of *Didymus*, wrote a great Dogmatical Treatiſe againſt "*Apollinarius*, and Commentaries upon *Job*, of which ſome ſpoke to me not long ago: This Author "is ſtill alive;" which ſhews that he died not till after the Year 392. And this is all that we have to ſay of this Author.

THEOTIMUS.

Theotimus. THEOTIMUS Biſhop of *Tomi* in *Scythia*, has written, according to the Teſtimony of the ſame St. *Jerome*, ſhort and ſententious Tracts by way of Dialogue, according to the ancient manner of Writing. This Biſhop was one of the defenders of St. *Chryſoſtom*. He was preſent at *Conſtantinople* when St. *Epiphanius* came thither, and ſpoke to him briefly in defence of *Origen*'s Books. *Socrates* produces his words Ch. 12. of the VIth. B. of his Hiſtory. *Sozomen* commends in Ch. 26. of the VIth. B. of his Hiſtory, and mentions ſome Miracles which he wrought.

EVAGRIUS *of* Antioch.

Evagrius of Antioch. ST. *Jerome* aſſures us that *Evagrius*, who was ordain'd in 386, Biſhop of *Paulinus*'s Party at *Antioch*, was a Man of a brisk and fervent Spirit; that when he was Prieſt, he wrote many Treatiſes upon different Subjects which he had read to himſelf, but that they had not yet ſeen the light; and that he had Tranſlated into Latin the Life of St. *Anthony* written by St. *Athanaſius*. This ſhows, that they are to blame, who attribute the Tranſlation of this Life to St. *Jerome*. This Author died in the Year 393.

St. AMBROSE Biſhop *of* Milan.

St. Ambroſe THE Father of St. *Ambroſe* was Prætorian Præfect of *Gaul* when this Saint was born, which was about the Year 340 (*a*), and was Nurs'd in his Father's Palace (*b*). 'Tis reported, that while he was ſleeping one day with his Mouth open in the Court of this Palace, a Swarm of Bees came and

(*a*) *About the Year* 340.] The date of St. *Ambroſe*'s Birth, depends upon the date of that Letter which was formerly the 32d. and is now the 60th. addreſs'd to *Severus*; for there he ſays, That he was 53 Years old, and that he wrote in a time of War. *Tot objecti barbaricis moribus, & bellorum procellis, in medio verſamur omnium moleſtiarum freto.* This may relate either to the War of *Maximus* in 387, or to that of *Eugenius* in 393; if it referrs to the firſt, he was born in 334, if to the ſecond, in 340. 'Tis hard to ſay whether it referrs to the one or to the other.

(*b*) *Was Nurs'd in his Father's Palace.*] *Paulinus* the Author of St. *Ambroſe*'s Life ſays plainly, that he was born in his Father's Palace, who was then the Prætorian Præfect

flew

flew about his Cradle, and having many times crept in and out to reſt themſelves upon his Mouth, at laſt they mounted up into the Air ſo high, till they quite vaniſh'd out of ſight; which was look'd upon by his Father as a Prodigy, and a Preſage of the future Greatneſs of this Infant. Profane Antiquity relates the ſame thing of *Plato*, and affirms, That it was a Preſage of the Sweetneſs of his Eloquence; but there is more Reaſon to believe what the Author of the Life of our Saint ſays, That this ſwarm of Bees form'd thoſe Hony-combs in his Mouth, which ſhould one Day make us reliſh the ſweetneſs of heavenly Gifts, and raiſe our Hearts up to Heaven. St. *Ambroſe*

The Father of St. *Ambroſe* dying ſomtime after, his Widow left *Gaul*, whether ſhe was come to dwell only upon the account of her Husband's Office, and return'd to *Rome* which was their Country. Thither ſhe carried St. *Ambroſe*, who was yet very Young, together with *Marcellina* his Siſter, and *Satyrus* his Eldeſt Brother; and ſhe took ſpecial Care of the Education of her Children. Her Daughter profeſs'd Virginity, and received the Veil from the Hands of Pope *Liberius*; St. *Ambroſe* profited very much by the Domeſtick Examples of the Piety and vertue of his Mother, his Siſter, and the Virgins that were with them; they inſpir'd into him from his tender Youth, the love of Vertue, and ſecured him from the Corruptions of the Age, and he joyn'd Learning to his Piety. His Works diſcover how vigorouſly he applied himſelf to humane Learning. Having finiſh'd his Studies, he acquir'd by his Merits the Friendſhip of *Anicius Probus*, and of *Symmachus*, to very Honeſt and Learned Men, tho' of different Religions. The Firſt was the Prætorian Præfect of *Italy*, in whoſe Court St. *Ambroſe* pleaded Cauſes with ſo much renown, that *Probus* made choice of him to be his Aſſeſſor. Afterwards he made him Governour of *Liguria* and *Emilia*, that is, of all that Country, which comprehends at this Day, the Archbiſhopricks of *Milan*, *Liguria*, *Turin*, *Genoa* and *Bolonia*. 'Tis reported that *Probus* ſaid to him at parting, *Go thy way, and Govern more like a Biſhop than a Judge*; which Words were a Prediction of what happened afterwards. For a little while after, *Auxentius* Biſhop of *Milan*, who was of the *Arian* Faction, being dead, the Biſhops of the Province of *Italy* aſſembled to place one in his room, according to the Orders of the Emperour *Valentinian*, who would not himſelf interpoſe in the Election; and upon this Occaſion there aroſe a great Contention among the People, becauſe the *Arians* and the Orthodox on each ſide, did all that laid in their Power to chooſe a Biſhop of their own Party. This Quarrel being like to raiſe a Tumult, St. *Ambroſe* thought it the Duty of his Office to come into the Church and prevent it, whither being come, he made an Oration to the People with much Diſcretion and Mildneſs, exhorting them to proceed in their Choice with the Spirit of Peace and without Tumult. While he was yet ſpeaking, the People

of *Gaul*. *Poſito in adminiſtratione præfecturæ Galliarum Patre ejus Ambroſio natus eſt Ambroſius, qui infans in Area Prætoris in Cunabulis poſitus*, &c This plainly enough diſcovers the place of his Birth and Education, for the Dwelling-Houſe and Palace of the Præfect of the *Gauls* was certainly in *Gaul*: 'Tis true that the ſame *Paulinus* ſpeaking afterwards of St. *Ambroſe*'s Journey to *Rome*, ſays, That he went to his own Country, *proprium ſolum*, and that St. *Baſil* writing to St. *Ambroſe*, ſays, He was of the Emperial City: But on theſe Occaſions, the Place of his Parents abode, the Origin of the Family, and the common Reſidence of St. *Ambroſe*, was conſider'd as the Place of his Country. And indeed ſo it was according to the Roman Laws; and the Children born in a place where their Parents were by chance about their Affairs, were eſteem'd to be of that Place, which was the ordinary Reſidence of their Fathers and Mothers. See *L. retro. ff. de captiv. & L. filios C. de municip. & L. cives C. de incolis.* 'Tis more difficult to aſſign preciſely that City of the *Gaules*, where the Prætorian Præfect then reſided, which is not certainly known. Some are of Opinion that it was at *Triers*, which St. *Athanaſius* and *Theodoret* call the Metropolis of *Gaul*, as *Milan* was the Metropolis of *Italy*: For the Reſidence of the Prætorian Præfect of *Italy* was at *Milan*. *Ammian. Marcellinus* calls the City of *Triers*, the Dwelling-Place of Princes; to which we may add, the Praiſes which many Authors have given of this City; but this proves nothing. In the time of the Tyrant *Maximus*, *Evodius* the Prætorian Præfect of the *Gauls* reſided at *Triers*, as appears by the Hiſtory of the *Priſcillianiſts* related by *Sulpitius Severus*. But it does not follow from hence, that this City was the Ordinary Reſidence of others, becauſe that *Maximus* a Tyrant, who was newly raiſed to the Empire, dwelt at *Triers*. Some have thought that the ordinary Reſidence of the Prætorian Præfect of the *Gauls* was at *Arles*. The Conjectures for this Opinion are theſe, That the Emperour *Conſtantine* reſided in this City. that he honour'd it with many Privileges, and particularly to be the Place for the meeting of a Council; That there is a Law of *Honorius* and *Theodoſius*, which Ordains that every year an Aſſembly of the Seven Provinces ſhould be held in the City of *Arles*, in the preſence of the Præfect, *ſub Illuſtri præſentia Præfecturæ*; That *Agricolaus* the Prætorian Præfect of the *Gauls*, to whom this Law was addreſs'd, received it at *Arles*; That in the Petition which thoſe Countries preſented to Pope *Leo*, they eſtabliſh the Dignity of the Eccleſiaſtical Metropolis of *Arles* upon the Privileges which had been granted to this City by *Valentinian* and *Honorius*, which made it be look'd upon as the Mother of all the other Cities, and upon the Honour which it had to ſerve for the Reſidence of the Prætorian Præfect. 'Tis added, That *Honoratus* writes in the Life of *Hilary* of *Arles*, That the Prætorian Præfect came to ſee this Biſhop when he was reduc'd to Extremity; That St. *Proſper* in his Chronicle ſpeaks of a Prætorian Præfect call'd *Exuperantius*, who reſided at *Arles*; That *Liberius* Prætorian Præfect of *Gaul*, who confirm'd the Second Council of *Orange*, dwelt at *Arles*; That *Fauſtus Rhedonenſis* writing to *Felix* the Præfect of *Gaul*, ſays, That he reſided in a City where he profited by the Inſtructions of *Eonius*, and this Man was Biſhop of *Arles*. All theſe Proofs plainly ſhew, that in the Fifth Age the ordinary Reſidence of the Prætorian Præfects of *Gaul* was in the City of *Arles*; but they do not prove, that it was alſo in the time of St. *Ambroſe*. One may rather believe, that it was the City of *Lyons*, which at firſt was the ordinary Reſidence of the Prætorian Præfect of *Gaul*. For, Firſt, This City was look'd upon as the Chief City of *Gaul*. Secondly, *Strabo*, aſſures us, That the Præfects and Governours of *Gaul* commonly reſided there, and coyn'd Money there of Gold and Silver: Now there is no probability, neither is there any Proof that *Conſtantine* changed this Cuſtom in favour of the City of *Arles*: And therefore there is nothing very certain upon this Subject.

unanimouſly

St. *Ambroſe* unanimouſly proclaim'd him Biſhop of *Milan*. This unexpected Choice ſurpriz'd him; he preſently withdrew, and made uſe of all the Artifices he could to ſhun this Biſhoprick. He aſcended the Bench of Juſtice, and affecting to ſeem cruel and unworthy of the Prieſthood, he cauſed the Criminals to be brought before him loaded with Chains, and commanded them to be rack'd with great ſeverity. This Artifice failing, he contrived another, by making Women of lewd Lives come into his Houſe. But the People perceiving all this to be affected, continued ſtill in their Choice: Whereupon he ſtole out of the City by Night, with a deſign to retire to *Ticinum*; but miſſing his way, he wandred up and down all Night, and found himſelf next Morning at the Gates of *Milan*. His Flight being known, a Guard was ſet about him, and a Relation of all that had paſs'd, was ſent to the Emperour: St. *Ambroſe* wrote alſo to him on his own behalf, that he might be excus'd from that Office. But the Emperour being wonderfully pleas'd with this Choice of the People, did not only confirm the Election, but gave Order to the Lieutenant of *Italy* to ſee the thing effectually done. In the mean time St. *Ambroſe* once more made his eſcape, and hid himſelf in the Houſe of one *Leontius*: But the Lieutenant of *Italy* having publiſhed the Order againſt all thoſe that knew where he was, and did not diſcover him, *Leontius* by an Innocent kind of Treachery declared where he was, and then St. *Ambroſe* finding it was in vain to reſiſt any longer, was firſt Baptiz'd, and ſome time after made Biſhop of *Milan*, at the End of the Year 374, or the Beginning of 375 (*c*.) Immediately after his Ordination he diſtributed to the Poor, or gave to the Church, all the Money that he had. He ſettled his Lands alſo upon the Church, reſerving only the Profits of them for Life. He committed the Care of his Affairs to his Brother *Satyrus*, who being gone to *Rome* by Sea in purſuit of a man who had unjuſtly poſſeſs'd himſelf of ſome part of their Eſtate, was like to have periſhed in a Shipwrack, which made him reſolve to be baptiz'd: Nevertheleſs he eſcaped the danger and returned ſafe to *Milan*, where he died in 379. Thus St. *Ambroſe* having renounc'd all Care of Secular Affairs, applyed himſelf wholly to the worthy diſcharge of his Epiſcopal Function. Tho' he was but newly baptiz'd, and never had time to Study Religion before his Ordination, yet by his great Induſtry he attained to that Perfection, that at the ſame time he both learned and taught the Truths of the Chriſtian Religion. He did every Day celebrate the Holy Myſteries; there paſs'd not a Sunday but he preached to his People. He hearkened to all Men with Meekneſs and Charity, he relieved the Poor, he comforted the Afflicted, ſo that all his People loved and admired him. He applied himſelf vigorouſly to root out the remnants of Arianiſm that were yet in the Church of *Milan*. He convicted *Secundianus* and *Palladius*, and procured their Condemnation in the Council of *Aquileia* held in the Year 381. The Death of *Gratian* changed the face of Affairs in the Weſtern Empire. The Tyrant *Maximus* who had put him to Death, having Uſurped *Gaul*, was become formidable to all *Italy*. It was feared, that he would paſs the *Alps*, and carry *Italy* by force from *Valentinian* the Younger, who was then but Twelve or Thirteen Years Old. St. *Ambroſe* was ſent Embaſſador to this Tyrant in the Year 384, and by his Prudence and Boldneſs diverted his Deſign of paſſing then into *Italy*. The Empreſs *Juſtina*, Mother to *Valentinian*, who was an *Arian*, having a Deſign to reſtore Arianiſm after its Extirpation in the Church of *Milan*, did at firſt deſire of St. *Ambroſe*, one of the Churches call'd the *Portian* Church, which St. *Ambroſe* refus'd to grant her; and ſo great was the Aſſembly of the People round about the Palace, that ſhe was forc'd to leave St. *Ambroſe* in the Poſſeſſion of his Church, and to entreat him alſo to appeaſe the People. Sometime after the Empreſs ſent to him to demand in the Emperour's Name, not only that Church, but alſo the *New*-Church. Our Saint oppoſed them with wonderful Boldneſs, and anſwered them with ſuch a fearleſs Courage, as aſtoniſhed the Perſons who brought the Emperour's Orders to him. This happened at the Beginning of the Year 385. On *Palm-Sunday* in the ſame Year, Officers were ſent to ſeize upon the *Portian*-Church, when St. *Ambroſe* was Officiating in the *New*-Church. This irritated the People, who run to that Church, and having apprehended one *Caſtulus* an *Arian* Prieſt, would have made a Riot, if St. *Ambroſe* had not ſent ſome Prieſts and Deacons to appeaſe them. The Emperour cauſed many of the Seditious to be Arreſted, and ſent armed Souldiers to take Poſſeſſion of the Church, which for all that was not put in Execution. On *Wedneſday* in Paſſion Week the Souldiers were ſent to ſeize upon the *New*-Church, but the People flocking thither in great Multitudes, the Souldiers never entred it; but the People within it ſpent the whole Night and Day, in ſinging of Pſalms; and the next day after, the Emperour being prevailed upon by the Boldneſs and Wiſdom of St. *Ambroſe*'s Carriage, who had put a ſtop to the Sedition, and yet had yielded nothing of what was demanded of him, ordered the Souldiers who ſurrounded the Church to retire.

In the Year following the Perſecution was renew'd againſt the Catholicks and St. *Ambroſe*, by an Edict of the Emperour in favour of the Council of *Ariminum*. A deſign alſo was laid to take from the Catholicks the *Portian*-Church. Orders were given to apprehend St. *Ambroſe*, and ſent him into baniſhment; but he was ſtill ſecur'd by the affection of the People of *Milan*, who Guarded him in his Church, where he ſpent many Days and Nights in ſinging Pſalms and Hymns continually with his People. He was challenged to Diſpute in the Palace with *Auxentius* the *Arian* Biſhop; but he refuſed to do it, becauſe Lay-men and Pagans were choſen to be Judges of their Conference. He offered to referr the Difference to the Judgment of a Council, tho' it was not reaſonable to trouble the Peace of the Church for one Man only, nor to call that in Queſtion which had been already deter-

(*c*) *Ordain'd Biſhop of* Milan *about the Year* 374, *or* 375.] *In Euſebius's Chronicon*, his Ordination is plac'd in the Year 375. But ſince it is certain that *Valentinian* died *November* 10th. 375. and that his Ordination was made the 10th. of *December* under this Emperour, we muſt of neceſſity place it in the preceding Year.

mined.

mined. After this he ſpoke an Oration againſt *Auxentius*, which provok'd the Empreſs *Juſtina* yet more againſt him: But at laſt ſhe gave over the further Perſecution of this Biſhop, ſeeing it was to no purpoſe, becauſe his own Wiſdom and Courage, and the Affections of his People, cover'd him from all her Deſigns. 'Tis believ'd, That the Diſcovery of the Relicks of St. *Gervaſius* and St. *Protaſius*, and the Miracles that were then done by them, contributed to the Peace of the Church. But 'tis very probable that the true Reaſon which hindred *Juſtina* and *Valentinian* from puſhing things to extremity, was the State of the Affairs of the Empire at that time. *Maximus* had prepar'd to paſs over into *Italy*, a Sedition was alſo to be fear'd in this Juncture, and they ſtood in need of St. *Ambroſe*. In Effect the Emperour found no Perſon fitter than he to treat with *Maximus*, whom he ſent Embaſſador to this Tyrant, who reſided at *Triers*: St. *Ambroſe* ſpoke to him with much boldneſs, but he could obtain nothing of him; on the contrary, this Tyrant march'd immediately into *Italy*; and thereby made himſelf Maſter of all the Weſtern Empire, ſo that *Valentinian* was forc'd to retire into the Eaſt, and deſire Aid of *Theodoſius*, who re-eſtabliſh'd him, after he had defeated, taken and be-headed *Maximus*. This Revolution happened in 387. St. *Ambroſe* continued during this time in his Biſhoprick. When *Theodoſius* came into the Weſt, he ſhowed no leſs Courage with reference to him, than before he had done to *Valentinian*. He oppoſed the re-eſtabliſhment of the Jewiſh Synagogue which *Theodoſius* would have done, and *of the Altar of Victory*, which *Symmachus* had already endeavour'd in vain to reſtore becauſe of the Oppoſition of St. *Ambroſe*. 'Tis well enough known, with what freedom he reproved the Emperour *Theodoſius* for the Maſſacre at *Theſſalonica*, which he gave a Warrant for putting in Execution, and after what manner he obliged him to do publick Penance for it. The Death of *Valentinian* and the Advancement of *Eugenius* for ſome time diſturbed the the Repoſe of St. *Ambroſe*. He was obliged to retire from *Milan* in the Year 393, but he returned in the Year 394, and finiſhed his Courſe as he had begun it. He died in the Year 396, aged 57 Years. St. *Ambroſe*

The Works of St. *Ambroſe* above all the other Fathers, have been moſt corrupted in the ordinary Editions. The Roman Edition from which thoſe that follow'd after were made, inſtead of reſtoring the Text of this Father, hath render'd it more Faulty in many places, by the Liberty which the Supervifors of that Edition took, of making Alterations in it by their own Authority. In this Edition the Works were in great Confuſion, without Order, and without any diſtinction of what were Genuine, and what were Suppoſititious; which induc'd the Benedictins of the Abby of St. *Germain de Prez* to undertake a New Edition of this Father's Works, wherein they have reſtor'd the Text from many Manuſcripts; and ranged the Diſcourſes in very good Order. In it they are divided into Two Volumes. The Firſt which is already publiſhed, contains the Treatiſes of St. *Ambroſe* upon the Scripture. The Second which will quickly come forth, and which they have allow'd me to make uſe of, contains the other Works of this Father. The Fifth begins with the Treatiſe upon the Creation of the World, compos'd of Nine Diſcourſes of St. *Ambroſe* to his People, preach'd in one of the laſt Weeks of Lent. 'Tis probable, that he reduc'd them afterwards into the form of a Treatiſe. 'Tis divided into Six Books, which anſwer to the Six Days of the Creation. This Work contains many Queſtions of Controverſie, and many Moral and Myſtical Conſiderations upon the Text of the Bible. There are many of them, particularly in the laſt Books which are very extraordinary, and far fetch'd. St. *Ambroſe* made this Treatiſe about the Year 389. He has imitated St. *Baſil* in it, whoſe Method he followed, and he has taken many things from him as alſo from *Hippolitus* and *Origen*.

The Treatiſe *of Paradiſe* is one of the firſt Books of St. *Ambroſe*. He Wrote it as he ſays in his Letter to *Sabinus*, ſoon after he was made Biſhop. He does not dive very deep into the Hiſtorical Queſtions which may be made upon this Subject, but for the moſt part acquieſces in the Allegorical Explications, which he draws out of *Philo* and other Authors, or which he invents himſelf: There he refutes the Hereticks of *Apelles*'s Sect, and occaſionally ſpeaks againſt the Jews.

St. *Ambroſe* continues the Explication of the Text of *Geneſis* in the Treatiſe of the Hiſtory of *Abel* and *Cain*, upon which he makes abundance of long Allegories wherewith he intermixes ſome Moral Thoughts. He enlarges particularly upon the Sacrifices of theſe Two Brethren. Upon occaſion of the ſaying that *the Blood of* Abel *crys*, he ſays, That God hears the Juſt even after their Death, becauſe they are even then living before God and enjoy Eternal Light.

The Hiſtory *of the Deluge and the Life of* Noah, furniſhed St. *Ambroſe* with very fit matter for the Continuation of his Myſtical and Moral Explications. This is the Subject of the Book *of the Ark and of* Noah, or *of the Ark of* Noah, as St. *Auſtin* calls it. This Treatiſe is not perfect, for St. *Auſtin* quotes a Paſſage out of it, which is not to be found there now.

There are Two Books of St. *Ambroſe* upon *the Life of* Abraham. In the Firſt he preſcribes the Life and Action of this Patriarch, and repreſents his Submiſſion to the Will of God, and his other Vertues. In the Second Book he diſcourſes on the Firſt Actions of this Patriarch, to draw from them a more ſublime and ſpiritual Sence, by applying them to the different Degrees of a ſpiritual Life, and to the Ways by which we tend to Perfection.

He treats alſo of the ſame Subject, tho' in a more compendious way, in the Book *of* Iſaac *and the Soul*, where he explains the Union of the Soul with the Word, which was figur'd by the Marriage of *Iſaac* and *Rebecca*. There he diſtinguiſhes Four Degrees through which the Soul muſt paſs, that it may be delivered from all earthly Affections, and arrive at a State of perfect Union with God. By this Union he explains the *Canticles*, on which he makes a kind of a Myſtical Paraphraſe, and therefore this Treatiſe may paſs for a Commentary upon this Book of Scripture.

St. *Ambroſe*

St. *Ambroſe* having diſcourſed of the Soul at the End of the preceding Treatiſe, found himſelf inſenſibly engag'd to treat of Death in the following Book. 'Tis entitled, *Of the Benefits or Advantages of Death.* There St. *Ambroſe* firſt diſtinguiſhes three kinds of Death; The Death of Sin, which kills the Soul; The Myſtical Death, by which we die to Sin; and the Natural Death, by which the Soul is ſeparated from the Body. All the World conſiders the firſt as a great Miſery, and the Second as a great Happineſs; but their Opinions are divided about the laſt: Some wiſh for it as a great Advantage, and others dread it as a great Puniſhment. St. *Ambroſe* declares for thoſe who hold it to be a great Benefit, he makes the Advantages of it appear, and oppoſes to them the Troubles of this preſent Life from which Death delivers us. He exhorts Chriſtians, not to ſet their Affections upon this Life nor the Pleaſures of this World; he makes them ſenſible of the bitterneſs which accompanies them; he repreſents the Dangers to which we are continually expoſed, the Temptations to which we are ſubject in all ſorts of Occurences, and the Sins into which we fall every moment. Afterwards he diſcourſes of the State of departed Souls; he ſuppoſes that till the Day of Judgment, they are in Places or Habitations: where they expect Eternal Glory or Damnation, tho' they enjoy already by anticipation ſome kind of Happineſs or Miſery. *All Souls wait*, ſays he, *for what they have deſerved; ſome expect Damnation and others Glory; but in this waiting, the former are not without Pain, nor the later without ſome Reward.*] St. *Ambroſe* inſiſts particularly upon the Joy which the latter enjoy, and diſtinguiſhes Seven Degrees of their Happineſs, whereof the laſt is to rejoyce in the aſſurance they have of ſeeing God face to face. He concludes with exhorting the Faithful to die without Fear, "Let us go on, "ſays he, without fear in the way to Jeſus Chriſt; Let us march without anxiety to the Aſſembly "of the Patriarchs and Saints; Let us enter in with Confidence into *Abraham*'s Boſom. Yes, O Holy "Patriarch, open to us your Boſom, extend your Arms to theſe poor Faithful. Jeſus is gone before "us to prepare Habitations, where we are to be received; he promiſed to do it before we asked it "of him. We deſire to follow thee, O Lord, but call thou us unto thee, that ſo we may effectu-"ally follow thee, becauſe without thee no Man can aſcend unto thee. Thou art the Way, the "Truth and the Life, thou giveſt us the Power, the Faith, and the Reward; receive us, ſince thou "art the Way; confirm us, ſince thou art the Truth; Grant us Life, ſince thou art the Author of "Life; make us to enjoy that good thing which *David* deſired; ſhow us that Eternal, that Immutable "Bliſs, which we ſhall enjoy for all Eternity." This Treatiſe of St. *Ambroſe* has another ſort of a reliſh than the foregoing; 'tis full of uſeful and ſolid Reflections, and of juſt and natural Reaſonings. He founds all that he ſays upon Paſſages of the Holy Scripture, which he applies very pertinently and very naturally. He builds very much upon the Fourth Book of *Eſdras* which he cites as Canonical. This Treatiſe was Written about the Year 387. The Book *of forſaking the World* was written ſoon after this, of which we have already ſpoken: the Title of it ſufficiently diſcovers the Subject. There St. *Ambroſe* makes uſe of ſeveral Allegories taken out of the Old Teſtament, to exhort the Faithful to flee from this World, that they may be wholly united to God.

The Books of *Jacob* and a *Happy Life*, treat of the Happineſs of the Righteous. In the Firſt, he diſcovers the means of arriving at Happineſs; the Chief whereof is, to follow the Light of Right Reaſon, which can command our Paſſions, and repreſs the Motions of Luſt: For tho' we cannot wholly extinguiſh our Paſſions, yet we may reſtrain their Violence by practiſing the Vertue of Moderation; for he maintains that we do Good or Evil freely. Jeſus Chriſt, he ſays, will have none for his Servants which are not free, and the Devil has none for Slaves, but thoſe that are voluntarily ſold to him by their Sins. But becauſe of Man's Weakneſs the Divine Aſſiſtance is neceſſary. The Law which God has given him does clearly diſcover to him his Sins; but it has not ſufficient Virtue to deliver him from Sin and Death; there is nothing but Grace could ſet us at Liberty, which Jeſus Chriſt by his Death hath merited for all Men. This Grace is ſo powerful, that provided we be willing to follow its Motions, nothing ſhall ever be able to ſeparate us from Jeſus Chriſt. Whatever befals us we ſhall be happy; a juſt Man is above all the Miſeries of this Life; 'tis true indeed, he ſuffers Loſſes, Afflictions, Diſeaſes, Pains, Captivity, &c. but he does not think himſelf leſs happy for being ſubject to theſe Accidents. There is nothing wanting to him that poſſeſſes Vertue; he fears nothing, he hopes nothing, he deſires nothing; tho' he be weak, he is ſtrong enough; tho' he appear to be poor, he is rich; tho' he is deſpiſed, he believes himſelf the more honoured; tho' he is alone, yet he is not forſaken; whatſoever Diſeaſe he has he enjoys a perfect Health.

Theſe Maxims are confirm'd in the Second Book by the Example of *Jacob*. St. *Ambroſe* there deſcribes the Life and Actions of this Patriarch, and ſhews, that the Afflictions and Croſſes which befell him did not hinder him from being happy. He concluds with the Example of *Eleazar* and the *Maccabees*, on whom he makes a very lively and Eloquent Panegyrick.

After he has diſcours'd of the Patriarchs, *Abraham*, *Iſaac* and *Jacob*, and treated, as he ſays himſelf, *of ſubmiſſion to the Will of God*, upon the occaſion of *Abraham*, *of Purity of Spirit* from *Iſaac*, *of Patience under Miſeries* from the Hiſtoy of *Jacob*; he treats *of Chaſtity* in explaining the Hiſtory of *Joſeph*, who has given an Illuſtrious, Example of the practice of this vertue, in reſiſting the Solicitations of *Potiphar*'s Wife. This Action of *Joſeph* is ſo much the more Glorious, by how much the Charms of this Woman were harder to be overcome; which St. *Ambroſe* ſtudies to ſet off to the beſt Advantage, that the Vertue of *Joſeph* may the better appear. After this he purſues the Hiſtory of this Patriarch, and diſcourſes of all the Circumſtances of his Life, which he referrs to Jeſus Chriſt, of whom *Joſeph* was a Figure. He lays open this Myſtical Senſe with much Art and Probability, by comparing what is ſaid of *Joſeph* in *Geneſis*, with what is ſaid of Jeſus Chriſt in the Goſpel.

The

The Commentary upon *the Benedictions of the Patriarchs*, follows naturally after the Book of the Life of *Joſeph*. St. *Ambroſe* there gives Myſtical Sences to the Bleſſings, which *Jacob* when he was dying gave to his Children, and referrs the greateſt part of them to Jeſus Chriſt. This Book and the preceding, are Sermons preach'd by St. *Ambroſe* at *Milan* about the Year 387, which he afterwards reduced into a Treatiſe, St. *Ambroſe*

The Book of *Elias* and of *Faſting*, contains many Sermons preach'd at *Milan* in *Lent*. Having formerly ſpoken of the Actions of *Elias* upon other Occaſions, he here enlarges upon the Morals of them. The Perſon of whom, and the Time when he preach'd, do both conſpire to invite him to treat of Faſting; and ſo this is the ſubject of the Firſt and Principal Part of this Work. He maintains that Faſting is a Duty as old as the World, and pretends that the Law by which God forbid *Adam* to Eat of the Tree of Life, was a kind of Command for Faſting. He alledges afterwards the Examples of *Noah*, *Abraham*, *Moſes*, *Eliſha*, *Daniel*, and many others, to authorize the Practice of Faſting. He diſcovers at laſt the Advantages of it, and ſhews how Intemperance and Exceſs are pernicious and inconvenient. This leads him inſenſibly to diſcourſe againſt the Debauchery, the Drunkenneſs, and the other Diſorders of Mens Tables, which were very common in St. *Ambroſe*'s Time: He adds, That theſe Exceſſes draw along with them all other vices, and particularly the Deſire of gathering Riches, to furniſh the exceſſive Expences which were neceſſary to ſupport their Luxury. He exhorts Chriſtians to apply themſelves to God who is the Sovereign Phyſician of theſe Evils; and propoſes the Day of Judgment as a Diſſuaſive from theſe Exceſſes. Addreſſing himſelf afterwards to the Catechumens, he preſſes them to purify themſelves from their Sins by receiving Baptiſm. He reproves thoſe ſharply who delay to receive this Sacrament, and exhorts them rather to imitate the forwardneſs of *Abel* than the Negligence of *Cain*. 'Tis eaſie to perceive, that this Treatiſe was compos'd of many Pieces collected together. St. *Ambroſe* has taken a great part of it out of St. *Baſil*, and in it there are many excellent Paſſages, and ſome things very remarkable about the Diſcipline of the Church. He ſays in Ch. 10. that they prepar'd themſelves by Faſting to approach to the Holy Table, that they faſted at *Milan* all the time of *Lent*, except *Sundays* and *Saturdays*; that on *Eaſter*-day the Faſt ended; that on that Day thoſe among the Catechumens, who were call'd Elect, were baptiz'd; that they approach'd to the Altar, and receiv'd the Sacrament. In ſhort, St. *Ambroſe* in this Treatiſe gives very Lively and Moral Deſcriptions of the Exceſſes and Debauchery of his Age: One needs only read the 12th. and 13th. Chapters, to be poſſeſs'd with a horrour of them. Even the Women were given to Wine, and did many Actions unbecoming the Modeſty of their Sex, of which St. *Ambroſe* makes them aſham'd in Chap. 18.

The Treatiſe of *Naboth and the Poor*, (for ſo it ought to be call'd, according to the ancient Manuſcripts, and according to the Cuſtom of St. *Ambroſe*) is a Diſcourſe full of Zeal againſt the Rich and Powerful who oppreſs the Poor, preach'd by St. *Ambroſe* upon the Hiſtory of the Oppreſſion of *Naboth* by King *Ahab*. This Saint there ſhews, that there are *Ahabs* and *Naboths* at all times. "The "Hiſtory of *Naboth*, ſays he, at the beginning of his Diſcourſe, is ancient, if we conſider the time "wherein it was Tranſacted, but in Practice it happens daily; *tempore vetus eſt uſu quotidiana*: For "who is the Rich man that does not deſire other Mens Goods? Is it not daily ſeen, that the Rich "would take from the Poor the little Eſtate that they have, and drive them away from the Inheri-"tance of their Anceſtors? Where is there one found that is content with what he has? There "has not been one *Ahab* only in the World, he is born in it every day; there has not been one *Naboth* "only kill'd, there are ſome ſuch every day oppreſs'd. Every day the Poor are over-whelm'd, driven "away, perſecuted, and reduc'd to die by Famine, by the Injuſtice of the Rich." He declaims afterwards againſt this Barbarity, and ſhews the Rich, by the Example of *Ahab*, that they are more unhappy with all their Riches, than the moſt Miſerable and the moſt Poor in their wants. He cries out againſt thoſe ſumptuous Feaſts and needleſs expences which they make, by which they waſte the Blood and Subſtance of the Poor. Here he relates a frightful Story of a Rich Man, who to procure good Wine to his Table, forc'd a Poor Man to ſell his Son; and then he brings the Parable of the Rich Man mention'd in the Goſpel of St. *Luke* Ch. 12. who purpoſed to pull down his Barns, that he might build larger, and ſhews from hence how far the Slavery, Blindneſs, and Miſery of Rich Men extends. Afterwards he returns to his Hiſtory of *Ahab*, and having repreſented the horribleneſs of the Action of *Ahab* and *Jezabel*, he exhorts Rich Men not to imitate it, by teaching them the uſe they ought to make of their Riches, which is deſcribed in *Pſalm* 75. He coucludes with this Remark, that God pardon'd *Ahab* for this Crime, but this miſerable Man brought upon himſelf Deſtruction by new Crimes. 'Tis thought, that this Treatiſe was compos'd about the Year 395.

The Book of *Tobit* is chiefly written againſt *Uſury*, which St. *Ambroſe* condemns moſt ſeverely. There he deſcribes the Miſeries to which Uſurers reduce the Poor, and the Artifices they uſe to enſnare young Heirs. Uſury according to him, is all that is receiv'd above the principal. It is condemn'd by the Divine Law in the Old and New Teſtament: If it was permitted to the *Iſraelites* with reſpect to Strangers, it was only with reference to them whom they might lawfully kill. He refutes thoſe by Name, who reſtrain the Prohibition of Uſury only to the Poor, and rejects the Reaſons of Intereſt which may be alledg'd to excuſe it. *Eraſmus* doubted whether this Book were St. *Ambroſe*'s or no, but it was a Doubt very ill grounded, for St. *Auſtin* cites it. It has St. *Ambroſe*'s Stile, it contains his Doctrine, which is alſo to be found in ſhort in his 23d. Letter to *Vigilius*, and it contains many Paſſages tranſlated out of St. *Baſil*, according to the Cuſtom of St. *Ambroſe*. This Book was written about the Year 386.

The Four Books *of the Interceſſion of Job and David*, (that is, of the Complaints which *Job* and *David* made for the Miſeries and Weakneſs of Mankind) are in this Edition replac'd here in their natural

St. *Ambroſe*

tural Order. In the two Firſt Books he enlarges upon the Complaints contain'd in the Firſt Chapters of the Book of *Job*, and in the *Pſalms*, particularly in the 72d. and 42d. In the Two laſt he anſwers the Complaints of thoſe who tax Providence, becauſe the Wicked are happy in this Life, and the Juſt miſerable. He proves that the Happineſs of the Wicked is not true happineſs, and that the Calamities, Miſeries and Misfortunes of the Good, do not at all render them unhappy.

In the Book entituled *the Apology of* David, he ſaves the Honour of this Holy King, not by juſtifying his Crimes of Adultery and Murder, which are uſed to render him odious; but by ſhewing, that he roſe again from his Fall by a quick and ſincere Repentance; that it was for our Inſtruction that God permited him to fall into Sin, and that he made amends for his Fault by a great number of good Actions. And therefore he explains the 5th. *Pſalm*, that it may ſerve as an Apology for this Holy King. Theſe Sermons were preach'd ſoon after the Death of *Gratian*, in the Year 385.

The *Benedictines* have plac'd here among theſe works of St. *Ambroſe* which are the Genuine, the Second *Apology for* David; but it is confeſs'd in the Preface, that it has been queſtion'd, and that there is reaſon for doing ſo: Indeed it is obſerv'd, that in all the Manuſcripts that have been ſeen, this Book goes under the name of St. *Ambroſe*, and the Conjectures which ſome Criticks have alledg'd to ſhow its impoſture, are rejected. But then they find the Stile is different from St. *Ambroſe*'s, and the Author uſes a different Verſion of Scripture, and ſometimes the Vulgar Latin, and he ſpeaks of Two ſorts of Wills and Operations in Jeſus Chriſt, in ſuch a manner as ſavours very much of the Times of the *Monothelites*. They add, that this Author only Copies and Enlarges upon what St. *Ambroſe* had ſaid before. The Second Apology contains a great part of what is in the Firſt; And what probability is there that St. *Ambroſe* ſhould twice repeat the ſame thing? The Subject of both is the ſame. The Author undertakes to ſhow, that no Man ought to be offended with any thing that is related in Scripture; and that *David* fell into the Crimes of Murder and Adultery. His Defence is divided into Three Parts. In the Firſt he ſhows that the Fall of *David* muſt be attributed to the Infirmity of Humane Nature, and that his Amendment was the effect of his Vertue. In the Second he ſays, that *David* fell, to inſtruct the *Jews* that they ſhould continue no longer in their blindneſs. In the laſt, Chriſtians are inſtructed in the Myſtery which is typyfy'd by *David*'s Fall. The Author enlarges upon common places, and employs part of his Diſcourſe in refutation of the Hereticks, and chiefly of the *Arians* and *Manichees*. This Treatiſe is compoſed of popular Harangues.

The Expoſitions of ſome particular *Pſalms* are not a formal Commentary upon them, but a Collection of Homilies upon the *Pſalms* preach'd or compos'd upon ſeveral Occaſions. However it appears by the Preface to the Commentary upon the Firſt *Pſalm*, that St. *Ambroſe* had a Deſign to Expound all the *Pſalms*. The Homily upon the Firſt *Pſalm*, was preach'd about the Year 390, after the Inſtitution of ſinging in the Church of *Milan*. The Explcations of the 35th. and the Five following *Pſalms* are alſo a Collection of Homilies preach'd one after another about the Year 393. The Preface ſhews that it is a Collection of Sermons, and there are Two or Three Places in the Explication of *Pſal.* 36. which ſerve to denote this Epocha.

As to the Expoſition of *Pſal.* 43. he dictated it himſelf a little before his Death to his Deacon *Paulinus*, as he ſays, in the Life of his Maſter.

The Explications of *Pſalms* 45, 47, 48, 61. are ſeparate Homilies. In theſe Expoſitions St. *Ambroſe* follows the Text of the *Septuagint*, but he ſometimes takes notice of the Differences of the Verſions of *Theodotion*, *Symmachus* and *Aquila*. Yet he does not confine himſelf to a literal Expoſition, but often gives Myſtical Sences of them. Sometimes he lays down Principles of Morality, and upon certain Occaſions he oppoſes the Hereticks. In many places he copies from St. *Baſil*, and in others from *Origen*, ſome of whoſe Errors have crept into his Expoſitions.

The work upon *Pſalm* 119. is a Collection of many Sermons, wherein St. *Ambroſe* rather confines himſelf to the Moral than the Spiritual Sence; which gave him occaſion to reprove the Vices of ſome Perſons in his time, and he ſpares not even the Diſorders of the Clergy-men. He explains the Letters of the Hebrew Alphabet, which ſerve to diſtinguiſh the Parts of this *Pſalm*. But as he knew but little of Hebrew, ſo what he ſays about it is not very ſolid; and 'tis probable that he took his from the Etymologies of *Phylo*, which were full of Faults as St. *Jerome* aſſures us. Theſe Sermons were preach'd about the Year 386, after the Diſcovery of the Relicks of St. *Gervaſius* and St. *Protaſius*. There are as many Sermons, as there are Letters of the Hebrew Alphabet which make the Diviſions of this *Pſalm*, each Sermon anſwers to a Section contain'd under each Letter. There he explains alſo part of the *Canticles*.

In the Commentary upon St. *Luke*, St. *Ambroſe* confines himſelf more cloſely to the Hiſtorical and Literal Sence, than in his other Commentaries. In explaining the Text of St. *Luke*, he clears ſome places of the other Goſpels, and reconciles the apparent Contradictions which may occurr between them. He obſerves in the Preface to this Work, that the Goſpel of St. *John* is more ſublime, but St. *Luke* follows the order of Hiſtory more ſtrictly, and relates many more particulars. He adds, that St. *Matthew* is chiefly employ'd in deſcribing the Birth of Jeſus Chriſt, and informing Men of his Manners; that St. *Mark* dwells longer in the deſcription of his Strength and Power: That St. *Luke* repreſents him as a High-Prieſt and a Sacrifice; And that St. *John* inſiſts more than any other upon the Miracles of his Reſurrection. In the begining of this Commentary he mentions the many Apochryphal Goſpels, as that of the Twelve, the Goſpel of St. *Thomas*, and that of St. *Matthias*, and aſſures us, that the Church never receiv'd any but thoſe Four Goſpels which were written by the Inſpiration of the Holy Spirit. Theſe are St. *Ambroſe*'s general Remarks upon the Four Goſpels. It were too long to mention particularly all things that are in this Commentary. He confines himſelf for

for the most part, as we have already said, to the Letter and History of the Gospel, but yet he cannot refrain from having recourse oft-times to the Mystical Sence, and draws from it Moral Precepts. These are the Homilies which make up the body of this Commentary, which is divided into Ten Books or Parts. He wrote it after the Persecution of the Empress *Justina* about the Year 386. St. *Ambrose*

This Tome ends with a Commentary upon the *Canticles*, extracted out of the Works of St. *Ambrose*, collected by *William* Abbot of St. *Thierry*, who lived about the Year 1142. We have already observ'd that St. *Ambrose* explain'd some considerable parts of it in many places. This gave occasion to many Persons to extract these Places, and make up a Commentary upon the *Canticles*. *Cartorius* caus'd one of his Collecting to be printed at *Louvain* in the Year 1558. Ten Years after *Gillotius* publish'd another which is attributed to *Dionisiares* a Doctor of *Paris*, who probably did nothing else but augment one that was shorter, which is in a Manuscript in the College of *Navarr*, and in another Manuscript of the Abby of *Vendosme* that is 600 Years old. *Chesseletus* had also a Manuscript of it more ancient by 200 Years, and he found it quoted by *Florus Magister* of *Lyons*, who liv'd about the Year 855, in a Commentary upon St. *Paul*, which was never printed. The Collection which is publish'd here by the *Benedictines*, was never printed before. It is publish'd from a Manuscript by the same hand of *William* Abbot of St. *Thierry*, and afterwards Monk of *Signi*.

The First Book contain'd in the Second Tome of St. *Ambrose*'s Works, is his excellent Treatise *concerning the Office of Ministers*, or the Duties of Clergy-men. For tho' the name of Ministers be cut out in the *Roman* Edition, and in those that follow'd it; yet it is to be found in all the Manuscripts; and 'tis plain by the Book it self, that St. *Ambrose* compos'd it for his Clergy. But tho' he addresses himself particulary to them, yet he does not forget to treat of the Duties of all Christians, of which he makes a particular Application to the Clergy.

He had been several Years Bishop when he compos'd this Work, for there he speaks to the Clergy whom he had Chosen and Ordain'd himself. He must therefore have been Bishop for some time, since he had already Ordain'd a considerable number of Clergy-men. He there takes notice, that he had endur'd several Shocks from the Civil Powers, because he would not deliver up the *Depositа* which were entrusted with the Church. He says, that Two Persons of whom he had a bad Opinion, had abjur'd the Catholick Faith in the time of the *Arian* Persecution, *Arianæ infestationis*; which is to be understood of the Persecution of the Empress *Justina*.

He says also, that he sold the sacred Vessels to redeem Captives and Slaves, whose number was so great, that they would fill a whole Province.

This may have reference either to the War of *Maximus* in the Year 387, or to the Inundation of the *Barbarians*, who having kill'd the Emperour *Valens* ravag'd the Countries of *Thrace* and *Illyricum*, and came over into *Italy*, where they made a great number of Captives, which happen'd in the Year 379. He speaks also of a Famine which afflicted the City of *Rome* under *Damasus* in the Year 383.

Lastly speaking of a *Depositum* entrusted with the Bishop of *Pavia*, he says, that the Emperour did all that he could to wrest it out of the hand of this Bishop, that he might give it to one of his Courtiers. And we find a Law of *Valentinian* publish'd at *Pavia*, *January* the 2d. 386. All these Transactions do clearly demonstrate, that the Books of Offices were not written by St. *Ambrose* at the beginning of his Bishoprick, and that 'tis very probable they were not written till about the Year 390, or 391, when Peace was restor'd to the Church after the Death of the Tyrant *Maximus*. He follow'd and imitated in these Three Books the Design and Method of *Tully*'s Offices. He confirms those good Maxims which this Orator had laid down, and corrects those that are imperfect, refutes those that are false, and adds several others which are infinitley more excellent, more pure, and more sublime.

The first Six Chapters of the First Book of St. *Ambrose*'s Offices, are a Preface to the whole Work, wherein he enquires, when and how it is seasonable to Speak or to be Silent. The Bishops are oblig'd by their Office to explain the Word of God; but they ought to discharge this Duty with Humility; they must learn by teaching, and that they may teach. This is what St. *Ambrose* applies to himself. "For, says he, being remov'd all of the sudden from the Civil Bench, and from the Office of "a Judge, that I might be promoted to the Priesthood, I have taught what I had not then learn'd, "and was oblig'd to Learn and Teach at the same time. After this he discovers the Advantages of being Silent, and the Dangers to which a Man exposes himself by speaking; but yet he would not have Men always to continue in silence. On the contrary, he says, that it is useful and necessary to speak, provided it be done with Humility and Moderation, provided that one weighs his Words in the balance of the Sanctuary, and does not follow the Motions of his Lusts, but Reason and Justice; and provided that he does not employ his Voice to retaliate Reproaches by Reproaches

After this Preface he enters upon the Matter, and undertakes to treat of *Offices*. He affirms that this Name was not only in use among the Philosophers, but that it is in the Holy Scripture. He quotes one single Passage taken out of the Gospel of St. *Luke*, Ch. 1. P. 23. Where there is mention made of the Ministry of *Zacharias*, and he translates the Greek Word by *Office*. This Example does not prove very strongly what he had affirm'd. After this he gives two Etymologies of the Word *Officium*; the First is *ab efficiendo, quasi efficium*; and the Second *ab officiendo*. The Philosophers distinguish'd Three Sorts of Offices, of *Honesty*, of *Profit*, and of *Pleasure*. St. *Ambrose* says, that the Christians know no other but that of *Honesty*, because they referr all to the Happiness of Heaven, being persuaded, that the *Profits* and *Pleasures* of this Life, are neither *true Profits* nor *true Pleasures*. And therfore he treats only of the Offices which have reference to Honesty. He affirms that this Term of Honesty and Decency was known to *David* before the Philosopher used it; and for proof

St. Ambroſe

of this, he quotes *Pſal.* 64. 2. *Praiſe becomes thee, O Lord, in Zion, Te decet hymnus, Deus, in Sion.* He adds ſome Paſſages of St. *Paul*, where he ſpeaks of *Decency and Honeſty*. He affirms that *Pythagoras* follow'd *David* in impoſing the Law of Silence upon his Diſciples. But he puts a very great difference between their Precepts, in that *Pythagoras* wholly forbade his Scholars to ſpeak, whereas *David* teaches us to ſpeak with moderation, and to hold our Peace when it is convenient to do ſo. He diſtinguiſhes Two Sorts of Offices, the leſs perfect which he calls *medium*, and the moſt perfect. He explains this by the Words of Jeſus Chriſt to the young Man, who aſk'd him what he muſt do to inherit Eternal Life. Jeſus Chriſt anſwer'd him at firſt, *Keep the Commandments, Do not commit Murder nor Adultery*, &c. Theſe, ſays St. *Ambroſe*, are the leſs perfect Offices, to which there is ſtill ſomething wanting. Thoſe that are perfect are deſign'd by what Jeſus Chriſt ſaid afterwards to the young Man, when he had anſwer'd him that he had obſerv'd all theſe things. *If you would be perfect, go and ſell all your Goods, and give them to the Poor, and you ſhall have Treaſure in Heaven, and come and follow me.* This gave occaſion to St. *Ambroſe* to recommend Alms-giving as one of the principal Duties of the Chriſtian Life.

Here he treats very largely of the Providence of God, and proves againſt the Philoſophers, that it extends to all Creatures. Why then do the Wicked here enjoy Plenty? This is the common Objection: To which St. *Ambroſe* anſwers, Firſt, that this Abundance does not make them happy in this Life, becauſe the remorſe of their Conſcience torments them.

He adds in the Second place, that we muſt not wonder, if the Wicked ſeem to be happy in this Life, and on the contrary the Good ſeem to be miſerable, becauſe this is not the Place of Reward or Puniſhment. That we muſt wait till the other Life, when every one ſhall receive according to his Works, that here we are in a place of Combate, that the Juſt are to endure continual Aſſaults, that they may obtain one day the Reward of their Victory; whereas the Wicked here enjoy Repoſe who deſerve no Reward, after which ſhall follow the Puniſhments which their Sins deſerve. That in ſhort, God has granted to thoſe the good Things and Advantages of this Life, that they might be without Excuſe in the Day of Judgement, for not obſerving the Commandments of God.

St. *Ambroſe* having thus eſtabliſh'd theſe general Maxims, enters upon the particular conſideration of the Duties of every State.

He begins with thoſe which belong to young Men: He recommends to them above all things Shamefac'dneſs and Modeſty; he gives a wonderful deſcription of this Vertue, and proves how neceſſary it is to Clergy-men. He ſays that he had hindred one from entring into Holy Orders, becauſe his Countenance was not modeſt enough, and that he had forbid another to walk before him becauſe he had too confident a Gate. He counſels them not to be preſent at Feaſts, and to ſhun the Converſation of Women; he recommends to them to ſtay at home, and to apply themſelves to the Duties of Piety which are agreeable to their Miniſtry. Afterwards he gives Precepts for reſtraining the Motions of Anger and of other Paſſions. He deſcribes the Diſcourſes of Clergy-men. He does not think it fit that they ſhould uſe Railery. He gives them Three Rules for the good Conduct of their Actions. The Firſt is, to hold their Paſſions in ſubjection to Reaſon; The Second is to obſerve Moderation; The Third is to do all things ſeaſonably and in order. He illuſtrates theſe Maxims by the Examples of many Saints in the Old Teſtament.

After he has laid down theſe general Rules, he diſcourſes of Vertues in particular, comparing the *Idea's* which Chriſtians have of them with thoſe which the Pagan Philoſophers had; and ſhews, that thoſe of the Chriſtians are much more ſublime. As for Example, Juſtice among Chriſtians does not allow, that they ſhould render Evil for Evil; it acknowledges no particular Intereſt, and it takes place, not only with reſpect to Friends, but alſo to declared Enemies. Likewiſe Chriſtians are not only to do good to their Friends and their Relations, but alſo to their Enemies. It is not Vanity, but Charity, which is the foundation of their Liberality; they do not only give of their Superfluities, but alſo of their Neceſſaries. Their ſtrength conſiſts chiefly in ſuffering with Courage and Conſtancy, in keeping off the Violence which is offer'd to the Weak, in over-coming their Paſſions, in deſpiſing the Riches of this World, and ſeeking after, loving and valuing nothing but Vertue. They preſerve an evenneſs of Soul and wonderful Tranquility of Mind in the midſt of Croſſes: Yet they do not raſhly expoſe themſelves, and are not aſham'd to fly, when they find themſeves too weak to reſiſt Perſecutions. In ſhort, their Moderation conſiſts in Tranquility of Mind, in the love of Mildneſs, in compleat Meekneſs and perfect Honeſty. St. *Ambroſe* explains particularly all the parts of theſe Vertues, gives excellent Precepts for obſerving them, and propoſes admirable Examples of them taken out of the Holy Scripture. He produces alſo ſome Examples of them taken out of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory; that of St. *Lawrence* is very remarkable. St. *Ambroſe* propoſes him as an illuſtrious Pattern of Conſtancy. He ſays, "That this holy Deacon, ſeeing *Xyſtus* his Biſhop dragg'd away to Martyr-"dom, he fell a weeping, not that the Martyrdom of his Maſter griev'd him, but becauſe he was left "behind him in the World; upon which account he addreſſes to him in theſe Words: *Whither go* "*you, my Father, without your Son? Whither run you, O holy Biſhop, without being accompanied by* "*your Deacon? You never us'd to offer Sacrifice without a Miniſter; what is it then that has diſpleas'd* "*you in me? Is it becauſe you have found that I have not well diſcharg'd my Office? Try now, whether* "*you have choſen a good Miniſter: Why do you refuſe him with whom you have conſecrated, and who* "*has conſecrated the Holy Sacraments with you? Why do you refuſe him, ſay I, to mingle his Blood with* "*yours?* St. *Xyſtus* anſwers in theſe words, and others like them. *I do not deſert you, my Son, I do* "*not abandon you, but you are reſerv'd for greater Combates: Mourn not, you ſhall quickly follow me,* "*within Three Days you ſhall be where I am.* Such, ſays St. *Ambroſe*, was the glorious conteſt of thoſe

"two

"two illustrious Martyrs, who strove who should first suffer for Jesus Christ. The History of *Orestes* and *Pylades* meets with applause, when it is represented how each of them endeavoured with all his might to die for one another. These two would both have died, the one having committed Particides, and the other being a Complice in it; but there was nothing that obliged St. *Lawrence* to offer himself to Death, his own Zeal only induc'd him to it; and three Days after, as he was roasting upon a Grid-Iron, he still mock'd the Tyrant, saying, *I am roasted enough, turn me and eat me*, and so he overcame the Violence of Fire by the Strength of his Courage. We must not forget the Example of St. *Agnes* which St. *Ambrose* relates before this. "This Holy Virgin, says he, being in "danger of losing either her Chastity or her Life, secur'd her Virginity, by yielding up this Mortal "Life to purchase an Eternal one. St. *Ambrose*

About the End of this Book St. *Ambrose* insists upon the principal Vertues of Clergy-men; he recommends to them above all things Disinterestedness and Purity. It appears by this place, That St. *Ambrose* thought that Bishops, Priests and Deacons, were obliged to live in Celibacy, and that those could not be received into the Clergy who had been twice married, tho' they had been married the first time before their Baptism.

He concludes with speaking of the Trust committed to us, and of the Fidelity we should show in keeping that which is entrusted to us. He recommends to the Clergy-men who take Care of the Vestry, to discharge their Duty with Faithfulness and Modesty.

He begins the Second Book with enquiring, wherein consists true Happiness, and he shows, That it consists in the Knowledge of God, and in Innocency of Life; That all other good things, do not only fall short of our supreme Happiness, but they do not so much as render us more happy; as on the contrary, the Crosses and Miseries of this Life do not render us more unhappy; That the good things of this World, such as Riches, Abundance, Joy, *&c.* are truly Evils, because they hinder us from working out our Salvation; whereas those things which are believed to be evil, as Pain, Affliction, *&c.* are good for us, because they give us Opportunities of practising Vertue.

Afterwards he treats of the Good that is Profitable; and having shown that there is no true Profit without Honesty, he discourses of the several sorts of Good Things that are truly profitable, of Friendship, of Advice, of Fidelity, of Liberality, of Good-will, of Civility, of the Protection of the Poor and Afflicted, of Hospitality, and the other Vertues necessary for maintaining Society and Commerce among Men. The Advices which he gives about these things, are very Judicious: Some of them are as follows. Nothing is more profitable than to be lov'd; nothing is more disadvantageous than not to be loved. Mildness, Civility and Modesty, cause us to be lov'd of all the World. These Vertues are very becoming to Kings and Princes as well as to private Persons; they maintain Peace and Charity. A Man is more easily trusted, who is lov'd by many. When Counsel is to be ask'd, we should address our selves to a Person who is equally Just and Wise. These Two Vertues are inseparable. We must not only assist the Poor who have nothing to live upon, but it is a Piece of Prudence and Charity to help also those who are unfortunate in their Affairs, chiefly, when it is not by their Debauchery that they are reduc'd to this Condition, but by some unforeseen Misfortune. 'Tis also a Duty of Charity to redeem Captives, and rescue them out of the Hands of their Enemies, to save Women from Disgrace; this is, to restore Children to their Fathers, and Fathers to their Children, and Citizens to their own Country. There are some also that do a Work of Charity, by marrying Orphan Daughters. When we cannot help others by giving them Money, it is good to assist them by our Counsel and Labours. We must do Works of Charity with Prudence, and not give Alms to those that are unworthy. There are some that feign Debts, and others that deplore their Misery; we must examine whether these things be true or no; and we are not only to employ our Hands to give, but also to make use of our Eyes to consider the Persons to whom we give. We must look upon him who does not see us, and seek after him who is asham'd to be found. Yet we must not retrench our Alms, under a pretence that many ask them who do not deserve to receive them. I omit many other fine Maxims which he proposes concerning Alms, and contempt of Riches; but I cannot forget that place, where he says, That he broke in pieces the Sacred Vessels to redeem Captives, He justifies himself in this Action, or rather he draws from it a great deal of Glory. "The "Church, says he, was founded without Gold, if she has it now, 'tis to give it and not to keep it; "tis for assisting the Poor with it in their great Necessities. What would be said of a Bishop, who "to preserve the lifeless Vessels, would suffer the living Members of Christ to perish? Would he say, "I am afraid lest the Temple of the Lord should be spoil'd of its Ornaments? Might it not be answered to him, That 'tis not necessary that the Sacraments of the Altar should be administred in "Gold or Silver; That the Redemption of Captives was an Ornament much more pleasing in the "sight of God; That those Vessels could not be put to a nobler Use than when they are employ'd "to redeem the Lives of Christians; That the true Treasure of the Lord is that which has the same "effect with his Blood; That then a Vessel is known to be truly the Lord's when there is a double "Redemption to be observ'd in it; that is, when the exteriour Vessel redeems from the Enemy, "those whom the Blood of Jesus Christ hath redeem'd from Sin.

He justifies also this Conduct by the Example of St. *Lawrence* who show'd the Poor when the Treasures of the Church were demanded of him. At last, He concludes, That tho' it be a Crime to break the Vessels of the Church, to turn them to our own Profit; yet on the contrary, it is an Act of Charity and Vertue to do it, to distribute them to the Poor, to redeem Captives, to build a Church, when such things are necessary. He adds, That he used that Precaution, as to take first the Vessels which were not Consecrated, and afterwards to break and melt those that were, lest any should turn the Sacred Chalices to profane Uses. He concludes this Book with recommending to the Clergy,

Clergy, to keep with Faithfulneſs and Courage what is depoſited in the Churches by Widows, and
St. Ambroſe relates ſome Examples of the Boldneſs wherewith ſome have defended theſe things againſt thoſe who came to invade them.

And here I muſt reſume the 24. Ch. of which I have ſaid nothing. St. *Ambroſe* there deſcribes the chief Duties of Clergy-men towards others in a few Words. "We muſt, ſays he, prepare our ſelves "by good Actions and by a good Intention to receive Offices, and chiefly thoſe of the Clergy. We "muſt not carry our ſelves proudly in them, nor eſtrange our ſelves from them by negligence; we muſt "equally ſhun Ambition and the Affectation of refuſing them. Simplicity and Uprightneſs compre- "hends all, and theſe are of themſelves commendable enough. In the Exerciſe of his Miniſtry he muſt "neither be too ſevere nor too remiſs, leſt he ſhould ſeem either to exerciſe his Authority with Domi- "nion over the Flock, or elſe to neglect the Duties of his Miniſtry; he muſt endeavour to oblige all "the World. A Biſhop ſhould conſider and protect the Prieſts and the other Clergy-men, he ſhould "not be offended if they purchaſe Eſteem either by their Charity, or their Faſting, or their Piety, or "their Learning: But theſe ought not to exalt themſelves, much leſs employ their own Merits to "diminiſh the Reputation of their Biſhop. The Wicked muſt not be defended; nor Holy Things "given to thoſe that are unworthy of them; but neither are we to reprove and condemn any Perſon "till he be convicted of a Fault. For if Injuſtice be otherwiſe above all things offenſive, it is inſup- "portable in the Church, where every thing ſhould be regulated according to Equity, where impar- "tiality ſhould be obſerved. The Powerful and Rich ought to have no more Authority than the "Poor, becauſe the Rich and Poor are all one in Jeſus Chriſt. The moſt Holy ſhould attribute no- "thing more to himſelf than others; for the more Holy he is, the more Humble he ought to be. "When we Judge, we ought not to have any reſpect of Perſons. Favour ſhould have no place in our "Judgments, but only the Juſtice of the Cauſe. Nothing does more wound the Reputation and Cre- "dit which we may have, than to betray the Cauſe of the weak in Favour of thoſe that are more "Powerful; to reprove a Poor Man that is Innocent ſeverely, and to excuſe a Rich Man that is Guilty. "'Tis true that we are naturally inclin'd to favour Great Perſons, leſt they find that Injuſtice has been "done them, and afterwards revenge themſelves upon us. But, Firſt, if you be afraid of making "your ſelves Enemies, do not meddle with judging or oppoſing. You can ſay nothing when a Matter "of Intereſt is under debate, tho' it were better done to protect Juſtice; but when the Cauſe of God "lies at ſtake, or it is to be fear'd that the Impious will be admitted to the Communion of the "Church, then it is a very heinous Sin for Clergy-men to uſe Diſſimulation.

In the Firſt Chapter of the Third Book St. *Ambroſe* ſhows, That this Maxim of *Scipio*, *That he was never more buſy nor leſs alone, than when he was by himſelf*, was ancienter than *Scipio*; and that it was verified in a more Illuſtrious manner in *Moſes*, *Elias*, *Eliſha*, and the Apoſtles, who did ſo many wonderful things, when they ſeem'd to mind nothing. He adds, That a Juſt man is never alone, becauſe he is always with God; That he is never idle, becauſe he is always meditating; That he ſeems to be unknown, and yet is Famous; That when he is thought to be Dead, he then enjoys a more happy Life; That he is never more joyful than when others think him to be under Affliction; That he is never richer than when he is poor, becauſe he places all his Happineſs in Juſtice and Honeſty. He obſerves afterwards, That the Compariſon which the Philoſophers make between the Good of Honeſty and of Profit, has no place among Chriſtians, becauſe they acknowledge nothing Profitable to be Good which is not alſo Honeſt. He diſtinguiſhes two ſorts of Good and of Duty, that which is more, and that which is leſs perfect. In ſhort, he maintains, That a Juſt Man ought never to ſeek his own Profit by doing Injury to others; but on the contrary, that he ought to ſeek the Good of others above his own. He enlarges upon this Maxim, and proves, that for any Man to do Injury to his Neighbour for his own Profit, is contrary to the Example, and to the Law of Jeſus Chriſt, to the Law of Nature, to the Dictates of Conſcience, and to the Civil Laws. Purſuant to this Principle he determines, that a Chriſtian in a Ship-wrack ought not to ſnatch from his Brother the Plank which he has taken to ſave himſelf; and that he ought not to fight againſt a Robber who would ſet upon him, and lays it down for a General Maxim, *That 'tis never lawful to preſerve our own Life by putting another to Death.* The Philoſophers were ſo far in the right when they affirm'd, That a Wiſe-man, tho' he were ſecur'd for ever from any Diſcovery, ſhould do nothing againſt his Duty; but finding no Example to prove it, they had recourſe to the Fable of *Gyges*'s Ring: St. *Ambroſe* confirms this Truth by the Example of *David* and St. *John* Baptiſt.

In a Word, St. *Ambroſe* proves that in all Caſes we ought to preferr Honeſty to Profit. He grounds upon this Principle his Aſſertion, That one who has gathered together much Corn, ought not to keep it up in his Barns untill a time of Famine that he may Sell it very dear. He condemns this Practice as a ſort of Uſury, or Robbery. He would not have Strangers hindred from coming into Cities in a time of Famine, and blames the ancient Romans for the practice of this Rigour; but praiſes an Old Man, who in his time was of a contrary Opinion. Having related many Examples taken out of Scripture, to ſhow that we ought to preferr Honeſty to Profit, he reproves the Conduct of thoſe who are always intent upon forbid Gain, who uſe all manner of Tricks to Cheat others of their Goods, and leave no means uneſſay'd to poſſeſs themſelves of their Neighbours Inheritance. He adds, That his Covetouſneſs is very much to be blam'd in all ſorts of Perſons; but it is inſupportable in Clergy-men, who ought to allow dying Men their Liberty to make their Laſt Will with Diſcretion and Freedom: That a Clergy-man ought never to alienate the Goods which belong to another for his own Profit, becauſe it is his Duty to do Good to all the World, and to do no Injury to any Man. From hence he concludes, that when we cannot help one Man, but we muſt do Injury to another, it

is

more convenient to deny our Aſſiſtance to the former, than by doing him Good to Prejudice the latter. For this cauſe he would not have Clergy-men meddle in Pecuniary Cauſes, becauſe in gaining from one they injure another. St. *Ambroſe*

At laſt he collects ſeveral Examples taken out of The Old Teſtament, which he alledges to prove, That Honeſty is to be preferr'd before any Intereſt and Advantage whatſoever. He concludes this Book with ſome Excellent Precepts which he gives concerning Honeſt and Chriſtian Friendſhip. I ſhall ſet down ſome of them. Friendſhip it ſelf ought to give place to Honeſty. No Man ought to favour his Friend when he is in the wrong, nor to deal unjuſtly by him when he is in the right: As we ought to vindicate him when he is Innocent, ſo we ought to reprove him when he is Guilty: we ought to ſpeak to him with ſincerity, to open our Heart to him, to reprove him with Freedom, to ſuffer for him when it is neceſſary, and to relieve him in his wants. The Foundation of Friendſhip is Faith in God, and no Man can be a true Friend to another, who is an Infidel towards God. Piety preſerves Friendſhip, and makes Friends equal. There can be no Friendſhip between Perſons of different Principles. One Friend ought to admoniſh another without bitterneſs, and rebuke him without reproaches. Our Friendſhips ought not to be founded upon Intereſt, for Friendſhip is a Vertue, and not a Matter of Traffick. There is no true Friendſhip where there is Flattery. Thus I have given an Abridgement of St. *Ambroſe*'s Offices, which is a very uſeful Book to teach all Chriſtians the Principles, Maxims, and Rules of that moſt Holy Morality which they profeſs: And this made it ſo common in former Ages; every one would have it, every one would read it with attention, and thoſe who had leiſure made Abridgments of it, which are ſtill extant. It were to be wiſh'd that Chriſtians, and chiefly Clergy-men, would do the ſame ſtill, and that they would draw from this pure Fountain the Morality which they teach and which they practice. The French Tranſlation which has been made of it may render it uſeful to all Men. But let us proceed to the other Treatiſes of St. *Ambroſe*.

The Books *of Virginity* were written by St. *Ambroſe* at the Requeſt of his Siſter *Marcellina*, who having heard ſome ſpeak of the Sermons which he had made about Virginity, deſir'd him to ſend her in writing what he had preach'd, ſince ſhe could not be ſo happy as to hear him. Whereupon he put his Sermons in the Form of a Treatiſe, and divided them into Three Books, which he addreſs'd to his Siſter *Marcellina*, in the Third Year of his Biſhoprick, that is to ſay in the Year 377.

After a very humble Preface, he begins his Treatiſe with a Diſcourſe in praiſe of St. *Agnes*. He ſets off the Glorious Martyrdom of that Illuſtrious Virgin with inimitable Elegance. "To Day, ſays he, "is the Feaſt of a Virgin, let us imitate her Purity: It is the Holy-day of a Martyr, let us offer up "Sacrifices: 'Tis the Feſtival of St. *Agnes*, let Men admire her, and Young Children entertain bleſſed "Hopes of her; let Married Women wonder, and Virgins endeavour to imitate her. But what can "we ſay worthy of a Perſon whoſe very Name is a ſufficient commendation. Her Zeal was above "her Age, and her Vertue exceeded the Powers of Nature.... This Holy Virgin ſuffer'd Mar"tyrdom at Twelve Years of Age. By how much the Cruelty of thoſe who did not ſpare ſuch ten"der Years is to be deteſted, by ſo much is the Vertue of that Faith to be admir'd, which could "make a Martyr at that Age..... Here is a New kind of Martyrdom. She was not yet of an Age "fit to ſuffer, and yet ſhe was already able to Conquer. She went to Death with more gaiety than "a young Bride to the Nuptial Bed. All People mourn for her, and yet ſhe ſhed not one Tear "for her ſelf. It was Matter of admiration, to ſee her prodigally throw away that Life, which ſhe "had ſcare yet taſted, with as much Eaſe as if ſhe were arriv'd at the end of her Courſe. In ſhort, "what ſhe did was ſo incredible of humane Nature, that it was believ'd to be from God; for what"ſoever tranſcends the Power of Nature, muſt proceed from the Author of it. What Threatnings "did not her Executioner uſe to frighten her? What Artifices did he not employ to perſuade her? "By what various Solicitations did he attempt her to yield to Marry? That were, ſaid ſhe, an In"jury to my Divine Spouſe, to entertain any hopes of being able to pleaſe others? I am only his "who has choſen me firſt: Why do you delay, Executioner, to do your Office? Let this Body of "mine periſh, ſeeing it is ſo unhappy as to be pleaſant in the Eyes of thoſe whom I would not have "it to pleaſe. Having ſpoken theſe Words ſhe put her ſelf into a Poſture to receive the Fatal Blow; "ſhe pray'd and then ſubmitted her Neck. You ſee here a double Sacrifice in one Victim. She is "a Martyr both for Religion and Virginity; ſhe remains a Virgin, and obtains a Crown of Mar"tyrdom.

St. *Ambroſe*, having propoſed this Illuſtrious Examlpe, treats at large of the Excellency of Virginity. He ſhews, That this Vertue comes from Heaven, and that God is the Author of it; That the Heathens neither knew it, nor practis'd it as they ought; That the Jews themſelves did not eſteem it, and that it was not common amongſt Men till Jeſus Chriſt came into the World. Afterward he gives a Catalogue of the Advantages which Virginity has above the married State, by comparing theſe Two Conditions. "I do not condem Marriage, ſays he, but I will prove that Virginity is more Excel"lent. Let us compare, if you pleaſe, the more conſiderable Advantages of married Women with "the leaſt Happineſs of Virgins: The married Woman may boaſt of her Fruitfulneſs, which makes "her happy in Children, but the more ſhe brings into the World, the more Pain ſhe ſuffers. She "may reckon upon the Comfort and Support ſhe ſhall have from her Children; but with this let "her balance the troubles they bring upon her. What might I not ſay of the troubles which Mo"thers muſt undergo both in Nurſing Children and bringing them up, and then in marrying of "them? What is more bariſh than that Subjection, or rather Slavery, to which Wives are reduc'd? "What is more uneaſy than thoſe perpetual Complaiſances which they muſt always uſe towards "their Husbands? Fears and Jealouſies and a Thouſand other Cares render them unhappy. The Ne"ceſſity and Slavery they undergo in dreſſing and adorning themſelves is a perpetual Puniſhment. But

St. *Ambroſe* "you, O bleſſed Virgins, know not what all this attiring means, you have no other Ornament but "Modeſty and Chaſtity; you court no other Beauty than that of Vertue, a Beauty which cannot be "ſhar'd with others, nor taken away by Death, nor defac'd by any Sickneſs; you have none to pleaſe "but God who loveth beautiful Souls, tho' they be ſhut up in deform'd Bodies; you are not troubled "with the Inconveniences of Child-bearing, and of bringing forth Children, and yet you have a very "numerous Spiritual Off-ſpring.

St. *Ambroſe* complains that there were ſo few Perſons at *Milan* who profited by his Inſtructions, whilſt a great many Virgins, not only from *Bologna* and *Placentia*, but even from *Mauritania*, came to receive the Veil at *Milan*. He reproves Mothers who hindered their Daughters from coming to his Sermons, leſt they ſhould embrace Virginity. At laſt, he commends thoſe Virgins who devoted themſelves to God without their Parents leave, and relates the Example of a young Gentlewoman, who being preſs'd by her Mother and Relations to Marry, threw her ſelf down before the Altars, and would not ſtir from thence till ſhe had obtained the Conſent of her Parents to her profeſſing Virginity. 'Tis obſervable, that St. *Ambroſe* ſays, That at length her Relations approv'd her Deſign, and ſo ſhe was not depriv'd of her Eſtate.

In the Second Book he undertakes to Inſtruct Virgins by ſome Examples which he propoſes to them: And becauſe the Virgin *Mary* was undoubtedly the moſt perfect of all Virgins, her Example is the Firſt and moſt Illuſtrious. St. *Ambroſe* here propoſes her Life as a Pattern which Virgins ought to imitate, and repreſents her Vertues in a moſt Excellent manner. *From this Father Preachers and Devoto's may learn how to praiſe the Virgin in ſuch a manner as is worthy of her, without ſtuffing their Diſcourſes with Apocryphal Stories, Exceſſive Praiſes, and Falſe Notions. The Picture which he draws of her, repreſents her as ſhe was, and ſets before our Eyes her Natural Beauty; whereas ſome of the Devoto's of the latter Ages, have changed and diſfigured her by vain Ornaments, which are no ways agreeable to her, neither could ſhe her ſelf endure them.*

St. *Ambroſe* having propos'd to Virgins the Example of the bleſſed *Mary*, as the Pattern of their Life; ſets before them alſo the Example of St. *Thecla* the Martyr, to Inſtruct them how to die well He ſubjoyns the Example of a Chriſtian Virgin of *Antioch*, who being carried to the Stews becauſe ſhe would not Sacrifice to Idols, was deliver'd from the Danger ſhe was in by a Souldier, who chang'd Clothes with her and ſav'd her. But when this came to be known, the Souldier was carried to the place of Puniſhment, where the Virgin alſo rendred her ſelf. and they both receiv'd the Crown of Martyrdom. St. *Ambroſe* deſcribes this Hiſtory in very lively and eloquent Figures, and comparing it with the Fable of *Damon* and *Pythias*, he proves that this Action was much nobler and greater, than that which is related of thoſe two famous Friends. Towards the End, he excuſes himſelf for uſing ſo many Flowers and Figures of Rhetorick in relating theſe Examples of Virgins, which he ſays he did not do to ſhow his Eloquence, but to win the Affections of Virgins by the Sweetneſs and Smoothneſs of his Diſcourſe, and to render their Condition the more Amiable by the Beauty of the Examples which he propos'd to them, before he proceeded to the Precepts and Advices which might be leſs agreeable.

The Third Book begins with an Exhortation which Pope *Liberius* made to *Marcellina* St. *Ambroſe*'s Siſter, when he gave her the Veil at *Rome* in the Church of the Apoſtles on *Chriſtmas-Day*. There is no probability that this very Diſcourſe ſhould be *Liberius*'s, but it was certainly made by St. *Ambroſe*, and contains very uſeful Advices to Virgins conſecrated to God. After he has exhorted them to love their Divine Spouſe, he preſcribes Rules concerning their principal Duties; he enjoyns them to be very Sober, to ſhun Viſits from the People of the World, to keep Silence, and to be very Modeſt and Reſerv'd in all their Actions. When he has given theſe Precepts under the Name of *Liberius*, he praiſes the Vertues of his Siſter, and chiefly her Faſtings, but he Counſels her to moderate them, that ſhe may apply her ſelf more to other Spiritual Exerciſes, and eſpecially to Prayer. He ſays, That ſhe ſhould pray in the Morning when ſhe awakes, before ſhe goes out, before and after Meals, towards Night, and when ſhe goes to Bed. He adviſes her alſo to repeat in her Bed the Lord's Prayer and the Pſalms, either before ſhe fals aſleep, or when ſhe awakes. And he thinks that ſhe ought to repeat every Morning the Creed as the Seal of our Faith. He adds, That ſhe ought to weep, and ſhun exceſſive Mirth, the Pleaſures of this World, and particularly Dancing. And to diſſuade Chriſtian Virgins from it, he relates the Example of the Dancing of *Herodias*'s Daughter, and deſcribes the fatal Conſequences of it: A fit Example, ſays he to teach Wiſe and Chriſtian Ladies, that they ought not to ſuffer their Daughters to practiſe Dancing.

Laſtly, St. *Ambroſe* anſwers the Queſtion which *Marcellina* had put to him, to know what was to be thought of Virgins who kill'd themſeves or threw themſelves head-long to ſhun falling into the hands of their Perſecutors, who ſought to deprive them of their Faith and their Virginity. He relates the Example of St. *Pelagia* who kill'd her ſelf, and of the Mother and Siſters of that Saint, who threw themſelves headlong into the River. He ſubjoyns the Example of St. *Sotera* who was of his own Kindred, and concludes from theſe Examples, that this Zeal is no ways forbidden. Here the Third Book of Virgins ends in all the Manuſcripts, tho' in the printed Editions there are many Pages added, that have no relation to this Treatiſe, which St. *Ambroſe* concludes with theſe Examples, as appears by the beginning of this laſt Chapter.

The Treatiſe *of Widows* was written ſoon after that of Virgins, as St. *Ambroſe* declares at the beginning of it. It was the Inconſtancy of a Widow which made him undertake this Work. St. *Ambroſe* had Comforted her after the Death of her Husband, and had Exhorted her to lay aſide her Mourning, but ſhe abuſing his Advices, had made uſe of them to gain Authority to her Deſign of marrying again. The Holy Father being unwilling that it ſhould be thought he had counſell'd her to do ſo,

wrote

wrote this Treatiſe *of Widows*, wherein he exalts the State of Widows as approaching near to the Perfection of Virgins. For proof of this he not only alledges the Teſtimony of the Apoſtle St. *Paul*, but he relates alſo the Examples of many Widows of the Old and New Teſtament. He exhorts Widows to continue in their Widow-hood, and in his Addreſs to this Widow who had occaſion'd his writing this Book, he ſhows her, That all the Reaſons which ſhe alledg'd for proceeding to a Second Marriage, were weak; yet he does not condemn either Firſt or Second Marriages; on the contrary, he rejects the Opinion of the Hereticks who had forbidden them; but he preferrs the State of Virgins and Widows before that of Married Women, and refutes with ſharpneſs the Reaſons which Women uſe for running into Second Marriages. Altho' he would not openly declare his Opinion of their Conduct, who uſe the Knife and Fire to Check the Motions of the Fleſh, yet he ſpeaks of it after ſuch a manner as plainly diſcovers that he did not approve it, and obſerves that it is contrary to the ancient Canons. This Treatiſe is cited by St. *Ambroſe* in his Commentary upon St. *Luke*, by St. *Jerom* in Letter Fifty to *Pammachius*, and ſo there can be no doubt but it is this Father's. St. *Ambroſe*

There is in this Edition a little Treatiſe of Virginity, which in the former Editions had been plac'd at the end of the Second Book about Virgins, but it is parted from it in all the Manuſcripts, and is evidently a diſtinct Treatiſe. The Treatiſe of Widows, which is there cited, was written after the Two Books of Virgins.

This little Piece is not very coherent. In it he praiſes the famous Judgment of *Solomon*, he blames the Action of *Jephtha*; and then he defends himſelf againſt thoſe who accus'd him of giving exceſſive Praiſes to the State of Virginity, and demonſtrates the Excellency and Advantages of it. He occaſionally anſwers thoſe who ſaid, That the great numbers of Virgins would leſſen the Race of Mankind, and he maintains that there are no places more populous than thoſe where there are moſt Virgins: For Proof of which he obſerves, that tho' at *Alexandria* in the Eaſt, and in *Africa*, there are an infinite number of Virgins, yet theſe Countries are very well peopled. He adds, that if this Reaſon were good, they muſt alſo adviſe Women to be lewd, becauſe ſo they would have more Children

After this, he examines the Reaſons of thoſe who find no fault with the Conſecration of Virgins, but only ſay, That we ſhould wait till they be of ſufficient Age before they receive the Veil. He confeſſes, that a Biſhop ought to beware of giving the Veil with too much precipitation, but then he ought not ſo much to regard their Age, as the ripeneſs of their Parts, nor to conſider ſo much the number of their Years as the Diſpoſition of their Hearts; that every Age can follow Jeſus Chriſt, and embrace the perfection of a Chriſtian Life. This gives him occaſion to ſpeak of the way which Virgins ought to hold in following of Jeſus Chriſt, and of the Life they ought to lead to imitate him. He concludes with comparing the Inſtructions of the Miniſters of Jeſus Chriſt, who exhort Virgins and Widows to live in Continence, to the miraculous Fiſhing of St. *Peter*; and he prays the Lord, that he would make his own fiſhing ſucceſsful to the catching of many. This Piece was compos'd of many Sermons, and was made ſoon after the Treatiſe of Widows.

The following Treatiſe is entituled in the printed Copies, *Of the Inſtruction of a Virgin*, addreſs'd to *Euſebius*, but in the Manuſcripts its Title is, *A Diſcourſe of the perpetual Virginity of the Virgin* Mary. And indeed the principal part of this Treatiſe is againſt the Errour of *Bonoſus*, who had oppos'd the perpetual Virginity of *Mary*. But that which gave occaſion to St. *Ambroſe* to compoſe this Diſcourſe, was the Profeſſion of a Maid call'd *Ambroſia*, Niece to *Euſebius* a Citizen of *Bolonia*, to whom St. *Ambroſe* had made an Exhortation when he gave her the Veil. He committed the ſame to Writing afterwards according to his cuſtom, and addreſs'd it to *Euſebius* with a Preface, wherein he diſcourſes of the chief Duties of Virgins that are conſecrated to God, which are in Silence and Prayer. After this he gives an account of a Diſcourſe which he made when he gave the Veil to *Ambroſia*: There he ſays many things in praiſe of Women, and undertakes the Defence of that Sex againſt thoſe who blam'd it. He proves that they are unjuſtly accus'd as being the cauſe of Man's Falling and Offending; and he extolls their Piety by propoſing the Vertues of many women. He ſhows, that if *Eve* gave occaſion to the Condemnation of Mankind, this Loſs was fully compenſated by *Mary*, who is the Honour of her Sex and of the Church. St. *Ambroſe* wonders, that there have been Chriſtians, who durſt oppoſe her perpetual Virginity. He adds, that this Error deſerv'd to be buried in Eternal Silence; but becauſe it had been maintain'd by a Biſhop (he means *Bonoſus*) he thought himſelf oblig'd to diſcover and refute it; which he does in the following part of this Diſcourſe, where he eſtabliſhes the Perpetual Virginity of the Virgin *Mary*, and refutes the Objections of *Bonoſus*, which were the ſame with thoſe of *Helvidius*.

The Firſt Objection which he propoſes is taken from the Word *Mulier* or Woman, which is attributed in the Holy Scripture to the Virgin. St. *Ambroſe* ſhews, that this Word is general, and is given to Virgins as well as Married Women and Widows.

The Second Objection is founded upon this Paſſage of the Goſpel, *Before they came together*; and upon that other, *He knew her not before ſhe had brought forth her firſt-born Son.* He anſwers, that theſe ways of ſpeaking do not intimate that St. *Joſeph* had afterwards any Carnal Knowledge of the Virgin, but only that he had not before; and that the Deſign of the Evangeliſt is to diſcover the principal Myſtery, *viz.* That a Virgin conceiv'd Jeſus Chriſt by the Operation of the Holy Spirit, and not to determine an incidental Queſtion. This Anſwer is much better than the Second, wherein he pretends, that the Word, *cognovit*, *he knew*, is to be underſtood only of the Myſtery, which was yet hid from *Joſeph*.

The

St. *Ambroſe* The Third Objection is taken from the Title of *Joſeph*'s Wife, which is given to *Mary*. St. *Ambroſe* anſwers, That this Title might be given her tho' ſhe were a Virgin, becauſe it is not the loſs of Virginity that makes Marriage, but the actual Conſent of the Parties, tho' it were never Conſummated. Wherfore he makes no Scruple to conclude, That there was a taue Marriage between *Joſeph* and *Mary*.

St. *Auſtin* and St. *Jerom* are of the ſame Opinion; *Gratian* and the Maſter of the Sentences follow'd them; and ſince that time it hath paſs'd for a Maxim among Canoniſts and Divines.

St. *Ambroſe* produces alſo an Objection taken from the Mention which is made of the Brethren of Jeſus Chriſt, but he does not think that it deſerves to be inſiſted on, ſince the Word, *Brother*, is a general Word which has many ſignifications, and agrees to others beſides thoſe who are born of the ſame Father and the ſame Mother.

St. *Ambroſe* proceeds afterwards to the Proofs of the perpetual Virginity of *Mary*.

He ſays Firſt, that ſince Jeſus Chriſt was able to preſeve the Virginity of his Mother, it is very improbable that he ſhould permit her to be depriv'd of that perfection.

The Second Argument is, that if *Mary* had not always been a Virgin, ſhe ſhould not have been Propos'd as a Pattern and Example to Virgins.

The Third is, that the Virgin was deſigned to be a Perſon of the greateſt Merits and Perfections, but there is none greater than Virginity.

The Fourth is, that *Joſeph* durſt not come near her, whom he knew to be the Mother of God.

The Fifth, upon which he inſiſts more largely, is, That Jeſus Chriſt ſufficiently teſtified it, by recommending her to his beloved Diſciple when he was upon the Croſs: For how, ſays he, could he remove her from her Husband, and give her to another, if ſhe had known a Husband; How could this Diſciple take her to his own houſe, if ſhe had to do with another as her Husband? Jeſus Chriſt would never have divorc'd them, and *Mary* would never have forſaken a Husband. This ſuppoſes, that St. *Joſeph* was yet alive, when Jeſus Chriſt upon the Croſs ſpoke thus to his Mother. If this Matter of Fact be not certain, the Argument is nothing worth. Beſides, ſuppoſing there was a true Marriage between St. *Joſeph* and the Virgin, as St. *Ambroſe* had already ſaid, they ought not to have been parted; 'Tis true St. *Ambroſe* anſwers, That this Marriage, being deſign'd only for the accompliſhment of the Myſtery, was to ceaſe aſſoon as the Myſtery was perfectly fulfill'd by the death of Jeſus Chriſt. But I doubt this Anſwer has more Wit than Solidity.

[Itis plain from the Second Chapter of St. *Luke*, that our Saviour lived with *Joſeph* when he was 12 Years old; for not only *Joſeph* and *Mary* then lived together, but he went with them again to *Nazareth*, after he had Diſputed with the Doctors in the Temple, and was ſubject unto *Them*: Afterwards ween he entred upon the Miniſtry, the *Galileans* took offence at his Preaching becauſe of his being (as they thought) only the Carpenter's Son, which had been a groundleſs Suggeſtion, if *Joſeph* and *Mary* had not Cohabited together; it does not indeed weaken the Opinion of the perpetual Virginity of the Bleſſed Virgin, tho' takes off the force of this Argument by which St. *Ambroſe* went about to prove it.]

The Sixth proof which St. *Ambroſe* alledges for the perpetual Virginity of *Mary*, is grounded upon Ch. 44. of the Prophet *Ezekiel*. He explains what is ſaid in this place of a Gate ſhut, through which the Lord of *Iſrael* had paſs'd, and thinks it ought to be underſtood of *Mary*, who is that Gate through which the Lord paſs'd without opening it, and which afterwards continued ſhut: Which ſhows that ſhe loſt not her Virginity, neither by bringing forth Chriſt into the World, nor after ſhe became the Mother of God.

St. *Ambroſe* having thus prov'd the Perpetual Virginity of *Mary*, exhorts the Virgins to follow her. He propoſes to them alſo another moſt powerful Motive to engage them to keep their Virginity; and that is the Love of Jeſus Chriſt, their Celeſtial Spouſe, who is extremely jealous of their Purity. The Majeſty of this Spouſe ſhould make thoſe tremble who had any thoughts of being unfaithful to him. He is God, the Son of God, his Eternal Word, conſubſtantial to his Father. Hence St. *Ambroſe* takes an occaſion to make a Digreſſion about the Divinity of the Word, and to diſpute againſt thoſe Hereticks that denied it. 'Tis probable that they were alſo the followers of *Bonoſus*, whom he attacks in this place, ſince we learn from the Canon of the Counſel of *Arles*, that theſe Hereticks follow'd the Error of the *Photinians* and *Paulianiſts*; from whence in *Gennadius*'s time the *Photinians* were call'd *Bonoſiacks*, as this Author obſerves in his Book of Eccleſiaſtical Writers, Ch. 14. The *Benedictines* who ſet out St. *Ambroſe*, whoſe exactneſs nothing has eſcaped, have not forgot to make this Obſervation.

After he has occaſionally anſwer'd Two Objections of thoſe Hereticks, he returns to his firſt Subject of the Virginity of *Mary*, and continues to exhort the Virgins to imitate her. He applies to this purpoſe may Paſſages of the *Canticles*; in particular he addreſſes himſelf to *Ambroſia*, and gives her excellent Inſtructions about the Vertues ſhe ſhould practice. He concludes with praying the Lord to receive her into the number of his Spouſes, and to pour upon her abundance of his Grace.

It appears by the Preface of this Book, that *Ambroſia* was ſtill to continue in her Fathers's Houſe, though ſhe had receiv'd the Veil, which plainly ſhows, that all the Virgins conſecrated to God were not yet ſhut up in Monaſteries, though there were already ſome Monaſteries ſet up.

Towards the end, the Ceremonies of a Virgin's making Profeſſion, are deſcribed. She preſented her ſelf at the feet of the Altar, where ſhe made Profeſſion before the People; the Biſhop preach'd to her

her, and gave her the Veil which distinguish'd her from other Virgins, but her hair was not cut. St. *Ambrose* says in this Treatise, that he had already written many other Books concerning Virgins; and in it he recites many things which are in his Commentary upon St. *Luke* compos'd in 386. At last he speaks of the Error of *Bonosus* as a Heresy publish'd not long before, which shows that this Treatise was written in the Year 392. For the Affair of *Bonosus* being carried into the Counsel of *Capua*, held in the Year 391, they sent it back to the Bishops of *Macedonia*. St. *Ambrose*

When St. *Ambrose* fled from the Tyrant *Eugenius* he retir'd to *Bolonia*, where he discover'd the Reliques of St. *Vitalis* and St. *Agricola*, who had suffer'd Martyrdom under the Persecution of *Diocletian* and *Maximilian*, and made a solemn Translation of them. From *Bolonia* he went to *Florence*, whither he carried the Reliques of these Saints, which he plac'd in a Church built by a holy Widow call'd *Juliana*, which he was entreated to Dedicate. 'Twas at the Dedication of this Church, that he made the Discourse entituled, *An Exhortation to Virginity*. *Juliana* having lost her Husband, was, not only consecrated to God her self, but by her Example and Instructions she so order'd the matter that she gave all her Children to God also: Her Son *Laurentius* was made Reader, and her Three Daughters profes's'd Virginity. St. *Ambrose* upon this occasion relates the Exhortation of this holy Widow to her Children. She told her Son, that his Father and she had given him that Name which he had, because they had obtain'd a Son by the Intercession of St. *Laurence*; That they had design'd him from that time for the Clergy, and that in this he ought to comply with their Desires, and fulfil their Vows. Afterwards addressing her Speech to her Daughters, she discribes the Troubles of Marriage, the excellency of Virginity, and exhorts them to consecrate themselves to God. She concludes with pressing her Son and her Daughters to accomplish the Vows which she and their Father had made in their behalf. St. *Ambrose* pursues this Exhortation, by adding Instructions to teach the Virgins after what manner they should live, and Examples to serve them for a Pattern. The Example of St. *Sothera*, the Kinswoman of St. *Ambrose*, is not here forgotten. Afterwards he promises to *Juliana* the Reward of her Piety. Lastly, he prays the Lord to accept graciously of that Church which he was consecrating, and to receive favourbly the Prayers, and Sacrifies of the Body of Jesus Christ, which should be offer'd there, and particularly the Oblation of all the Family of *Juliana*. This Treatise was written when St. *Ambrose* retir'd upon the Account of the coming of *Eugenius* the Tyrant, in the Year 393, towards *Easter*.

The Treatise *of the fall of a Virgin consecrated to God*, is here found under the name of St. *Ambrose*. It is also among St. *Jerom*'s Works; but certainly it is not his; for it is notorious that the Author of this Treatise was a Bishop, but St. *Jerom* was only a Priest. *Gennadius* assures us also, that *Niceas* Bishop of *Aquileia* wrote a Discourse address'd to a Virgin who had faln into Sin, very proper to persuade all those who should fall into the like Faults, to return from their Evil ways. This gave occasion to the Conjecture of many, that this Bishop was the Author of this Treatise. But the Title alone is not a sufficient proof, since St. *Basil* wrote a Book upon the same Subject, which has the same Title. The *Benedictines* observe that all the Manuscripts which they have seen, attribute this Work to St. *Ambrose*, except one only, wherein it is attributed to St. *Chrysostom*. They maintain also, That there is nothing in this Book which may not very well be St. *Ambrose*'s: But they confess that it has not the Stile of this Saint; and indeed there is neither that sharpness of Wit, nor the lively and spiritual Thoughts which are in his Works: This is more languid and less sublime. Whosoever be the Author of it, he is Ancient, for one may find there Traces of the ancient Discipline, one sees that Publick Penance was administred but once: Nay, even this Author obliges this faln Virgin to do Penance all her life, and he seems also to take from her the hopes of receiving Absolution in this Life. It appears, that there were yet Idolaters in his time, and that the Adult were baptiz'd on *Easter*-day. He admits a middle State between the Damn'd and the Happy; he describes the Ceremonies of the Profession of Virgins, almost as St. *Ambrose* does. He says, that she to whom he writes, who was a young Woman of Quality, call'd *Susanna*, having resolv'd against the Will of her Kindred to embrace Virginity, profes's'd it on *Easter*-day at Night in the great Church, where she was accompained by those that were newly baptiz'd, holding lighted Torches in their hands; That there she pronounc'd her Vows publickly before the People, and then receiv'd the Veil, and entred into a Monastery; that presently after Reports were spread about which wounded her Reputation, and they were found to be false, and the Authors of them could not be discover'd; but that Three Years after she committed the Crime whereof she had been falsly suspected before, suffering a young Man to lie with her many times, by whom she was gotten with Child. She was accus'd also of having destroy'd her Child, which Murder she endeavour'd by all means possible to conceal, and would never confess; but being convicted of it before the Bishop, she was put under publick Penance. The Author of this Treatise represents to her the monstrous heniousness of her Crime, and the Scandal she had given; he exhorts her to do Penance all the rest of her Life; he Orders her to repeat every day the 51st. *Psalm*, and to pass her Life in Sorrow and Grief, that at least she might avoid the punishment of Hell-fire. He excites her also to the Acts of Penance and Compunction, which he deduces from many places of Scripture. There is also a Chapter against him who had abus'd this Virgin, whom he exhorts to do Penance. The Author of this Treatise is accus'd of being a *Novatian*, because he tells this Virgin, that she ought not to expect Absolution of her Sin in this Life; and that those who promis'd her pardon of her Sin in this Life deceiv'd her. 'Tis true, that this Rigour was practis'd in some Churches in the First Ages of the Church. But he who speaks thus in the Fourth Century, appears to be much inclin'd to the *Novatians*. St. *Ambrose* was the Man of all the Fathers who did most vigorously oppose this Maxim in his Books *of Penance*, and therefore 'tis no wise probable that he should affirm the same in this Treatise, without giving any Explication of his Words. But here it may be said, that this Author exhorts

this young Woman to do publick Penance; Why ſhould he exhort her to do Penance, if ſhe was uncapable of Abſolution? This is what St. *Ambroſe* and the other Fathers juſtly object againſt the *Novatians*, That they put Sinners under Penance, and exhort and force them to do it, but yet afterwards they deprive them of the fruit of Penanace by refuſing them Abſolution. The Language of the Author of this Exhortation is perfectly like that of the *Novatians*. He exhorts this young Woman to do Penance, but he gives her no hopes of obtaining Remiſſion in this Life: On the contrary, he tells her expreſly, that this ſhall not be, and that thoſe who promiſe it to her, do but deceive her; but that ſhe ought always to do Penance, to ſhun Eternal Torments. He even dares not Promiſe her Glory, but only the Privation of Torments. Theſe are Doctrines contrary to thoſe which St. *Ambroſe* eſtabliſh'd in his Book *of Penance*, or rather that is the only Doctrine which he oppoſes there. It is no ways probable therefore, that this Treatiſe ſhould be his, and we muſt ſtill continue in as great uncertainties as ever concerning its Author.

St. *Ambroſe*

The Book *of Myſteries or Sacraments* is an Inſtruction to the New-baptiz'd, wherein St. *Ambroſe* explains to them the Significations and Vertue of the Sacraments which they had receiv'd. Here is an Abridgment of what is moſt remarkable in this Inſtruction.

"After we have ſpoken every day of Morality, and propos'd to you the Examples of the Patri-
"archs and Prophets, while the Proverbs were reading, that you might be accuſtom'd to follow the
"Examples of the Saints, and to lead a Life becoming thoſe Perſons who are purified by Baptiſm;
"'Tis now time to diſcourſe to you of the Myſteries and to explain the Sacraments; for if we had
"explain'd them to you before you were initiated, we ſhould have thought that we had profan'd, ra-
"ther than diſcover'd them: Beſides that the Light of the Myſteries themſelves, which you did not
"expect, has now aſtoniſh'd you more than if we had inſtructed you about them before. Open
"therefore now your Ears to receive the ſweet word of Eternal Life, which we ſignified to you when
"we celebrated the Ceremony, by which we wiſh'd that they might be open'd, by ſaying *Ephatha*,
"that ſo all thoſe who were to come to Baptiſm might know what was demanded of them, and
"what they anſwer'd. At laſt you are introduc'd into the place where the Sacrament of Baptiſm is
"Adminiſtred; you are oblig'd to renounce the Devil and his Works, the World and its Pomps and
"Pleaſures. You found in this place the Waters and a Prieſt who conſecrated them; the Body was
"plung'd into this Water to waſh away Sins; the Holy Spirit deſcended upon this Water; you ought
"not to fix your mind upon the External part of it, but to conſider in it a Divine Vertue. Do
"not imagine therefore, that it is this Water which purifies you, 'tis the Holy Spirit. There are
"Three things in Baptiſm, the Water, the Blood and the Spirit, and without theſe Three Things,
"the Sacrament is not compleat; neither the Remiſſion of Sins, nor Grace is receiv'd, unleſs it be in the
"Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt. The Baptiſm of Jews and Infidels does not
"purify at all; 'tis the Holy Spirit, which deſcended formerly under the Figure of a Dove, which ſan-
"ctifies theſe Waters. We muſt not conſider the merit of the Prieſt, for it is our Lord Jeſus Chriſt
"who baptizes. You made Profeſſion of believing in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt. After
"this you drew near unto the Prieſt, he anointed you, and your Feet were waſhed. This Sacrament
"blots out your hereditary Sins, and the Baptiſm blots out the Sins contracted by your own Will.
"After this you receiv'd white Garments, to ſignifie that your were ſtript of Sin and clothed with In-
"nocence. You received the Seal of the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Wiſdom, of Power, *&c.* The Fa-
"ther hath mark'd you out, the Son hath confirm'd you, and the Holy Spirit hath given you aſſu-
"rance of your Salvation. Afterwards you run to the Heavenly Feaſt, and ſee the Altar prepar'd,
"where you receive a nouriſhment infinitely exceeding that of *Manna*, a Bread more excellent than
"that of Angels. 'Tis the Fleſh of Jeſus Chriſt, the Body of Life, 'tis the incorruptable *Manna*, 'tis
"the Truth whereof the *Manna* was only the Figure. Perhaps you will tell me, But I ſee another
"thing? How do you aſſure me, that it is the Body of Jeſus Chriſt which I receive? That we
"muſt prove. We muſt ſhow that it is not the Body which Nature hath form'd, but that which
"the Benediction hath Conſecrated: Which St. *Ambroſe* confirms by an infinite number of the like
"Miracles; and laſtly, by the Myſtery of the Incarnation which he compares to that of the Eucha-
"riſt. A Virgin, ſays he, brought forth. This is againſt the Order of Nature. The Body which we
"conſecrate came forth of a Virgin. Why do you ſeek for the Order of Nature in the Body of Jeſus
"Chriſt, ſince Jeſus Chriſt was born of a Virgin contrary to the Order of Nature? Jeſus Chriſt
"had real Fleſh which was faſtened to the Croſs, and laid in the Sepulchre. So the Euchariſt is the
"true Sacrament of this Fleſh. Jeſus Chriſt himſelf aſſures us of it: *This is*, ſays he, *my Body*; before
"the Benediction of theſe Heavenly Words it is of another Nature, after the Conſecration it is the
"Body. So likewiſe of the Blood: Before Conſecration it is call'd by another Name, after Conſe-
"cration it is call'd the Blood of Jeſus Chriſt, and ye Anſwer, *Amen*, that's to ſay, 'Tis true. Let
"the Mind acknowledge inwardly that which the Mouth brings forth; let the Heart be of that Judg-
"ment which the Words expreſs. The Church exhorts her Children to Receive theſe Sacraments
"which contain the Body of Jeſus Chriſt. This is not Bodily but Spiritual Food; for the Body
"of the Lord is Spiritual. Laſtly, this Heavenly Meat gives us ſtrength, this Divine Drink rejoyces
"us Having therefore receiv'd theſe Sacraments, let us be perſuaded that we are regenerated, and
"let us not ſay, How can this be? 'Tis not by Nature, but by the Holy Spirit.

From hence we may learn the chief Ceremonies which were obſerved in the Church of *Milan*. As to the Adminiſtration of the Sacraments, theſe which follow are remark'd. The Ears of the Catechumens were touch'd, ſaying *Ephatha*, and after that they were bidden enter into the place where they were to be baptiz'd. There they were oblig'd to renounce the Devil, the World and its Pomps; the Biſhop bleſſed the Water of Baptiſm, the Creed was repeated to the Catechumens, they were anoin-

ted

ted with Holy Chriſms, there Feet were waſh'd, they were plung'd into the Water, and at the ſame time the Three Divine Perſons were invocated; afterwards they were clothed with White Garments, the Sacrament of Confirmation was given them, and the Holy Spirit was called upon for them: From thence they were conducted to the Altar, where they were preſent at the Conſecration of the Euchariſt, and received the Body and Blood of Jeſus Chriſt, anſwering, *Amen.* St. *Ambroſe*

Since theſe Ceremonies and the Doctrine of this Treatiſe do not agree with the Opinions of Proteſtants, ſome among them have done what they could to raiſe Doubts about this Book, whether it were St. *Ambroſe's*. But the Reaſons which they alledge are ſo weak, that the ableſt Men among them have ſincerely acknowledg'd that it is really his. There are very ſtrong Proofs that it is this Father's; the beginning alone diſcovers that it is his; for there he ſpeaks plainly of the Sermons he had made to the Catechumens upon the Lives of the Patriarchs and Prophets. This does not agree to any other Author but St. *Ambroſe*; 'tis the Stile of this Father, tho' he treats of things more particularly than in his other Books. 'Tis his Doctrine, and no body doubts but it is his Work: It has always been cited under his Name, and is attributed to him in all the Manuſcripts. This Diſcourſe was ſpoken by St. *Ambroſe*, after his Sermons upon the Lives of *Abraham*, *Iſaac* and *Jacob*, toward the Year 387.

The Opinions of Criticks are very much divided concerning the Author *of the Book of the Sacraments*. The *Benedictines* produce in their Preface what has been ſaid upon this Subject, and after having given a very Wiſe and Equitable Judgment about the different Opinions, they give their own Thoughts of it, and build their Judgment upon good Reaſon. Firſt of all, they obſerve, That 'tis indifferent to the Members of the Church of *Rome*, to whom this Work be attributed, ſince St. *Ambroſe* teaches the ſame Doctrine in his Treatiſe of Myſteries; and ſo, tho' it were ſuppoſed with *Aubertine*, that the Author of the Book about the Sacraments is of the Seventh Age, or with *Daillee*, that he is of the Eighth, the Cauſe of the Church would be ſo much the ſtronger, becauſe it would have two different Teſtimonies of the Judgment of the Church; and indifferent Ages, *viz.* St. *Ambroſe* in the Fourth Age, and this Author in the Seventh or Eighth. Tho' this were not ſo, and the Church might draw ſome Advantage from ſuppoſing that St. *Ambroſe* was the Author of the Book *about the Sacraments*, yet if it ſhould appear that the contrary Opinion is more probable, we muſt undoubtedly follow it. We muſt judge of theſe kind of Matters without Prejudice and Affection, and we muſt not conſider what would be moſt advantageous to our ſelves, but what comes neareſt to the Truth. This is what the *Benedictines* do; they profeſs to Examine this Queſtion with all poſſible ſincerity, as if it had never been canvaſſed before, and without addicting themſelves to the Prejudices of any Party. They immediately diſapprove the Reproaches which the Proteſtant Criticks have thrown upon this Author, they cannot endure that they ſhould make him paſs for an Ignorant and Ridiculous Perſon, for an Impoſtor and a Liar; They vindicate him from ſome Miſtakes and Abſurdities, which *Cook*, *Rivet*, and *Dailleé* had faſten'd upon him. They ſhew, That this Expreſſion, *For this cauſe at* Rome *the Name of the Faithful is given to the Baptiz'd*, is not ſo ridiculous as theſe Criticks imagine; becauſe tho' it were true, that the baptiz'd were call'd by the ſame Name in other Churches, yet it were no unprofitable Obſervation, that in the Church of *Rome* they were call'd ſo alſo. They obſerve, That ſome Manuſcripts have *Rectè*, inſtead of *Romæ*, but they do not think that we are obliged to follow this Correction. They ſhow alſo, That the manner wherein this Author relates the laſt Words of the *Pater Noſter*, *Ne patiaris nos induci in tentationem*, inſtead of *Ne nos inducas in tentationem*; that this manner, I ſay, of ending the Lord's Prayer was not peculiar to him, and that St. *Cyprian* read and repeated thus the laſt Words of the Lord's Prayer. Laſtly, They defend him againſt the Accuſations of Barbariſm, of falſe Subtilty, of vain Allegories, which are chag'd upon him by the Criticks whom we have mentioned.

After this the *Benedictines* produce the Reaſons which are alledg'd by Catholick Authors, to ſhow that the Books of the Sacraments were St. *Ambroſe's*, and at the ſame time prove that they are not very convincing.

The Firſt is drawn from the Authority of many ancient Manuſcripts, where this Treatiſe is found under the Name of St. *Ambroſe*. To theſe is added the Authority of all the Editions which have been made of it, and the Teſtimony of a great number of Authors of the Ninth Age, and thoſe that followed it, *viz.* of *Hincmarus* Biſhop of *Rheims*, of *Deoduinus* of *Liege*, of *Paſchaſius Ratbertus*, of *Ratramnus* a Monk of *Corbie*, of *Florus* a Deacon of the Church of *Lyons*, of *Lanfranc*, of *Berengarius*, of *Algerus*, of *Guitmondus*, of *Durandus Troarnenſis*, of *Ivo Carnutenſis*, of *Gratian*, of the Maſter of the Sentences, and of other later Authors, who have all cited the Book of the Sacraments under the Name of St. *Ambroſe*: This Argument appears plauſible enough, yet the *Benedictine* Fathers maintain, that it is not fully convincing: For how often has it happened, ſay they, that Books have been, and every Day are taken from thoſe Authors under whoſe Names they had always paſſed? It is not very well known that the greateſt part of thoſe who cited the Works of the Fathers in the latter Ages, did not carefully examine, whether the Books which they cited were theirs, but truſted to the common Title of them? As to the Manuſcripts, the *Benedictines* aſſure us, that the moſt ancient have not the Name of the Author, and that it is probable the Name of St. *Ambroſe* was added in thoſe which are more Modern, either becauſe it was known, that St. *Ambroſe* had treated of this Subject, or becauſe theſe Books were found together with that about the Myſteries which treats of the ſame matter, and the firſt bearing the Name of St. *Ambroſe*, whoſe it was indeed, they thought that the laſt were this Father's alſo.

The Second Proof which is alledg'd to ſhow, That the Books of the Sacraments are St. *Ambroſe's*, is taken from the Agreement of the Stile of this Work, with that of the Book *of Myſteries*. The

Bene-

St. *Ambroſe*

Benedictines ſay, That 'tis true this Author does ſo imitate St. *Ambroſe*, that he Copies out the ſame which he had ſaid; but they obſerve, that in Copying it out he corrupts it, and accommodates it to his own Stile, which is much below that of St. *Ambroſe*. Wherefore this Argument is more proper to raiſe a doubt, whether theſe Books of the Sacraments be St. *Ambroſe*'s or no, than to confirm them in the Poſſeſſion of the Title which they bear.

The Third Argument produces alſo the ſame Effect. 'Tis ſaid that St. *Auſtin* affirms, That St. *Ambroſe* wrote a Book about the Sacraments; but 'tis evident that the Book which St. *Auſtin* cites under this Title, had quite another Subject than this Book. It was a Book of Philoſophy againſt the Platoniſts, as appears by what this Father ſays of it in the Second Book againſt *Julian*, Ch. 5 and in the Second of his Retractations, Ch. 4.

The *Benedictines* produce alſo ſome places drawn out of this Book, which are thought to agree to St. *Ambroſe*, as the Complaint which he made that he had not a ſtrong Voice, and the Explication of the Lord's Prayer, which St. *Ambroſe* probably would not have omitted in his other Treatiſes, but that it was in this; but at the ſame time they ſhew how weak theſe Arguments are.

After having thus diſcuſs'd what is ſaid on both ſides about the Author of theſe Books, they endeavour to diſcover him by the Work it ſelf, and for that end they enquire into theſe three Things; what Rank he held in the Church, at what time he lived, and of what Country he was.

As to the Firſt Point they ſay, That it plainly appears he was a Biſhop, who Inſtructed the Catechumens.

Upon the Second, they ſay that the Teſtimony of the Authors which have quoted him, ſhew that he was older than the Eighth Century, and there is a Manuſcript in the Abby of St. *Gal* written in great Letters, which *Mabillon* believed might be about 1000 Years old, whoſe Antiquity ſhows that this Author liv'd before the Seventh Century: Beſides that it appears by the Work it ſelf, that it is more ancient: For there he ſpeaks of a great Number of Adult Catechumens, which proves that he liv'd at a time, when the practice of Baptizing all Infants was not ſo general. He obſerves alſo, That there were yet in his time ſome Remainders of Idolatry. And in a ſhort, he refutes no other Hereticks but the *Arians*, and he makes uſe of a Verſion of the Bible different from that of St. *Jerom*, which yet is not that which St. *Ambroſe* uſed.

As to the laſt Head which concerns the Country of this Author, 'tis evident that he was not a Roman, ſince he ſays, That he Honours the Church of *Rome*, and follows many of its Practices, tho' he does not think himſelf oblig'd to follow it in all. This gives occaſion to conjecture, that he was not far diſtant from it. The Cuſtoms and Practices which he deſcribes, agree very well with the ancient Rites of the Church of *Milan*, and the Churches of *Gaul*.

Theſe Remarks ſeem to prove that this Book may be St. *Ambroſe*'s; for all theſe Characters agree perfectly well to him; but there are other Reaſons which hinder the *Benedictines* from attributing it to him. The Firſt and Principal is the diverſity of the Stile; for tho' it may happen, that an Author ſhould write in a more plain and leſs ſublime manner than he was wont to do, yet the Strength of his Wit is always perceiv'd. 'Tis never found, that an Author who has naturally an Elegant and Noble Stile, does write in a very mean one. St. *Ambroſe* never falls into this Fault; he does not make uſe of cold and childiſh Interrogations, ſuch as this Treatiſe is full of: Beſides that, 'tis no wiſe, probable that St. *Ambroſe* ſhould imitate himſelf ſo exactly, and tranſcribe a part of his Book about Myſteries, and a part of his Treatiſe of the Inſtitution of a Virgin. They add alſo, That St. *Ambroſe* never reproves his People for Communicating ſeldom, as this Author does, and that there is no probablity that he ſhould oppoſe ſo publickly the Practiſe of the Roman Church about the waſhing of Feet. Theſe laſt Conjectures are a litttle weak; on the contrary, the former are very ſtrong, and are, as one may think, ſufficient to have determin'd the *Benedictines* to remove this Book from the Place of which it was poſſeſs'd, among the Genuine Works of St. *Ambroſe*, eſpecially ſince in reading the Book of the Sacraments, it plainly appears, that the Author was nothing elſe but a cold Imitater of St. *Ambroſe*. In effect, the Subject of this Book is the ſame with that of the Book about Myſteries. The Author does nothing but enlarge upon what St. *Ambroſe* had ſaid before. He follows him ſtep by ſtep; he adds very few things of his own; he ſpeaks only of the ſame Sacraments, and the ſame Ceremonies; he gives the ſame Explications of them; he amplifies the ſame Arguments and the ſame Obſervations; yet he enlarges ſometimes a little more upon certain Ceremonies. He openly oppoſes the Cuſtom of the Church of *Rome* in omitting the Waſhing of Feet. He explains the Change which is made in the Sacrament more largely. He gives an Explication, of the *Pater Noſter*, and diſcourſes of Prayer. But he has alſo taken what he ſays of it out of St. *Ambroſe*'s Book of the Inſtitution of a Virgin. Theſe Six Books are ſo many Sermons preached to the Novices.

The Two Books of Penance are undoubtedly St. *Ambroſe*'s; they have his Stile. He ſpeaks of them in his Commentary upon *Pſalm* 37. and St. *Auſtin* cites them ſeveral times. There cannot be more convincing Proofs to ſhow that any Work is Genuine. Theſe Books were written againſt the *Novatians*, who would not allow the Church to have Power to Pardon Crimes. This is the Error which St. *Ambroſe* diſputes againſt in the Firſt Book.

"He begins with a commendation of Moderation and Chriſtian Meekneſs, whereof Jeſus Chriſt "himſelf has given us an Example, who condemns the harſhneſs and rigour of the *Novatians*, who "fright Sinners from Penance, and hinder them from applying a Remedy to their Diſeaſes. For who "is it, ſays he, who will have the Courage to do Penance without any hope of Pardon? What Con-

"fidence

"fidence will any one have in such a Physician, who is so far from having Compassion for his Sick "Patient, that he shows nothing but Contempt and Rigour towards him. Afterwards he explains "wherein the Errour of the *Novatians* consists. They maintain, says he, That we must not admit "those to Communion, who have faln by violating the Law of God. If they spoke only of Sacri- "ledge, if they refus'd Pardon to this Crime only, this would indeed be a Rigour condemn'd by the "Words of Scripture. But they offend also against common Sence, by making all Crimes equal, and "by depriving those of Communion that are guilty of lesser Crimes, as well as those that have Com- "mitted the greatest. They say, That they do Honour to Jesus Christ by reserving to him only the "Power of Pardoning Sins; and in this very thing they dishonour him, because they violate his Com- "mandments. The Church obeys Jesus Christ in binding and loosing Sinners. The *Novatians* "content themselves with binding only, and will never loose Sinners, tho' Jesus Christ gave at the "same time to the Church the Power of binding and loosing; whence it follows that the one can- "not be permitted without the other; wherefore both the one and the other are done in the Church, "and neither the one nor the other can be done among Hereticks: For this Jurisdiction belongs only "to Priests; and none but the Church can assume it, since none but she has true Priests, and Here- "ticks have none at all. St. *Ambrose*

Tho' what we have just now receited might make us believe that the *Novatians* granted not Remission to any Sin; yet St. *Ambrose* confesses in the following Discourse that they pardon'd lighter Sins, and refus'd Absolution only to those that were guilty of great Sins. He asserts against them that *Novatian* was never of this Opinion, and that his Judgment was, That Penance should not be allow'd to any Sinner. Perhaps St. *Ambrose* would have found it very difficult to prove this Assertion, which seems not to agree with the Account we read in St. *Syprian* of the Birth of the Error of the *Novatians*.

However it be, St. *Ambrose* having objected to them, that they condemn the Author of their Sect, disputes against their Distinction, by saying, That Jesus Christ did not make it; That his Mercy extends unto all Sinners; That those who have committed the greatest Sins should perform the greatest Penance; and Lastly, That the greater the Sins have been, the greater need there is of Relief. In the remaining part of this Book he proves by many Passages and Examples taken out of the New Testament, That Absolution ought not to be refus'd for any Sin weatsoever; and he answers the Objections of the *Novatians*. He observes also towards the End of this Book, that the *Novatians* do in vain exhorts Sinners to Penance, since they deprive them of the fruit of Penance. "For, says he, if "any one be guilty of Secret Sins, and does Penance for them very heartily, in Obedience to the "Command of Jesus Christ, How shall he receive the Reward, unless he be restor'd to the Com- "munion of the Church? I would have the Guilty hope for the Pardon of his Sins, yet he should "beg it with Tears, yet he should beg it with Sighs, yet he should beg it with Lamentations of "all the People. I would have him pray for Absolution; and when he is twice or thrice delay'd as "to his Re-admission into the Communion of the Church, let him believe, That this delay pro- "ceeds from the want of Importunity in his Prayers; let him redouble his Weeping, let him render "himself more worthy of Pity, and then let him return, let him throw himself at the Feet of the "Faithful, let him embrace them, kiss them, bath them with his Tears, and let him not forsake them, "that so our Lord may say unto him, *Many sins are forgiven him, because he loved much.* I have "known some Persons who in their Penance have spoil'd their Face with much weeping, who have "hollow'd their Cheeks with continual Tears, who have prostrated themselves on the Ground to be "trod under Foot, who by their continual Fasting have rendred their Countenance so pale and dis- "figur'd, that they carried in a living Body the very Image of Death. This is a lively Representation of Publick Penance which was yet in its Vigour in the time of St. *Ambrose*. This Passage also informs us, That there were then some Persons who were guilty only of secret Mortal Sins, who submitted to the trouble of Publick Penance. Mounsieur *Daillé* thinks, that instead of *siquis occulta habens crimina*, it must be read, *siquis multa habens crimina*: But his Conjecture not being Authoriz'd by any Manuscript ought not to be receiv'd.

In the Second Book after having answer'd Two principal Objections of the *Novatians*, whereof one is drawn from a Passage of the Epistle of the Apostle St. *Paul* to the Hebrews, where 'tis said, That 'tis impossible for those who have once lost the Grace of Baptism to be renew'd again, and the other is grounded upon what Jesus Christ says of the Sin against the Holy Ghost: After, I say, he has answer'd these Two Objections, and confirm'd the Doctrine and Practice of the Church, he exhorts the Faithful to Penance, and signifies to them with what Dispositions they should enter upon it: he proposes the Resurrection of *Lazarus* as an Illustration of the Spiritual Resurrection of a Sinner who reflecting upon his own Condition, begs of God the Pardon of his Sins. Lastly, He discourses, of the Conditions necessary to make Penance useful, and of the Faults that are to be met with in ordinary Penances. There are also towards the end of this Book, some things very Remarkable concerning the Discipline of the ancient Church in the Administration of Penance.

"There are many ways, says he, of paying to God what is owing him; and tho' a Man be "Poor he is always Rich enough to pay him; Prayer, Tears, Fasting, are the Tributes due to him. "A Man may lessen his Sin by distributing his Patrimony to the Poor, but Faith must make this "Expence valuable; for to what purpose serves the giving away of his Patrimony if he has no Cha- "rity. There are some who give their Riches out of Vanity, and satisfy themselves with the Re- "ward which they can have in this World without troubling themselves about that of another. "Some having given their Riches to the Church, by I know not what sudden fit of Devotion, with- "out sufficient Consideration of what they do, revoke their Donation. Others blame themselves "for having given their Goods to the Poor. But as to those who do Penance, that which they are

St. *Ambroſe* "chiefly to fear, is, leſt they repent of having done Penance: For many Perſons being terrified with "the fear of Puniſhment, and puſh'd forward by the Remorſe of their own Conſcience, deſire "Penance, and after they are admitted to it, leave it off for the ſhame of the publick Humiliation. "What can be ſaid of ſuch Perſons, but that they did well to deſire Penance for their Sins, but "at the bottom they repent of the Good they have done? There are others who deſire not to enter "upon Penance, but that they may be immediately reſtor'd to Communion: Theſe do not deſire ſo "much to be loos'd as to bind the Prieſt; for they don't unburden their own Conſcience, but they "burden the Conſcience of the Prieſt, who is commanded not to give Holy Things unto Dogs, and "not to throw Pearls before Swine, that's to ſay, not eaſily to admit Impure Souls to the Holy Com- "munion. You ſee them walk with their ordinary Apparel, who ſhould be weeping and ſighing for "having defil'd the Garment of Baptiſm and of Grace. You ſee the Women alſo ſtill wearing "Pendants and Diamonds at their Ears, who ſhould be mourning for having loſt the Heavenly "Diamond, that's to ſay, the Grace of Baptiſm. There are ſome alſo who think that Penance con- "ſiſts merely in refraining from the Sacraments. Laſtly, There are others, who ſeeing the hope "that is given them of doing Penance, do from thence take occaſion to think that they have the "greater Liberty to Sin, not conſidering that Penance is appointed to be a remedy of Sin, and not "an inducement to commit it. But who can endure that you ſhould be aſham'd to pray "unto the Lord, who are not aſham'd to pray ſo often unto men? That you ſhould "be aſham'd to appear before God in the Condition of a Supplicant, who are not aſham'd "to confeſs your Sins unto Men? Are you afraid to have any Witneſſes of your Prayers? Alas! if "Satisfaction is to be made to ſome Men, is it not neceſſary that you ſhould ſee many Perſons, and "pray them to intercede for you? Are you not often obliged to proſtrate your ſelf at his Feet whom "you have offended? Muſt you not kiſs the places through which he has paſs'd? Muſt you not preſent "your Children who had no hand in their Father's Fault, to obtain Pardon by their means? Why "are you troubled to do the like in the Church, to appeaſe the wrath of God, to deſire the Suffrages "of the People? In the Church, I ſay, where there is but one thing only of which we ought to be "aſham'd, and that is not to confeſs our Faults, becauſe we are all Sinners; where he that is moſt "humble is moſt eſteem'd, where the more one is abas'd, the more Holy he is thought to be. Let "the Holy Church your Mother mourn for you, let her waſh away your Faults with her Tears..... "And yet we have reaſon to anſwer thoſe who; think that Penance may be done more than once, "becauſe this is to abuſe the Mercy of Jeſus Chriſt for if they ſhould once do true Penance, they "would not believe that they had Power to reiterate it. As there is but one Baptiſm, ſo there is "but one publick Penance; for we ought alſo to do Penance for the Sins we commit every Day: "But this laſt Penance is for ſmall Sins, and the former for great ones. I have found more Per- "ſons who have preſerv'd the Innocence of their Baptiſm, than who have done Penance as they "ſhould after they have loſt it. For 'tis believ'd, that Penance may be conſiſtent with the Ambition "of aſpiring to Offices, with Pomp and high Feeding, with the Pleaſures and Uſe of Marriage. But "they muſt renounce the World, and allow leſs time for Sleep than Nature requires; they muſt break "their Sleep with groaning and ſighing, and employ ſome part of that time in Prayers; they muſt "live in ſuch a manner, that they may be dead to the uſe of this Life; Let ſuch Men deny themſelves, "and change themſelves wholly, *&c.*

This place teaches us many Remarkable Circumſtances concerning the Penance which was in uſe in the time of St. *Ambroſe*; Firſt, That the Sinners themſelves deſir'd to be put under Penance. Secondly, That by putting them under Penance they were ſeparated from Communion. Thirdly, That they did Penance publickly. Fourthly, That they us'd many Faſts, Auſterities, and Humiliations during the time of their Penance. Fifthly, That this Penance was impos'd but once. Laſtly, That this Penance was only for enormous Crimes, and that ordinary Sins were pardon'd by the daily Penance. For the better underſtanding of this place, 'tis neceſſary to obſerve, How the Fathers underſtood this Diſtinction of great and little Sins. *Tertullian* who was the Firſt who ſpoke diſtinctly of it in his Book *of Chaſtity*, places among the Number of little Sins, Anger, Evil-ſpeaking, a vain Oath, a Failure in our Promiſe, a Lye extorted by ſhame or neceſſity, *&c.* He calls theſe Capitals or Mortal Sins, Murder, Idolatry, Fraud, Apoſtacy, Blaſphemy, Fornication, and other Crimes of this Nature. Theſe are all the Crimes which St. *Cyprian* calls great Sins in his Treatiſe *of Patience*. *Origen* in Homily 15th. upon *Leviticus*, ſays, That there are Mortal Sins which are not in the rank of great Sins. I know very well that Mounſieur *Arnaud* has affirm'd, That in this place we muſt read *culpæ moralis*, for *culpa mortalis*, as it is to be found in one Edition. But ever ſince, the Maſter of the Sentences time, who cites this place, it has been read, *culpa mortalis*; and if one minds well the Sence, he will perceive that it is to be read ſo. This place of *Origen* has much affinity with thoſe of St. *Ambroſe*, whereof we are now ſpeaking; for he ſays, That Penance is allow'd but once, and that but ſeldom to thoſe who have committed great Sins, whereas the Sins of every Day are pardon'd every Day. He explains himſelf alſo almoſt after the ſame manner in his Sixth Treatiſe upon St. *Matthew*, where he handles this Queſtion, Whether a Man may not be treated as a Heathen and a Publican, that's to ſay, ſeparated from the Church, when he does not amend his ways, after he has been re-prov'd for ſlight Sins. The Examples which he gives of ſlight Sins, are Evil-ſpeaking, lying, idle Words, addictedneſs to Wine, *&c.* And thoſe which he gives of great Sins, are Murder, Adultery, *&c.* He concludes, That there is no doubt but what is ſaid in the Goſpel, that we ought

[The true Reaſon why Slander, Evil ſpeaking, Anger, Covetouſneſs, and ſuch ſort of Sins were not ſubjected to publick Penance in the Primitive Church, ſeems only to have been, becauſe they are not ſo eaſy to be proved, and Delinquents cannot ſo well be convi-

ought to look upon thoſe as Heathens and Publicans who do not Reform after they have been Reprov'd, is to be underſtood of great Sinners. He adds, That it may alſo be underſtood of other Sinners with reſpect to the Judgment of Men, but that it does not belong to us to judge whether they are ſuch before God. St. *Auſtin* diſtinguiſhes in many places Two ſorts of Sins; the great Sins for which Men are put under Publick Penance, ſuch as are Murder, Adultery, Fornication, *&c.* And the other Sins which are daily committed, and are pardon'd by a daily Penance. He ſays of the Firſt, that they kill the Soul all at once, and that Chriſtians who have Faith and Hope do not commit them. But there is one place that is in Ch. 26. of the Book *of Faith and Works*, where he treats more clearly of this Matter and diſtinguiſhes Three Sorts of Sins. "There are ſome, ſays he, ſo great, "that they deſerve Excommunication, and for which "Sinners will want Reconciliation: There are others for "which this Penance is not neceſſary, but they may be "healed by the Remedy of Chaſtiſements; And laſtly, "there are ſome that are very light, which are blotted "out by the Lord's Prayer, from which no Man is free "in this Life. This diſtinction ſeems to be more juſt and reaſonable; for there are certainly many Sins which are not of the number of great Crimes, neither are they ſo ſmall, but they may be Mortal. The difficulty is to know, to which of theſe Two Claſſes we ſhould refer thoſe Sins, which hold the middle place between the Firſt and the Second; for ſince this diſtinction was not very common, and ſince all the Fathers and St. *Auſtin* himſelf in many places did not diſtinguiſh but Two Sorts of Sins, and Two Sorts of Penance, it may be doubtful under what Claſs this Third Sort was comprehended. For my part I believe that for the moſt part they were comprehended under the Second: Firſt, becauſe the Fathers in relating the Examples of ſlight Sins, place in that number thoſe that are conſiderable enough, ſuch as Slander and addictedneſs to Wine. The Author of Sermon 41, among thoſe of St. *Auſtin*, which is attributed alſo to St. *Ambroſe*, places in the rank of light Sins, Drunkenneſs, Theft, Evil-ſpeeches, *&c.* *Julianus Pomerius* in the 2d. Book of a contemplative Life, Ch. 7. ſays, That ſlight Sins are thoſe for which one is not condemn'd before Men. *Cæſarius* of *Arles*, *Fulbertus* of *Chartres*, and St. *Eloi*, when they make a particular Enumeration of Mortal Sins, place among them Anger and Drunkenneſs, but with reſtrictions, *viz.* Anger, *if it laſt long*, and Drunkenneſs, *if it be continual.* Secondly, the Fathers conſider'd the firſt Claſs, as enormous Sins, great Sins, great Crimes, which no Chriſtian commits, which do wholly diſgrace a Man, and which are extreamly rare. Now there are many Sins between theſe great Sins, and the ſmalleſt Sins, of which we cannot ſpeak after this manner. Thirdly, All the Sinners of the firſt Claſs, when they are known, either by Confeſſion or by Conviction, are put under Publick Penance. But none were put under Publick Penance except for very heinous Sins, ſuch as are mentioned in the Canons of Councils, and the Canonical Letters of Biſhops. What are theſe Sins? Theſe are Murder, Adultery, Fornication, and the conſequents of theſe great Crimes. There is no Canon to be ſeen againſt Anger, Covetouſneſs and Slander; at leaſt it does not appear that Publick Penance was impos'd upon any for theſe kind of Sins. Theſe Sins therefore, tho' they be ſometimes Mortal, were comprehended under the ſecond Claſs, and not under the Firſt, which contained only thoſe for which Publick Penance was done. This may be confirm'd by the Canonical Letter of St. *Gregory Nyſſen* to *Letoïus*, where he makes exact enumeration of thoſe Sins which ſubjected Men to Publick Penance, which are all enormous Sins and conſiderable Crimes. Fourthly, It may be added, that Publick Penance being granted but once only, they muſt be very extraordinary and enormous Crimes for which Men were ſubjected to it. Laſtly, *Origen*, St. *Auſtin* and St. *Bernard* ſay, that the great number and the cuſtom of ſome Sins of the Second Claſs may finally deſtroy, and ſtifle Charity in the Soul; therefore they did not believe, that this Claſs did not contain Mortal Sins.

I would not have it thought that I make theſe Remarks to authoriſe Licentiouſneſs, or to inſinuate, That there are ſome Mortal Sins which may paſs for Venial: God forbid that I ſhould have ſuch a deteſtable Deſign! On the contrary, my intention is to create a horror of all Sins; Firſt of great Crimes. Secondly, of Sins which may be Mortal, tho' they appear not ſo enormous. And Thirdly, even of ſlighter Sins alſo. But I thought my ſelf oblig'd to obſerve here, for explaining the Paſſage of St. *Ambroſe*, That none but the Sins of the Firſt Claſs did ſubject Men to Publick Penance, and that 'tis of theſe only that the Fathers ſpeak, and which they comprehend under the Name of Enormous Sins and Crimes; tho' there be others which may be alſo Mortal, and which a Chriſtian ought carefully to ſhun; but then they are ſuch for which he was never ſubjected to the Humiliation of Publick Penance, but only to Corrections and Reprimands given in ſecret, as St. *Auſtin* informs us. But now let us return to our Subject, the Time is not certainly known when St. *Ambroſe* compos'd theſe Books *of Penance*. He ſays in the Explication of *Pſal.* 37. made about the Year 393, that it was a long time ſince they were written: *De pœnitentia duos jamdudum ſcripſi libellos, I wrote two little Books of Penance a long while ago*: But this denotes no certain time. It appears by the Books

St. *Ambroſe*

ected. Sins of the Fleſh, and Crimes againſt publick Society, are Matters of Fact liable to Proof and Examination, and therefore come under Cognizance of Civil Laws as well as Eccleſiaſtical; whereas Circumſtances may ſo alter the Nature of Spiritual Crimes, that what in ſome caſes may be damnable, in others may be venial, in others, again, highly commendable; and accordingly the ſelf-ſame Actions in all thoſe Caſes, ſhall meet with different Appellations. To ſpeak evil of Dignities is a Sin expreſly forbidden in Scripture; yet to defend the Cauſe of Truth unjuſtly trampled upon, even againſt thoſe whom in lawful and indifferent things we are bound to obey, may be very often our Duty. This with due alterations may be extended to all other Crimes where the Good and Evil depends ſo viſibly upon ſuch Circumſtances, wherein a Criminal's word muſt of neceſſity be taken. And this I ſuppoſe was the true Reaſon why thoſe things were left to God and their own Conſciences; ſince it is moſt manifeſt that the Fathers eſteemed theſe Sins, if unrepented of, to be as damning as any of thoſe of a groſſer Nature.]

Books themſelves, that he was then well advanc'd in Years, and had taken much pains for the Church.

St. *Ambroſe* The *Benedictines* think, that they may have been written in the Year 384.

After the Treatiſes of Morality and Diſcipline, follow his Writings of Controverſy. The Five Books *of Faith*, or *the Trinity*, are the chief of his Writings of that ſort. St. *Ambroſe* wrote the Two firſt at the Requeſt of the Emperour *Gratian*, who at his departure into the Eaſt in the Year 377, to aſſiſts the Emperour *Valens* againſt the *Goths*, deſir'd of St. *Ambroſe* a Treatiſe concerning the Faith againſt *Arianiſm* which then rain'd in the Eaſt. St. *Ambroſe* proves the Divinity of the Son in theſe Two Books of the Faith of the Church, and anſwers the Objections of the *Arians* conciſely and ſmartly. The *Arians* having accus'd him of treating this Matter too ſuccinctly, and of having abridged their Objections and his own Anſwers too much, he added in the Year 379, the Three laſt Books, in which he enlarges and confirms the Principels that he had laid down in the former. Theſe Books are written with much Wit, Vigor and Subtilty; he illuſtrates the Matter which he handles with lively and pleaſant Deſcriptions. He propoſes the moſt ſubtil Objections in an intelligible manner, and anſwers them with all the Induſtry and clearneſs that is poſſible. It may be ſaid, that there is none among the great number of Treatiſes written by the Ancients upon this Subject, where the Theological Difficulties about the Myſtery of the Trinity are better diſcus'd, and clear'd up than in this. Yet he is not always Exact, and he ſometimes employs Arguments which are not very concluding.

The Books *of the Holy Spirit* are written in a leſs conciſe, leſs lively, and leſs ſmart Stile: St. *Jerom* ſays, *That they contain nothing Logical, nothing maſculine, nothing moving, nothing convincing, but that every thing in them is feeble and languid, tho' it be poliſh'd, dreſs'd up and painted with ſtrange Colours.* He accuſes him alſo of having robb'd the *Greeks*, and particularly the Book of *Didymus*, whoſe Tranſlation St. *Jerom* publiſh'd then, and of having made a bad Latin Book out of many good Greek ones; for *Ruffinus* informs us, That St. *Jerom* ſpeaks of St. *Ambroſe* in this place. It muſt be acknowledg'd, that tho' the paſſionate Deſire which this Saint had to extol the Treatiſe of *Didymus*, made him ſpeak a little too vehemently againſt St. *Ambroſe*'s Book, yet there is ſomething of truth in what he ſays. For this Book is not written ſmartly, and the greateſt part of the things which it contains are taken out of the Works of *Didymus*, of St. *Baſil*, and St. *Athanaſius*. St. *Auſtin* was ſo far from finding in it that Beauty and thoſe Ornaments which St. *Jerom* met with in it, that he gives it for an example of a Book written in a low Stile, *Becauſe*, ſays he, *the Subject does not require Ornaments of Diſcourſe to move the Heart, but Proofs of the Truths which he propoſes.* St. *Ambroſe* has there collected together all that could be ſaid for eſtabliſhing the Divinity of the Holy Spirit. He wrote it after the death of *Athalaricus* King of the *Goths*, and before the Death of *Peter*, of *Alexandria*, and before the Celebration of the Counſel of *Conſtantinople*, that's to ſay, in the Year 381. There is one place in it, where he ſeems to aſſert, That Baptiſm given in the Name of one Perſon only of the Trinity, is valid. There are many Explications given of it which may be ſeen in the Note of the *Benedictines* upon this Paſſage.

The Treatiſe of the Incarnation is a Diſcourſe which St. *Ambroſe* ſpoke to refute the Objections which Two *Arians*, Officers who belong'd to the Emperour *Gratian*, had propos'd to him with much pride. He engag'd to anſwer them the next day in his Sermon. *Paulinus* informs us, that theſe Two Officers having mounted up into their Chariot to come to this Sermon, were thrown down headlong. St. *Ambriſe*, who knew nothing of this Accident, waited long enough for them, and tho' they came not at all, yet he did not fail to perform his promiſe. But before he entred upon the Matter, to give them yet longer time to come, he begun his Diſcourſe with the Explication of the Sacrifices of *Cain* and *Abel*. Afterwards he applies to Hereticks the Curſe which God pronounc'd againſt the Sacrifice of *Cain*, and makes a Catalogue of the principal Hereſies, ending with the *Apollinarians*. After this he proves againſt the *Arians* the Divinity of the Son, and his Humanity againſt the *Apollinarians*, and demonſtrates againſt both the one and the other, That there were in Jeſus Chriſt Two perfect and compleat Natures; the Divine Nature according to which he is equal to his Father; and the Humane, that is to ſay, as a real Body and underſtanding Soul with the Properties of theſe Two Natures. When St. *Ambroſe* afterwards wrote down this Sermon, he added the Anſwer to a Difficulty which the *Arians* propos'd to him after his Sermon, *viz.* How it is poſſible, that the Father who was not begotten ſhould be of the ſame Nature with the Son who was begotten. This is the Subject of this Treatiſe, which he compos'd ſometime before the Death of *Gratian* in 383, and after the Book of *Faith* which he wrote in 379, that's to ſay, about the Year 382.

There is at the end of this Treatiſe, a Paſſage of St. *Ambroſe* about the Incarnation, which is produced by *Theodoret* in his Second Dialogue, as taken out of a Book, Entituled, *An Explication of the Faith.*

The Letters of St. *Ambroſe* are plac'd in a new Order, and divided into Two Claſſes. The Firſt contains thoſe whoſe Time and Order could be found out. The Second contains thoſe whoſe Date is not certainly known.

The Letter of the Emperour *Gratian* to St. *Ambroſe* is of a more ancient Date than the reſt. He wrote to this Holy Biſhop after his Return from the Eaſt, whither he had gone to aſſiſt his Uncle *Valens*. He ſignifies to him how much he deſired to have him near him, and prays him to ſend him again that Book, which he had given him before, (meaning the Two Books of the Faith,) and to add to them the Proofs of the Divinity of the Holy Spirit. St. *Ambroſe* in the Anſwer which he made to this Letter, excuſes himſelf for not coming to wait upon him when he return'd from the Eaſt, and praiſes the Faith and Piety of this Emperour. He promiſes Satisfaction to his Demands. This Letter was written in 379, ſoon after the Return of *Gratian.*

The

The Second is written to *Constantius*, who was lately promoted to a Bishoprick. He exhorts him to govern his Church well in the midst of Storms and Tempests. He discourses to him very largely about the Instructions which he should give to his People. He recommends to him the Church of *Imola*, which was without a Bishop, and prays him to visit it often till a Bishop were Ordain'd for it; because, as for himself, he was so busy during the time of *Lent*, that he could not go far from his own Church. Lastly, he admonishes him to take heed lest the *Arians* that came from *Illyricum* should spread their Error among the Faithful of his Country. He adds, that they ought to think of the Misery which had befaln them, because of their Infidelity; which discovers that the *Arians* were driven out of *Illyricum* by the *Goths*, who entred into that Country after the Death of the Emperour *Valens*: And therefore this Letter was written in the *Lent* of 379. St. *Ambrose*

The Two following Letters are address'd to *Felix* Bishop of *Comum*. In the First St. *Ambrose* thanks him for the Mushrooms which he had sent him, and complains that he had not yet come to see him. In the Second he praises him, and invites him to be present at the Dedication of the Church of St. *Bassianus* Bishop of *Lodi*. If we may believe *Ughellus*, the Author of *Italia Sacra*, this Church was Consecrated in the Year 380, but that is very uncertain. This *Bassianus* subscrib'd at the Council of *Aquileia*.

The 5th. Letter to *Siagrius* Bishop of *Verona* concerns a Point of Discipline. This Bishop had condemn'd a Virgin who was accus'd of having violated her Virginity, to be examined by a Midwife. St. *Ambrose* nulls this Judgement in a Synod of Bishops. *Siagrius* being offended with this Proceeding, wrote to him, that 'twas to be fear'd the Inhabitants of *Verona* would complain of the Judgment which he had given. St. *Ambrose* shows in this Letter, that his Judgment was as Canonical as that of *Siagrius* was irregular. He accuses this Bishop of being too hasty in giving this Judgment, which was so disgraceful to a Virgin who had been consecrated by his Predecessor *Zeno*, and who had always pass'd for a vertuous Maid. This was so much the more unjust, because there was neither Accuser, nor Informer, nor Witness against her. She had been defam'd by none but a Club of *Libertines* unworthy of Credit, whom she had driven away from her House. And therefore this Judgment, being against all Laws Ecclesiastical and Civil, was void in Form; neither was it better as to the Matter, because what it ordain'd was against good Manners, against Modesty and Civilty. St. *Ambrose* represents to him, that there are other ways to be assur'd of the good behaviour of a Virgin, and that we must never proceed to these Extremities. That oftentimes this way is not successful, and leaves the Matter as uncertain as before; That it was very dangerous to make the Reputation of a Virgin consecrated to God, depend upon the Credit of a Woman, who might easily be corrupted or deceiv'd; That if these means might be us'd, it was only to be us'd to Maid servants, who are more afraid of a Discovery than of Sinning; but it ought never to be us'd for trying the Chastity of Virgins consecrated to God; That in this particular Case 'twas to no manner of purpose to use these Means, because, if it were true, that this young Woman, who was accus'd, had been with Child, and put it to death after her being brought to Bed, as was given out, it had been impossible but this would have been known by many Persons, and consequently there must have been many Witnesses found against her; That the thing which had stirr'd up some Persons against her, was because she liv'd retir'd in her House, and made no Visits to the Ladies of the World; That *Maximus*, who was her true Accuser, tho' he would not appear in it, had been engag'd in a Law-suit and some Differences with her; That all this Accusation was founded only on a false Report which had been spread about; That *Renatus* and *Leonitus* the Witnesses, at first contradicted themselves, and afterwards disappear'd; That *Indica*, having no more Accusers or Witnesses against her, brought *Marcellinus* and two other Witnesses, who averr'd, That she always behav'd her self very prudently, and in consequence of this, That he and his Collegues had declar'd that her Reputation was untainted, and Excommunicated *Maximus*, *Renatus* and *Leonius* her Accusers, with this difference, That *Maximus* might be receiv'd again without doing Penance, by confessing his Fault only, whereas the other Two were oblig'd to do Penance.

The 6th. Letter is to the same Bishop upon the same Subject. He represents to him also how odious the Judgment was which he had given, and the Respect which is due to Virginity. This Letter is plac'd in the Year 380, but there is no convincing proof brought of it.

The 7th. and 8th. Letters are written to *Justus*, who is thought to be the Bishop of *Lyons*, who was present at the Council of *Aquileia*. St. *Ambrose* explains in the first, after a very Mystical manner, the Questions which this Bishop had propos'd to him upon some places of the Holy Scripture. In the Second he affirms, That the sacred Writers wrote with Art, and gives many examples of it which are very intricate.

There are plac'd here among the Letters of St. *Ambrose* the Acts of the Council of *Aquileia*, which are maintain'd to be Genuine and Authentical, against the Opinion of *Chiffletius*, who thought fit to affirm, That they were compos'd by *Vigilius Tapsensis*: But this is an Opinion which is not supported by any reasonable Conjecture [d], and is confuted by the bare reading of these Acts, which discover that

[d] *This is an Opinion which is not supported by any reasonable Conjecture*, &c. p. 824.] These Acts are written in a Simple and Natural way. The Questions which are put to the Accus'd, and the Answers which they gave, are not of the nature of those that are made at pleasure; but such as are made in the ordinary Forms. There is nothing in them which smells of Forgery. They contain particular Facts, which could not be known by any Man that had liv'd but 30 Years after. There is no Errour in them contrary to History. In the other Letters of the Council of *Aquileia*, there is mention made of Two Bishops of *Dacia* and *Mœsia* condemn'd by this Council. The Bishops which are named in these Acts, are all Bishops of that time. What is said there, That this Council was

they are Originals. Theſe Acts are not entire, for what concerns the Condemnation of *Secundianus*, St. *Ambroſe* and the Concluſion of the Council, is loſt. The Six following Letters are written in the name of the Biſhops of *Italy*, who were preſent at the Council of *Aquileia*, and concern the Hiſtory of that time. What we have to ſay of the Acts of this Council and theſe Letters, may be found in our Diſcourſes of the Councils of *Aquileia* and *Conſtantinople*.

The 15th. addreſs'd to the Biſhops of *Macedonia*, and to the Clergy of *Theſſalonica*, was written upon the death of *Aſcholius* Biſhop of that City. St. *Ambroſe* comforts them upon his death, becauſe he was removed into a better life, and enjoys the happineſs of Saints. He compares him to *Elias* and *Eliſha*; he teſtifies how much he lov'd him, and how much he regrets the loſs of him; he enlarges upon his Vertues, and congratulates the Churches of *Macedonia* upon the receiving *Anyſius* for his Succeſſor. To him the following Letter is written, which is alſo full of the Praiſes of his Predeceſſor *Aſcholius*. He prays God that *Anyſius* may be ſucceſſor to his Vertues as well as to his See. Theſe Letters are written in the Year 383.

In Letter 17th. St. *Ambroſe* writes to the Emperour *Valentinian* againſt the Petition which *Symmachus* had made in the Name of the Senate for reſtoring the Altar of Victory. He remonſtrates to him, that as all the Subjects of the *Roman* Empire ought to ſubmit to him, ſo he alſo was oblig'd to ſubmit to the only true God, and as they defend his Empire, ſo he was oblig'd to defend the Religion of Jeſus Chriſt. That a Chriſtian Prince ought neither to Diſſemble nor Tolerate, and much leſs ought he to Authorize the Worſhip of Idols and falſe Gods. He wonders therefore, that under a Chriſtian Emperour, there ſhould be found any Perſons ſo raſh, as to hope, that he would grant an Edict for reſtoring the Altars of the Gods, and that he would contribute towards the Expence of it, by giving Money out of his Exchequer: That tho' the Temples had not been deſtroyed, and the Worſhip of the Gods forbidden by the Laws of his Anceſtors, yet he ought to do it now; but after the Laws have been in force for a long time, there was yet leſs reaſon to ſubvert them: That in this buſineſs he muſt never hearken to the Advice of a Pagan, how Prudent ſoever he may be otherwiſe; and that if any Chriſtian had been cowardly enough to conſent to this Propoſition, he deſerv'd not to bear the Name of a Chriſtian any more: That if a Pagan Emperour would re-eſtabliſh an Altar, and oblige Chriſtians to conſent to it, this would be lookt upon as a Perſecution. How then can a Chriſtian Emperour do it, without committing Sacriledge? That there was no probablity, that all the Senate had conſented to this Propoſition, ſince all the Chriſtans Senators two Years before had entred their Proteſtation againſt it, and that they were not preſent in the Senate when it was done, becauſe they thought that they could not have their liberty there to make head againſt it. He warns *Valentinian* that he ſhould not ſuffer himſelf to be ſurpriz'd, and exhorts him to do nothing new in an Affair of this Importance without the Advice of the Emperour *Theodoſius*, whom he was wont to conſult in Affairs of Importance. Now what Affairs, ſays he, can be of greater Importance than this of Religion? What is more precious than the Faith? He prays him to deſire of them a Copy of the Act of the Senate, and that they would leave him to anſwer it. In a word, he tells him with an aſſu-

call'd together from the Eaſt and the Weſt, agrees with another Letter of a Council of *Italy*, where 'tis ſaid, That there was a Synod held in the Weſt, *quæ videbatur ex univerſus orbis partibus eſſe præcepta*. There were in this Council ſome Biſhops of *Gaul* and *Africk*. All the Biſhops are named there with their Biſhopricks: In fine, all things conſpire to confirm the truth of theſe Acts. The Opinion of *Chiffletius* is founded only upon frivolous Conjectures. *Vigilius Tapſenſis*, ſays he, obſerves that *Palladius* wrote a Diſcourſe after the death of St. *Ambroſe* to refute what this Saint had ſaid about the Trinity, and that *Vigilius* himſelf had anſwer'd this Work of *Palladius* in a little Book by it ſelf. What follows from thence? *Vigilius* wrote a Treatiſe againſt that of *Palladius*; therefore it was the Acts of the Council held againſt the Hereticks. Who can believe it? Is there any thing more different, than theſe Acts are from a Piece about Doctrine againſt any Author's Book? Theſe Acts treat of the judicial Condemnation of a Perſon, but ſay nothing of the Refutation of a Book. The other Conjectures are yet more weak. He objects, That theſe Acts are not found in the Ancient Editions of the Councils, as if the firſt Collectors had collected all: How many Councils did they forget, and Synodical Writings which are in the Works of the Fathers. 2. That *Valerian* of *Aquileia* is nam'd there before St. *Ambroſe*. This Objection is no more againſt the common Opinion, than againſt that of *Chiffletius*; for either *Vigilius* had the Acts of the Council of *Aquileia*, or he had them not; if he had them, why ſhould he change the Order of the Biſhops; if he had them not, wherefore was not the Biſhop of *Milan* plac'd before the Biſhop of *Aquileia*: He muſt therefore, as well as we, find out a reaſon why the Biſhop of *Aquileia* goes before the Biſhop of *Milan*: It may be, becauſe the Synod was held in his own City, and the Order of the Emperour for calling the Synod together was directed to him. The 3d. and 4th. Reaſons of *Chiffletius*, is, becauſe this Diſpute favours not of Epiſcopal gravity, and all the Diſcourſes there are made by the ſame hand. If one takes the pains to read the Acts, he will ſee that 'tis not ſo, and that there are Anſwers and Queſtions which are Originals, and could not be gueſſed at by any Author. He alledges for a 5th. Reaſon, that *Anemius* Biſhop of *Sirmium*, does there impertinently aſſume the Title of the Head of *Illyricum*. But 'tis certain that he enjoyed it in the time of *Conſtantine*, and it does not appear that he was diſpoſſeſs'd of it ſo ſoon after, ſince he enjoyed it ſtill in the time of *Juſtinian*. 'Tis not certain that *Theſſalonica* had yet received the Lieutenancy of *Damaſus*, and tho it were ſo, *Sirmium* was always the Head of the Weſtern *Illyricum*; and it may be that the Biſhop of *Sirmium* contended againſt him for the poſſeſſion of this Lieutenancy, eſpecially at the beginning. *Chiffletius* pretends that *Aſcholius* Biſhop of *Theſſalonica* was preſent at the Council of *Aquileia*, but he has no other Proofs of it but the Auhtority of a Synodical Book full of Errors. The 6th. Reaſon of *Chiffletius* is, that the Anſwers of *Palladius* are ridiculous: But it may be they do not appear ſo ridiculous to all the World, and tho' they did, is this the firſt time that Hereticks have defended themſelves ill? I ſhall not ſtay longer to mention the other Conjectures, which are as weak as the reſt, ſo that there never was a fancy worſe grounded than this of *Chiffletius* about theſe Acts.

rance

rance becoming an Holy Biſhop, That if he ſhould act otherwiſe, the Biſhops would not ſuffer nor diſſemble the Injury which he would do to Religion; and that if he came to the Church, he ſhould not find a Biſhop there, or elſe he ſhould find one who would oppoſe his Entrance into it. "And "what will you anſwer then, ſays he, addreſſing his words to the Emperour *Valentinian*? What "will you anſwer to the Biſhop when he ſhall ſay, The Church cannot receive Oblations from him "who has given Ornaments to the Temples of the Gods: His Gifts ſhall not be preſented on the "Altar of Jeſus Chriſt, who hath made an Altar for Idols. The Edict ſigned with your own Hand "convicts you of the Fact. How can the Honour which you give to Jeſus Chriſt be acceptable to "him, ſince at the ſame time you worſhip Idols? No, you cannot ſerve Two Maſters. The Virgins "conſecrated to God, have no Priviledges, and yet you have granted Priviledges to Veſtals? Why have "you recourſe to the Miniſters of Jeſus Chriſt, after you have preferr'd before them the Petitions of "Pagans? St. *Ambroſe* adds to theſe Remonſtrances of the Biſhops, the Charge which his Brother *Gratian* could draw up againſt him, if he ſhould return into the World, and the Accuſations which his Father *Theodoſius* might juſtly make againſt him. St. *Ambroſe*

Becauſe St. *Amboroſe* had deſired of *Valentinian* a Copy of the Petition which had been preſented to him in the Name of the Senate, and which he anſwers in the following Letter, that is alſo here inſerted. *Symmachus* therein deſires of the Emperours, as Governour of *Rome*, and Deputy of the Senate, that they would cauſe the Altar of Victory to be repaired, that ſo the Oath might be adminiſtred according to ancient Cuſtom upon the Altar, and that they would reſtore to the Veſtal Colledge, and the Prieſts of the Gods, the Goods and Priviledges of which they had been unjuſtly deprived, ſince the Gods, being provoked with the Injuries done to their Prieſts, had avenged themſelves by a cruel Famine, wherewith the Empire was afflicted. He aſſerts, That they ought not to imitate the Emperours, who have taken away thoſe ancient Ceremonies. He introduces the City of *Rome* deſiring this Reſtauration, and he affirms that this may be done without any Expence to the Treaſury. This Petition was written with all the Eloquence and Politeneſs poſſible.

St. *Ambroſe* anſwers it in the following Letter, and reduces the reaſons of this Requeſt to theſe Three: The Firſt is the claim which the City of *Rome* makes to her ancient Ceremonies: The Second is the Injuſtice which is done to the Veſtal Virgins, and the Prieſts of the Falſe Gods, by deſpoiling them of their Revenues: The Third is the Vengance which the Gods have ſent down upon the Empire by Famine. To the Firſt he oppoſes a contrary *Proſopopœia*, wherein the City of *Rome* condemns her ancient Superſtitions, and demonſtrates the Advantages which ſhe has drawn from the Chriſtian Religion. In anſwer to his Second Argument, he compares the Virgins Conſecrated to God with the Veſtal Virgins, and the Chriſtian Biſhops with the Prieſts of the Falſe Gods. The Veſtals continued Virgins, becauſe of the Honour and Advantages which there Condition procured to them; but the Chriſtian Virgins have no other Recompence of their Virginity, but their own Vertue. They complain that the Prieſts of Falſe Gods, are deprived of Revenues from the Publick; but the Chriſtian Prieſts are even deprived of the Right of Succeſſion. "The New Laws, ſays he, have "made this Regulation, and yet we do not look upon it as an Injury, becauſe we are not much "concerned for this loſs. The Prieſts of the Falſe Gods are capable of Donatives, but no Legacies "can be made in Favour of our Church-men. I do not complain of this ſeverity, ſays St. *Ambroſe*, "for I would rather that Eccleſiaſticks ſhould have leſs Riches and more Grace. The Church hath "no Patrimony but her Faith; if ſhe has any Revenues they are for feeding the Poor. In ſhort, St. *Ambroſe* diſcovers the Falſhood of *Symmachus*'s Suppoſition, That the Gods of the Pagans being provoked, ſent the Famine which afflicted the Empire the preceding Year. Firſt, becauſe this Famine did not begin till long after the Pagan Prieſts were depriv'd of their Rewards and their Honours. Secondly, Becauſe this Famine did not continue long, and Plenty ſucceeded it, tho' nothing was done in favour of the Prieſts of the Pagan Gods. He concludes this Anſwer with ſhowing, That the Emperours ought not to expect Protection from the Gods of the Pagans. Theſe Pieces were written in the Year 384 when *Symmachus* was Governour of *Rome*.

The 19th. Letter to *Vigilius*, lately choſen Biſhop of *Trent*, contains ſome Important Inſtructions, which he counſels him to give unto his People. The Principal is, To diſſuade the Faithful from contracting Marriages with Infidels; of this he treats largely in this Letter. But he admoniſhes him alſo by the by, to teach his People the Obligation that lies upon them to pay Labourers their hire; to inſtruct them that Uſury is forbidden, and to exhort them to uſe Hoſpitality. One of the Reaſons which he brings to ſhow, That a Chriſtian ought not to marry an Infidel, is this, *That Marriage ought to be ſanctified by the Prieſtly Veil, and by the Bleſſing: How then can a Marriage be made between two Perſons of a different Belief?* The Hiſtory of *Sampſon* and *Dalilah*, affords him a fair Field to enlarge upon; by which Example he ſhows that Chriſtians ought to ſhun marrying with Perſons of a different Religion. *Vigilius* died under the Conſulſhip of *Stilico* in 400 or 405. 'Tis commonly believed that he was 20 Years a Biſhop; yet there are Acts of the Life of this Saint, where he is ſaid to be only 12 Years inſtead of 20. If he died in 400, and was Biſhop only 12 Years, this Letter was in the Year 383. If he died in 405, and was 20 Years a Biſhop, the Letter may be written at the ſame time; it cannot be in the Year 381, becauſe the Name of his Predeceſſor is found in the Subſcriptions of the Council of *Aquilea*.

The 20th. Letter to *Marcellina*, Siſter to St. *Ambroſe*, contains a Relation of the Endeavours, that the Empreſs *Juſtina* us'd in the Year 385, to take from the Catholicks of *Milan*, two of their Churches, and of the manner wherein St. *Ambroſe* defended them. "The Day after I received your Letter, "ſays he, by which you ſignify to me, That you were very much tormented with troubleſome "Dreams, here begun thoſe Commotions which have created me a great deal of trouble. They were

"not

St. *Ambroſe* "not ſatisfied with asking the *Portian*-Church, which is without the City, but they damanded alſo "the *New*-Church which is within the City, and is greater than the other: The Lords of the Court "and the Officers, came to find me out, and told me that I muſt abandon this Church, and hinder "the People from making any Sedition. I anſwered according to my Duty, That a Biſhop cannot "deliver up the Temple of the Lord. The next morning there was great Crying in the Church, "and the Prefect came thither to perſuade us to give up at leaſt the *Portian* Church; the People op- "pos'd him with their Clamours, and he retired, ſaying, That he would make his Report of what "was done to the Emperour. The next Day, which was *Sunday*, after the Reading and Sermon, "when I was Explaining the Creed to the Catechumens, I was told, That Serjeants were ſent to ſeize "upon the *Portian*-Church, that they had already hung up Curtains, and that a great many People "were flocking thither: I went on ſtill in diſcharging my Duty and began Maſs; but as I was "offering, I was inform'd, that the People having met with an *Arian* Prieſt call'd *Cartulus*, had laid "Hands upon him. This made me weep, and I prayed to God in the midſt of the Holy Sacrifice, "that he would hinder the ſhedding of Blood in the Quarrel of this Church. At the ſame time I "ſent Prieſts and Deacons to recover this Man out of the Hands of the People. Immediately very "ſevere Sentences were paſs'd, Firſt againſt all the Companies of Merchants; ſo that at this Holy "Time, which was the laſt Week of Lent, when Priſoners were wont to be ſet at Liberty, there "was nothing heard every where but the rattling of Chains wherewith Innocent Men were loaded, "and great Sums of Money were extorted from the People. The Officers threatned Perſons of Qua- "lity, if they would not deliver up the Church to them. The Counts and Tribunes came to me, and "required me to deliver up the Church preſently, ſaying, That the Emperour, in whoſe Power all "things are, does but demand his Right. I anſwered them, did he demand any thing of mine, my "Money, or my Land, I ſhould willingly give them up to him, tho' all that I have belongs to the "Poor; but Places Conſecrated to God belong not to the Emperour, neither is it in my Power to give "them. If you ſhould demand my Patrimony, ſaid I to them, take it; If you would have my Per- "ſon, I am here ready for you, carry me away Priſoner, put me to Death, if you pleaſe; In ſhort, "Do with me what you pleaſe, I'm content, I will not call upon the People to Succour me, I will "not proſtrate my ſelf before the Altar to beg my Life, but I will rather willingly Sacrifice "my ſelf for the Altar's ſake. I was deſir'd to put a ſtop to the Sedition of the People, "I anſwered, That all that I could do, was to give no Encouragement to it, but God only could "appeaſe it; That if they thought I was the cauſe of it, the Emperour might baniſh me whither- "ſoever he pleas'd. I paſs'd the reſt of the Day in the Old Church, and at Night, I went back to "ſleep at my own Houſe, that they might find me ready to be gone if they had a mind to force me "away. Next morning the Church was encompaſs'd with Souldiers; the People came ſtill flocking "thither in great Multitudes; the Souldiers who had Orders to ſeize upon it, joyned with the People "in the Prayers which were put up in it. In the mean time, St. *Ambroſe* preached in another Church about the preſent Calamities. He recites here his Sermon full of Boldneſs and Reſpect, out of which take an Excellent Paſſage as follows. "I was commanded to deliver up the Church, I an- "ſwered, That it was not lawful for me to deliver it up, nor for you, Prince, to receive it. You "cannot juſtly Invade the Houſe of any particular Man, and would you forcibly take away the "Houſe of Jeſus Chriſt? I was told that every thing is lawful to the Emperour. I anſwered, That "the Emperour has no Juriſdiction over Divine Things; That he ought not to aſſume this Boldneſs, "and if he would Reign long he muſt ſubmit to God: For 'tis written, we muſt render to God what "is God's, and to *Cæſar* what is *Cæſar*'s; the Palaces are for Kings, the Churches for Biſhops: The "Emperour has Power over the Walls of the City, but not over Sacred Edifices. 'Twas ſaid, but "'tis very Juſt that the Emperour ſhould have a Church for himſelf. No, he ought not to have "any. Here ſome came and told him, That they had already brought his Royal Hangings into the Church, and that the People which were there, earneſtly deſired his preſence. This gave him oc- caſion to apply the Pſalm which was read that Morning to the Caſe in hand, *O Lord, the Heathens are come into thine Inheritance*, &c. While he was diſcourſing upon this Subject, there came a Notary in the Emperour's Name to ask him, Why he had acted contrary to the Orders of his Majeſty. St. *Ambroſe* anſwered, That he did not believe that he dad done it. "Why then, ſays the Notary, "did you ſend Presbyters into the Church which he had a mind to take Poſſeſſion of? If you be a "Tyrant, the Emperour deſires that you would declare your ſelf ſo, that he may know what he, "has to do.. St. *Ambroſe* anſwered, That he dad done nothing contrary to the Reſpect which he ow'd to the Emperour, nor contrary to the Intereſt of the Church: That he had indeed ſent Presbyters to this Church, but he did not believe that he had herein done any thing contrary to his Authority; That if they took him for a Tyrant, they might put him to Death; That he had no other Arms to defend himſelf withal but the Invocation of the Name of Jeſus Chriſt; That under the ancient Law the Kingly Power had been given to Prieſts, but they had never uſurp'd it; That Kings were more deſirous of the Prieſthood than the Prieſts of the Kingly Power; That Chriſt himſelf run away for fear leſt he ſhould be choſen King; That *Maximus* would not ſay that he had been wanting in his Loyalty to *Valentinian*. In ſhort, That Biſhops had never been Tyrants, but had often ſuffered hard things from them.

All the Day was ſpent in ſadneſs, and St. *Ambroſe* could not return to his own Houſe, becauſe the Church was encompaſs'd with Souldiers; ſo he paſſed the Night in ſinging *Pſalms* in the Church. The next Day the Book of *Jonas* was read. As St. *Ambroſe* was expounding it, word was brought him, that the Emperour had commanded the Souldiers to withdraw, and order'd the Fines which were exacted from the Merchants to be reſtor'd. "What Joys, ſays he, what Acclamations

"of

" of the People! This was the Day wherein Jeſus Chriſt was delivered up for us, the Day wherein " Abſolution is given to Penitents. This is, writes he to his Siſter, what is paſs'd, God grant that " here may be an end of it. But the Threatnings of the Emperour make me fear ſtill ſome greater " Commotions: He ſays, That I am a Tyrant and more than a Tyrant: And when his Officers pray'd " him to come to Church, he anſwered them, If *Ambroſe* would command you, you would deliver " me up. Behold, what am I to expect after this! All thoſe that heard him ſay this, teſtified ſuf- " ficiently the trouble that it gave them; but there are ſome about him, who have blown up the " Coals. *Calligonus* Maſter of the Wardrope came to me, and threatned me in theſe Words; Why " do you deſpiſe the Emperour, Vengeance ſhall quickly come upon you? I anſwered him, That if " God ſhould ſuffer theſe Threatnings to take Effect, he would do as Eunuchs have been wont to " do, and I ſhould ſuffer as becomes a Biſhop: Heavens grant, That all the Miſchiefs which " threaten the Church may fall upon me; That her Enemies may point all their Darts againſt " me; That they may aſſwage their Rage with ſhedding of my Blood. Thus ends this Excellent Letter of St. *Ambroſe*. St. *Ambroſe*

Tho' the Firſt Efforts of *Juſtina* had ſuch bad Succeſs, yet ſhe did not give over her Perſecution. To colour her Deſign, ſhe caus'd a Conference to be propos'd between *Auxentius* the *Arian* Biſhop and St. *Ambroſe*, before ſuch Judges as they ſhould name, hoping by theſe means to have a Pretence to force him away. Then an Officer was ſent in the Name of *Valentinian* to ſignifie unto him, That *Auxentius* had named ſome Judges, and that he ſhould name ſome in his own behalf. St. *Ambroſe* anſwered, That according to the good Maxim of *Theodoſius* the Father of *Valentinian*, Biſhops could have none but Biſhops for their Judges; That Laymen could not judge between Biſhops, and much leſs Infidels or Hereticks, ſuch as *Auxentius* in all probability had choſen. This is what St. *Ambroſe* remonſtrated to *Valentinian* in Letter 21ſt. which is properly a Petition wherein he ſhows that he had done nothing contrary to the Reſpect which he owes him by this Anſwer; That he only followed the Law which his Father had eſtabliſh'd, and that this was the Cuſtom of the Church: That if a Conference about the Faith was neceſſary, it ſhould be in the Church and before Biſhops: That if *Auxentius* ſhould appeal to a Synod, tho' it was not neceſſary to aſſemble one, (ſince if an Angel ſhould come from Heaven and teach a contrary Doctrine, it ought not to be preferr'd before the unanimous Conſent of all the Churches;) yet if a Council ſhould be aſſembled, he was ready to appear there; That he would have come to Court and to the Emperour's Council, if his People, his Clergy and the Biſhops had not hindred him; That he was not wont to go thither but for the Intereſt of the Emperour, neither was it his Cuſtom to freqent the Court.

At the time when St. *Ambroſe* ſent this Petition to be preſented to the Emperour, he preach'd a Sermon to his People, to allay the Fear they were ſeized with, after they underſtood that St. *Ambroſe* was cited to appear before the Emporour's Council. This is plac'd after the preceding Letter. There he declares to his People, That he had no deſign to abandon his Church; That they might arreſt his Body by force, but they could not ſeparate his Mind from it; That he would never willingly forſake them, but if he ſhould be driven away by force, he would not reſiſt. " I can, ſays he, " ſigh and mourn, I can lament; Tears are my only Arms againſt Violence and againſt Souldiers; " Biſhops have no other Defence. I cannot, I ought not to reſiſt any other ways, but as to flying " away and forſaking my Church, that I will never do. You know that the Reſpect which I have " for the Emperour does not make me yield cowardly; That I offer my ſelf willingly to Puniſh- " ment, and that I do not fear the Miſchiefs they threaten me with. If I knew that in my abſence " the Church would not be deliver'd up to the *Arians*, and if it were the Duty of a Biſhop to go to " the Palace, I would go willingly; but this is not his Duty, for Matters of Faith cannot be hand- " led but in the Church. If any one has a mind to oppoſe our Creed, let him come here, and I " will defend the Faith which I profeſs. The Souldiers that encompaſs the Church and their rattling " of their Arms, do not at all make me afraid, neither do they ſhake my Conſtancy; all that I " fear is, that while you detain me, ſome Reſolution may be taken againſt you. I am not wont to " have any fear for my ſelf, but I tremble for you. When the Veſſels of the Church were demanded " of me, I ſaid, That if they would demand any thing that was mine, I ſhould willinly give it; " That I could give nothing that belonged to the Church, and that in refuſing them I gratified the " Emperour, ſince he could not receive them without doing an Injury to Jeſus Chriſt. After this he exhorts his People to continue Spectators of the Combate which he was to maintain. He ſays, That he had no reaſon to fear, becauſe he was aſſured, that it was for the Cauſe of God, who could protect him againſt all his Enemies, and defeat all their Deſigns: That he had already ſmitten them with blindneſs, ſince they did not perceive the Gate of the Church which was left open, tho' they had compaſs'd the Church about, and ſought for a way to enter into it; That he went forth daily to make Viſits, or to go to the Sepulchre of the Martyrs, without being ſtopp'd by any Body, tho' 'twas already reſolv'd to drive him away, and that *Auxentius* had a deſign to Invade his Church. Here he inveighs freely againſt this *Arian*, and againſt the Law which he had gotten by ſurprize in favour of his Party. He obſerves, That he was ready to refute him, tho' there was no need of it, ſince *Auxentius*'s Cauſe was quite deſperate, and he had been condemn'd even by thoſe, whom he had choſen for his Judges, and in the abſence of his Adverſaries: That after he was thus conquer'd, he would have taken the Emperour for a Judge, tho' he was yet but a Catechumen: That he had perſuaded the Emperour the preceding Year to take away a Church from the Catholicks, but the Reſiſtance of the People hindering him from compaſſing that Deſign, he had charged St. *Ambroſe* with rebelling againſt the Orders of his Prince, tho' he always anſwered with much Moderation. " If the Em- " perour, ſays he, demand of us Tribute, we will not refuſe to pay it him, the Lands of the Church

St. *Ambroſe*

" do pay it. If he would have the Lands themſelves, he can take them, none of us does oppoſe it. " I will not give them to him, but neither will I hinder him from taking them. We keep our ſelves " within the bounds of a Juſt Obedience, We render to *Cæſar* that which is *Cæſar's*, and to God the " things which are God's. Tribute is *Cæſar's*. No body refuſes him that. The Church is God's; 'tis " unlawful to give it to the Prince; he has no Authority over it. Could any thing be more reſpectful, " or more to the Honour of the Emperour? 'Tis an Honour to him to be of the Church; he is in " the Church, but not above the Church.

The 22d. Letter contains the Hiſtory of the Diſcovery of the Reliques of St. *Gervaſius* and St. *Protaſius*, and the Sermons which St. *Ambroſe* made to his People upon this Subject. It is alſo to his dear Sitter *Marcellina*, to whom he communicated an Account of what had paſſed in his Church. He writes to her, that having dedicated a Church at *Milan*, he was deſired to Conſecrate it with the ſame Solemnity, wherewith he had done the Roman Church (this was another Church which was near the Roman Gate) which he promiſed to do, if he could find any Reliques. That he had cauſed the Ground at a place which was before the Rails of the Selpulchres of St. *Felix* and St. *Nabor* to be broke up; That in this place he found the Bones of two Men of extraordinary bigneſs with much Blood; That there were ſufficient Signs to diſcover that they were Martyrs; That having brought thither ſome poſſeſs'd Perſons, it was known by their Agitation, that they were before the Selpulchre of Martys; That the People flocked together in great Multitudes for the ſpace of two Days to ſee theſe Relicks, and that afterwards thoſe Bones were diſpoſed according to their Natural Order to be carried into the *Ambroſian* Church; That they were laid up in *Fauſtus's* Church, where Vigils were celebrated all that Night, and the next Morning they were tranſlated to the *Ambroſian* Church; That while they were tranſlating, a blind Man was cured. This was the diſcovery of the Bodies of theſe Martyrs. St. *Ambroſe* adds two Sermons made to his People upon this occaſion, which contain alſo ſome Circumſtances of it. In them he obſerves, That theſe two Saints are St. *Gervaſius* and St. *Protaſius*. He does not tell us, whence he knew it: But St. *Auſtin* informs us that he had got an Account of their Death, and the place where their Bodies were laid, by a Revelation which he had that Night. He ſpeaks of the many Miracles which thoſe Reliques wrought, of the Poſſeſſed that were delivered, of the Sick that were healed, of the Handkerchiefs that were touched, to carry them to the Sick. He tells his People, That theſe Bones muſt be put under the Altar; That ſuch Victims could not be better plac'd than under the Altar where the true Sacrifice lay; That Jeſus Chriſt is upon the Altar, becauſe he ſuffered for all, and the Martyrs are under the Altar, becauſe they were redeem'd by his Blood. He adds, That he had deſign'd this place for his own burial place, becauſe it was fit that a Biſhop ſhould be interr'd in that place where he was wont to make the oblation, but that he yielded this place to the Martyrs, and would preſently go and place their Reliques in it. The People earneſtly deſired, that he would put off the Performance of this Ceremony till *Sunday*, but he would delay it no longer than till the next Morning. And then he made another Diſcourſe to his People, wherein he confutes the Infidelity of the *Arians*, and the Incredulity of ſome of the Faithful, by the Miracles which the Reliques had wrought, and chiefly by the Cure of the blind Man which was publick and certain. St. *Auſtin* Ch. 7. of the IXth. B. of his Confeſſions, and the Author of the Life of St. *Ambroſe*, ſay, That an end was put to the Perſecution by the diſcovery of thoſe Reliques, which diſcovers to us that this Letter was written in the Year 386.

The 23d. Letter is written to the Biſhops of *Emilia*, about a ſcruple they had concerning *Eaſter* Day for the Year 387. St. *Ambroſe* obſerves in the Firſt Place, That the Holy Scripture and Tradition teach us, That we muſt carefully find out *Eaſter* Day; That the Council of *Nice* believ'd this ſo neceſſary; That they had made a Cycle of 19. Years; That by this means the Sacrifice in Honour of Chriſt's Reſurrection might be offered in all places in the ſame Night; That the Biſhops of *Alexandria* and *Rome* had already made Regulations of this Buſineſs; but ſince there were many who would alſo have his Opinion, he thought himſelf obliged to write his Thoughts; and tho' the difference at preſent was only about the Celebration of the next *Eaſter*, yet he would ſhew what Day ſhould be obſerved for time to come, whenſoever the like Queſtion ſhould return. He ſays, That there are two Things to be obſerved concerning the Celebration of *Eaſter*, the 14th. Day of the Moon and the Firſt Month; That this time was fixed for the Paſſover under the Old Teſtament, and that Jeſus Chriſt obſerved this Law, by celebrating the Paſſover on *Thurſday* the 14th. Day of the Moon of *March*, and by being crucified on *Friday* the 15th. and riſing the *Sunday* following. That therefore Chriſtians ought to Celebrate the Feaſt of the Reſurrection on the *Sunday* after the 14th. Day of *March*-Moon, a Day on which it is not any more lawful to Faſt; and when the 14th Day of the Moon happens to be *Sunday*, as it will fall out to be quickly, we muſt put off the Solemnity of *Eaſter*, till the following *Sunday*, becauſe we muſt not Faſt upon *Eaſter*-Day, nor break our Faſt upon the 14th. Day, which is the Day wherein Jeſus Chriſt was delivered up to be crucified. He proves by Examples that this is the Cuſtom. He ſpeaks afterwards of the Firſt Month, and ſhews that 'tis not neceſſary to Celedrate the Day of the Reſurrection in the Firſt Month, provided the Day of the Paſſion happens in it. He makes this Remark, becauſe he was treating of the Paſſover for the Year 387. which was to be celebrated on the 23d. of *April*, a Day which ſeem'd not to belong to the ſame Lunar Month. 'Tis certain that St. *Ambroſe* ſpeaks of the *Eaſter* of that Year as being quickly to come to paſs, *quod futurum eſt proximè*, and that he ſpeaks of the *Eaſter* of the Year 380, as being already paſs'd ſome Years ago, *ſuperioribus temporibus*; which proves, that this Letter was written in 386, or 387. tho there be a place in this Letter, which ſeems to prove, that it was written in the Year 381, becauſe he ſpeaks of the *Eaſter* for the Year 378, as being two Years before.

before. But this muſt be a Fault in the Tranſcriber; for what probablity is there that he ſhould take ſo much Pains to fix an *Eaſter* which was not to happen till Six Years after, and that he ſhould ſpeak of it as the next Feſtival? St. *Ambroſe*

In Letter 24th. St. *Ambroſe* gives an Acount to the Emperour *Valentinian*, to whom it is addreſſed, of his Embaſſy to *Maximus*, which the Emperour had entruſted with him the Second time in the Year 386. He tells him, That when he came to *Triers*, he deſired to diſcourſe with *Maximus* in private, but he would not ſay any thing but in his Council, tho' he was told, that it was not the Cuſtom for Biſhops to do ſo; That when he was admitted there, *Maximus* came to ſalute him, but he would not receive his Kiſs till after much Diſcourſe; That *Maximus* accus'd him of putting a Trick upon him in his Firſt Embaſſy, and hindring his Paſſage into *Italy*; that he excus'd himſelf, and prov'd from the ſeveral Steps that he had made, that he had no Deſign to deceive him; That he came to treat about a Peace in the Name of his Prince, and that not being able to conclude it, he return'd; That he had not paſs'd his Word to him that *Valentinian* ſhould come and meet him; That he had never diſſuaded this Emperour from doing it; That this Reſolution of his was taken before he return'd, and that he had ſent Deputies to acquaint *Maximus* that he would not come; That he had acted with all the Moderation that is poſſible; That he had ſent back his own Brother to him, tho' *Maximus* had put *Valentinian*'s to death, and by an unheard-of Inhumanity refus'd ſtill to reſtore his Body; That *Valentinian* had preferr'd Peace to War, tho' he might hope for Succors from the *Huns* and *Alanes* againſt the *Barbarians* whom *Maximus* had brought into the Empire; That *Maximus* ought not to blame thoſe, who being with *Valentinian*, made their Eſcape and fled to *Theodoſius* for Refuge, ſince he put all to death that he could lay hands upon, and among the reſt one *Vallion* who was a brave Captain; That after this Diſcourſe he receiv'd no other Anſwer from *Maximus*, but that he would conſider what he had to do. St. *Ambroſe* adds, that *Maximus* underſtanding that he would not communicate either with the Biſhops who had receiv'd him into Communion, or who had deſir'd the death of ſome Hereticks, he receiv'd Orders to be gone immediately, and at his going away he had the diſſatisfaction to ſee the Holy Biſhop *Hyginus* ſent into Baniſhment, and us'd with all poſſible Rigour, ſo that his Age and bad Uſage reduc'd him to that condition, which left him no hopes but of death.

The Two following Letters are about a Queſtion which *Studius* had put to St. *Ambroſe*; Whether a Magiſtrate ought to condemn Criminals to Death, and whether he that condemns ſuch Perſons ſhould be excommunicated. The practice in St. *Ambroſe*'s time was not very certain: Some Biſhops excluded them from Communion, others on the contrary received them; nay, there was alſo an example of ſome Biſhops, who a little while before deſir'd the death of the *Priſcillianiſts*: Some Magiſtrates themſelves abſtain'd from theſe things. St. *Ambroſe* confeſſes, that we ought not to excommunicate a Magiſtrate, who according to the Duty of his Office Condemns a Man to death, and Orders him to be Executed; but he wiſhes that Judges would abſtain from doing it, and would have no Criminal Condemn'd to Death, but only to a Priſon or ſome other Puniſhment, that ſo they may have opportunity to reform themſelves, and do Penance if they be baptiz'd. or to receive Baptiſm if, they be Catechumnes. To prove that a Chriſtian Magiſtrate ought to uſe this Clemency, he alledges the Judgment which Jeſus Chriſt gave of the Woman taken in Adultery, and makes many Reflections upon this Action in this Letter and the next. Theſe Letters were written after Judgment was given againſt the *Priſcillianiſts*, about the Year 386.

The Seven following Letters to *Irenæus* contain Allegorical Explications of ſome Difficulties about Paſſages of the Holy Scripture. There are Four of them which were formerly among the Treatiſes upon the Holy Scripture. 'Tis thought they were written about the Year 386; but there is no convincing proof of it. The order in which they are to be plac'd is better aſcertain'd, becauſe it is authoriz'd by the Firſt Words at the beginning of each Letter.

The Three Letters to *Orontianus* were written immediately after one another. In the Third he ſpeaks of his own Perſecution, and therefore they were written after the Year 386. Theſe are alſo about ſome Difficulties of Scripture.

The Letters 37th. and 38th to *Simplicius* are about Morality. In them St. *Ambroſe* ſhows, that none but a wiſe Man can be truly Free and truly Rich. Theſe Letters are plac'd in the Year 387, tho' without certain proof.

The 39th. is a Letter of Conſolation to *Sabinus* upon the death of his Siſter. He ſays, that as he return'd from *Bolonia*, he ſaw the Cities ruin'd. This may have reference to the irruption of *Maximus*, or that of *Eugenius*.

The 40th. Letter to *Theodoſius* is more conſiderable. The Governour of the Eaſt had written to *Theodoſius* who was then at *Milan* after the death of *Maximus* in 388 or 389. That a Synagogue of the Jews and a Temple of the *Valentinians* were burnt, and that the Biſhop was the cauſe of this Conflagration. *Theodoſius* gave order that thoſe who had done this Action ſhould be puniſh'd, and that the Biſhop ſhould rebuild this Synagogue at his own Charge. St. *Ambroſe*, who was then at *Aquileia*, underſtanding that *Theodoſius* had given this Judgment, wrote to him with all poſſible freedom, that his Order was not conſiſtent with his Piety, and the Zeal he had for the Chriſtian Religion; That the Biſhop could not obey him without prevaricating. He defends alſo the Counſel of this Biſhop, and the Action of thoſe who had burnt the Synagogue. He ſhews, that the Jews had often burnt the Temples of Chriſtians, without being puniſh'd for it, or condemn'd to rebuild them; That it was unworthy of a Chriſtian Emperour, who had received ſo many benefits from Jeſus Chriſt, to take part with a Synagogue of Jews againſt the Church. In a word, he heaps together many thoughts and expreſſions of this Nature, which have more of Declamation than true Reaſoning, to hinder any Repa-

St. *Ambroſe* Reparation of the Injury which was done to the Jews by burning their Synagogue: He threatens alſo the Emperour to deprive him of Communion, if he did not recal theſe Orders. He did not only write to the Emperour about it, but he alſo made a Sermon upon this Subject in his preſence, which is related in the following Letter written to his Siſter. He prevail'd ſo far, that the Emperour promis'd none of the Chriſtians ſhould be ſought after for this Cauſe, after which he went, ſays he, to the Altar, which he ſhould not have approach'd if the Emperour had not paſt his word about that matter.

The 42d. Letter is a Synodical Epiſtle of a Council at *Milan*, being an Anſwer to that which *Siricius* and his Council had written to the Church of that City againſt *Jovinian* and his followers. This Letter is ſign'd by Seven Biſhops, and a Prieſt who ſubſcribed it in the preſence of his Biſhop and by his Command. In it they certify the Pope, that they were of the ſame Judgment with him concerning the excellency of Virginity. They prove that *Mary*, the Mother of God, never loſt her Virginity in Child-bearing. They ſhow the neceſſity and uſefulneſs of Faſting. Laſtly, they condemn *Jovinian* and his followers whom *Siricius* and the *Roman* Church had condemned.

The Letters 43d. and 44th. are Explications of Two Difficulties which *Orontianus* had ſtarted about the Creation of the World, which were not explained in St. *Ambroſe*'s Treatiſe upon this Subject written about the Year 389.

The Five following Letters addreſs'd to *Sabinus* were written much about the ſame time: They contain nothing very remarkable.

The 50th. addreſs'd to *Chromacius*, is about the Prophecy of *Balaam*. St. *Ambroſe* was old when he wrote it.

In the 51ſt. he exhorts *Theodoſius* to do Penance for the Maſſacre done by his Order at *Theſſalonica*, and repreſents to him the Enormity of this Action. This Letter was written in the Year 390.

The 52d. to *Titianus* contains nothing remarkable; he congratulates him that *Ruffinus* was made Prætorian Præfect, not only upon the account of the Honour that was done him by it, but alſo becauſe this Office hindred him from being Judge in a Law-ſuit which *Titianus* had with his Grand-daughter whom *Ruffinus* favour'd. *Ruffinus* was made Prætorian Præfect in 392. and ſo the date of this Letter is certainly known.

In the 53d. St. *Ambroſe* teſtifies to *Theodoſius* how much he was afflicted for the Death of *Valentinian*, which happened on the Firſt of *March* 392, and this Letter was in the Summer following.

The Two following Letters are written to *Euſebius* who was of an Illuſtrious Family of *Bolonia*. In the Firſt St. *Ambroſe* acquaints him with what he had done for an Officer whom he had recommended to him, and gives him an account of the News about his Grand-ſon *Pauſtinus*. In the Second he writes to him that he had detain'd at *Milan*, *Ambroſia* the Siſter of *Fauſtinus*. This is the Virgin to whom he had given the Veil, of which he ſpeaks in the Book of the Inſtitution of Virgins, publiſh'd in 392. This Letter was written immediately after.

The 56th. Letter is an Anſwer of St. *Ambroſe* to *Theophilus*, who had conſulted him about the difference between *Evagrius* and *Flavianus* for the Biſhoprick of *Antioch*. St. *Ambroſe* tells him at the begining of this Letter, that *Evagrius* had no cauſe to puſh on the Deciſion of this Affair, and that *Flavianus* ought to fear the event of it. He prays him to pardon theſe Words, which a juſt Grief drew from his Pen, becauſe all the World quarrell'd about them, tho' they did not ſympathize with the Grief of others. He adds, that the Council of *Capua* having referr'd this Affair to *Theophilus* and the Biſhops of *Egypt*, it was like to be determin'd by a Judgment which could not be ſuſpected of Injuſtice, ſince the Judges did not communicate with either Party, but that *Flavianus* had had recourſe to the Emperour's Reſcripts, to avoid being judg'd by the *Egyptians*. This made St. *Ambroſe* think that *Flavian* was in the wrong, altho' he did not find the Cauſe of *Evagrius* very good, and he condemns very ſharply the procedure of *Flavian*. But *Theophilus* having written to him that ſome means of accommodating this Affair might be found out, he was not averſe to it, and counſels him to cite *Flavianus* yet once more, and if he perſiſted to refuſe to appear, then to accommodate this Affair as he ſhould think fit: Nevertheleſs he ought not to violate the Canons of the Conncils of *Nice* and *Capua*, and muſt ſtill preſerve peace with all the World, leſt they ſhould ſeem to deſtroy that which had been built up. He advertiſes him alſo, that it was convenient to write to the Biſhop of *Rome*, being perſuaded that he will give no deciſion which can diſpleaſe him, becauſe the way to maintain Peace, is to do nothing which may ſtir up Diviſion among the Biſhops of his own Communion. Laſtly, he declares to him, that he will joyfully receive what he ſhould determine if the *Roman* Church approve it.

The 57th. Letter about the Affair of *Bonoſus* is not St. *Ambroſe*'s but the Pope *Siricius*'s. For Firſt, in it he ſpeaks of St. *Ambroſe* as a Third Perſon. *Bonoſus*, ſays the Author of this Letter, *underſtanding your Judgment, ſent to conſult our Brother* Ambroſe, *to know if he might return to his Church*; and this cannot be underſtood of any but our Holy Biſhop of *Milan*. There was no other *Ambroſe* Biſhop at that time, and tho' there were, yet 'tis plain that he ſpeaks of our Biſhop in this place, ſince it was he who preſided at the Council of *Capua*, of the execution of whoſe Judgment he was treating. Secondly, The Stile of this Letter is no ways like that of St. *Ambroſe*, and is very like that of *Siricius*. Thirdly, It appears plainly that it is a Biſhop of *Rome* who ſpeaks. Fourthly, *Holſtenius* has publiſh'd it in his Collection under the name of *Siricus*, upon the credit of the Manuſcript in the *Vatican*. Neither is it to *Theophilus* of *Alexandria* that this Letter is addreſs'd, but to *Anyſius* of *Theſſalonica*, and the Biſhops of *Macedonia*. For tis' evident that it was written to thoſe to whom the Council of

Capua

Capua had referr'd the Affair of *Bonoſus*; and 'tis no leſs certain that it was referr'd to the *Macedonians*, to the Biſhop of *Theſſalonica*, and the other Neighbour Biſhops of *Bonoſus*, who was Biſhop of *Naïſſa* a City of *Dardania*. To convince any Man of theſe Two things he needs only read the beginning of the Letter. *I have read the Letters which you wrote to me concerning the Biſhop* Bonoſus, *wherein you deſire our Opinion, either to clear up the Truth, or through Modeſty only; but the Council of* Capua *having order'd that the Neighbours of* Bonoſus *and his Accuſers ſhould be Judges of this Affair, and chiefly the* Macedonians, *together with the Biſhop of* Theſſalonica. . . . . *It belongs to you who are entruſted with this Cauſe, to judge according to the Order of the Council of* Capua, *becauſe you are ſubſtituted in the room of this Synod, who has choſen you to enquire into this Affair. And the ſame* Bonoſus *having ſent to conſult our Brother* Ambroſe, *whether he ſhould enter into his Church, received for anſwer, That he ſhould undertake nothing againſt your Judgment, but follow what you ſhould Ordain, ſince the Synod has committed to you this Truſt.* Two things are evident from theſe Words: Firſt, That the Biſhops of *Illyricum*, and chiefly thoſe of *Macedonia*, were entruſted, together with the Biſhop of *Theſſalonica*, by the Synod of *Capua*, to enquire and judge of the Cauſe of *Bonoſus*. Secondly, That this Letter is addreſs'd to thoſe who were thus entruſted. But ſome may ſay, if it be ſo, why does it ſpeak of the Biſhop of *Theſſalonica* and thoſe of *Macedonia* in the Third Perſon? Why does not the Author write thus, *The Synod of* Capua *having referr'd this Cauſe to you and to your Brethren*; but, *The Synod of* Capua *having thought fit, that the neighbouring Biſhops of* Bonoſus, *and chiefly the* Macedonians, *and the Biſhop of* Theſſalonica, *ſhould enquire into and judge this Cauſe*, &c. 'Tis eaſy to anſwer, that the Reaſon is, becauſe he relates in this place the proper Words of the Synod of *Capua*. Now it often happens, that when ſuch Writings are alledg'd to the Judges wherein they are ſpoken of, the way of ſpeaking of them is not chang'd, but they are nam'd in the Third Perſon, as they are in the Writings. But what is ſaid afterwards is addreſs'd to them, and what is related is applied to them. And this the Author of this Letter does in the next Line; *veſtrum eſt igitur qui hoc recepiſtis Judicium*, &c. 'Tis needleſs to inſiſt any longer upon a thing ſo clear; and therefore the true Title of this Letter is that which *Holſtenius* has in his Collection; Siricius, *to our dear Brethren* Anyſius, *and the other Biſhops of* Illyricum. This Letter is no ways unworthy of this Pope as ſome pretend. He does not aſſume to himſelf the Judgment of a Cauſe referr'd to others. This is no ways contrary to the Prerogatives of the Roman Church; on the contrary, this is according to Rule and agreeable to the Canons: This is the Practice and Judgment of the ancient Popes, who had a moſt profound Veneration for the Deciſions of Synods, and who inviolably kept the Laws of the Church. ¶ St. *Ambroſe*

The Letter 58. is written to *Eugenius*, ſometime after this Tyrant came into *Italy*, that's to ſay, in the Year 393.

The Pagans, who had attempted thrice in vain to obtain of *Valentinian* the Reſtitution of the Goods which belonged to their Temple, addreſs'd this New Emperour with the ſame Petition. He refuſed twice to grant it; but at laſt the great Lords of the Pagans having Petition'd that theſe things might be reſtor'd, he did it; ſaying, That he did not give them to the Temple, but to themſelves for the Services they had done him. St. *Ambroſe*, who mightily oppos'd all the Petitions of Pagans under *Valentinian*, ſpeaks with no leſs Boldneſs to the Tyrant *Eugenius*, than he had done to *Valentinian*. He remonſtrates to him, That how great ſoever the Power of the Emperour be, 'tis infinitely below that of God, who ſees the bottom of our Hearts, and from whom nothing is hid; That he ought not to grant, for the Importunity of theſe great Lords, any thing prejudicial to Religion; That the Biſhops would not blame him for the Gifts which he had given to the Pagans; That they did not Envy them theſe Goods; but they could not approve of his Authorizing, by this Grant, the Uſe that theſe Pagans would make of it to reſtore their Religious Worſhip; That it was never lawful to contribute directly or indirectly to the Worſhip of Falſe Gods; That in the former Ages the Chriſtians of *Antioch* dwelling at *Jeruſalem*, being oblig'd to pay a Tax at *Antioch*, at the time of the publick Sports, would never give it, but upon Condition that it ſhould not be employed for the Sacrifice of *Hercules*, but in other Expences neceſſary for the good of the Commonwealth; That if Chriſtian Subjects being forced to obey, thought themſelves obliged to do ſo, a Chriſtian Emperour who was Maſter of his own Will, had much more reaſon to uſe the like precaution.

In the Letter 59. to *Sabinus* Biſhop of *Placentia*, St. *Ambroſe* makes an Encomiaſtick upon St. *Paulinus* and his Wife, who having ſold their Goods to diſtribute the price of them to the Poor, had taken a Reſolution to retire to *Nola*. This gives him occaſion to ſhow the Advantages of Solitude and Voluntary Poverty. This Letter was written ſome time before St. *Paulinus* retir'd to *Nola* at the beginning of the Year 393.

The 60th. Letter is to *Severus*; where he ſpeaks of a Prieſt call'd *James*, who was come from *Perſia* to retire into *Campania*, that he might ſerve God more quietly; as alſo of the Troubles and Wars wherewith his own Country was harraſs'd. This Letter has relation to the War of *Eugenius* in the Year 393, or to that of *Maximus* in the Year 387.

The Letter 61ſt. to *Paternus* is about a point of Diſcipline. This Man who had been Lord Treaſurer, as we learn from the Letters of *Symmachus*, and the 14th. Law *de Metallis*, had conſulted St. *Ambroſe*, if he could marry one of his Sons to his Daughter's Daughter, or his Grand-Daughter. St. *Ambroſe* anſwers him, That he wonders he ſhould ask ſuch a Queſtion of him; That the bare Propoſal of the thing diſcovered that it was forbidden; That the Law of God forbidden the Marriages of Couſin-Germains, does much more ſtrongly imply a Prohibition of this, tho' it was not by name forbidden in the Divine Law; That the Civil Laws forbid it, and that *Theodoſius* forbad Marriages between Couſin-Germains; That if this Law were diſpens'd with, yet it ought not to Authorize this

ſort of Marriages, becauſe a Diſpenſation is only for him that obtains it. The reaſon which he aſ-
St. *Ambroſe* ledges; That his Son was not related to his Grand-Daughter by the Father's ſide, but only by the Mother's ſide, proves nothing, ſince Marriage was equally forbidden between Brethren, whether they were born of the ſame Father and Mother, or of the ſame Mother and different Fathers. Laſtly, he ſays, That it would be more Advantageous to his Family, that his Son and his Daughter ſhould marry to others, becauſe by this means he ſhould have in his Family Children both by his Son and his Grand-Daugther. The Law of *Theodoſius*, which he cites, is of the Year 384. and therefore this Letter was written after that Year: 'Tis there ſaid, that *Paternus* poſſeſs'd a great Office which makes it to be placed in the Year 393. becauſe the Law which we have cited, diſcovers to us, that in this Year he was Lord High Treaſurer, *Comes Sacrarum Largitionum*: But he might have been ſo before.

The Letter 62 was written by St. *Ambroſe* to the Emperour *Theodoſius*, immediately after the Death of the Tyrant *Eugenius*, who was defeated and kill'd in the Month of *September* of the Year 394. St *Ambroſe* retir'd from *Milan* when he underſtood that *Eugenius* was coming thither that he might avoid meeting this Tyrant: But aſſoon as he was gone out of *Milan*, St. *Ambroſe* returned in the Month of *July*. Some time after, the Emperour *Theodoſius* having defeated *Eugenius*, wrote to St. *Ambroſe* to return thanks to God for his Victory. This Saint made Anſwer in this Letter, That he would do it with Joy, and that he would offer up in his Name an acceptable Sacrifice to God; he praiſes the Piety of this Emperour, who did not ſeek after the Pomps of a vain Triumph, but deſired the Biſhops to offer up Sacrifices of Thankſgiving. He ſignifies to him, That he had ſatisfied his deſire; That he had carried his Letter to the Altar, and laid it upon the Holy Table, That he held it in his Hand while he was offering Sacrifice; "To the end, ſays he, "that your Faith might be "made known by my Mouth, and that your Majeſties Letter might ſerve as Matter for an Epiſco-"pal Oblation. Afterwards he praiſes God for having plac'd a Prince upon the Throne who ſur-"paſs'd the greateſt Princes in Glory, and the Holieſt Biſhops in Humility. "What can be wiſh'd for, "what can be deſired more, ſays St. *Ambroſe* to him? You poſſeſs, Sir, all Vertues, you are a Prince, "of ſingular Piety and Clemency. All that can be wiſhed for, is, that God would encreaſe in you "this Piety, and that the Church which rejoyces that Innocent Men live in Peace and Tranquility, "may receive alſo the Conſolation of ſeeing the guilty abſolv'd. Show Favour at leaſt to thoſe "who have not hitherto taken Arms againſt their Prince.

The 63d. Letter addreſs'd to the ſame Emperour, followed quickly after the preceding, wherein St. *Ambroſe* begs favour for thoſe of *Eugenius*'s Party who retired into the Church after the Death of this Tyrant.

The 64th. is addreſs'd to the Church of *Verceilles*, which had loſt her Biſhop. This was not *Euſebius* who died in the Year 370, but *Limenius* who was preſent in the Year 381. at the Council of *Aquileia*. If we believe the Acts of St. *Gaudentius* of *Novara*, produced by *Mombritius* and *Bollandus* upon the 12th. of *January*, St. *Ambroſe* a little before his Death made a Journey to *Verceilles*, upon the Account of ſome Diſſention which was in the Church, which was probably about the Election of a Biſhop; and this makes ſome believe that this Letter was not written till the Year 394. But this conjecture is founded upon a very uncertain Ground; for it ſuppoſes theſe two things which are not well proved: Firſt, That what is related in the Acts of St *Gaudentius* of *Novara* is true; Secondly, That the Diviſion which obliged St. *Ambroſe* to go to *Verceilles* was about the Election of a Biſhop. It ſeems alſo that St. *Ambroſe* needed not to have written this Letter if he had been upon the place himſelf. Some have ſaid, That this Letter was not St. *Ambroſe*'s, becauſe that *Venice* is named in it: But if this Objection be of any force, we muſt alſo for the ſame reaſon reject the Second Anſwer to *Symmachus*, which is without all Controverſy St. *Ambroſe*'s. This Letter has his Stile and his Air of Writing; he has inſerted into it ſome entire Fragments of his own Commentary upon the Goſpel of St. *Luke*, and upon *Pſalm* 119. He exhorts the People and the Clergy, to put an end to the Diviſions which diſtracted them about the Choice of a Biſhop. He admoniſhes them afterwards to beware of harkening to two Men, called *Sermatian* and *Barbatianus*, who were gone out of a Monaſtery of *Milan* to go and lead a licentious Life at *Verceilles*, where they preached, That no Merit belonged to Abſtinence, nor any peculiar Grace to Virginity; and that it was a folly for any one to Faſt and Mortify himſelf. St. *Ambroſe* makes a long Digreſſion to refute theſe Errors, and to prove the Uſefulneſs of Abſtinence and Faſting, and the Excellency of Virginity. Afterwards he returns to his Subject, and treats of the Qualities of the Perſon who ought to be choſen for a Biſhop. One of the Principal is, that he has had but one Wife. St. *Ambroſe* extends this Prohibition to thoſe alſo who had Contracted a Firſt Marriage before their Baptiſm. Thus he underſtands the Paſſage of the Apoſtle St. *Paul*, and the Cannon of the Council of *Nice*. There is alſo another Condition obſerved by St. *Paul* concerning the Qualifications of a Biſhop, That he ſhould not be a Novice, or one lately Inſtructed in the Faith. Becauſe they tranſgreſſed this Rule in the Ordination of St. *Ambroſe*, he is forced to juſtify himſelf, by ſaying, That he was Ordained againſt his Will. At laſt, he ſays, If great Care ought to be taken in the Choice of a Perſon who is to be plac'd upon any Epiſcopal Throne whatſoever, it was a Matter of the greateſt Importance to place a Perſon of ſingular Merit upon the Epiſcopal Throne at *Verceilles*, becauſe the Biſhop of this Church was entruſted with the Care of a Monaſtery and a Church, and ſhould joyn the Practice of a Religious Life with the Vertues of a Biſhop, as St. *Euſebius* did, who was the Firſt that united theſe two things in the Weſt, by ſetting Monaſteries in a City, and governing his Church without renouncing a Monaſtick Life. Here he enlarges upon the Praiſes of this Holy Biſhop, and of *Denys* of *Milan*, the Companion of his Baniſhment, and of the troubles he endured for the Defence of the

the Faith of the Church; and propoſes the Life of their Diſciples as a Pattern. He concludes with a long Digreſſion, wherein he recommends the Practice of Chriſtian Vertues, and chiefly of Poverty, of Abſtractedneſs from the World, of Retirement, of Patience, of Charity, of Abſtinence, *&c.* St. *Ambroſe* I believe that this laſt Part has been ſince added, and that it is a Fragment of ſome Diſcourſe of St. *Ambroſe*, for it has no relation to, nor connexion with what goes before.

Theſe are all the Letters of St. *Ambroſe*, of which the Order and Time can be gueſſed at: The others which compoſe the Second Claſs, are without Date, tho' they have prefixed the Figures to theſe as well as to thoſe that went before. The Nine firſt contain Expoſitions upon ſome places of *Exodus*, of *Liviticus*, of *Deuteronomy*, and the Prophet *Micah*. Theſe were formerly among the Commentaries upon the Holy Scripture. The Four following are upon ſome places of the Epiſtles of St. *Paul*.

The 78th. addreſs'd to *Marcellus*, is about an Arbitration which he had made of a Law-Suit that this Biſhop had with his Siſter. St. *Ambroſe* was nam'd Judge of it, but he choſe rather to make an end of it, to the content of the two Parties, by giving his Siſter the Revenue of the Land in Queſtion during her Life only.

In the 79th. he exhorts his Clergy not to neglect the Functions of their Miniſtry, becauſe of the Pains, the Fatigues, and the Perſecutions they were to endure in the diſcharge of their Duty.

The 80th. 81ſt. 86th. 87th. 88th. 89th. 90th. 91ſt. and 92d. are ſhort Letters about private Affairs.

The 82d. is addreſs'd to a ſick Man call'd *Bellicius*, who was converted in the heighth of his Diſeaſe, and was now beginning to recover. St. *Ambroſe* tells him, That God had ſent this Sickneſs to ſave him; That he had ſmitten him with this Infirmity to Cure him by it; That God knowing his inward Thoughts, ſaw that he had good Deſigns, but delayed the Execution of them, and therefore God had ſent him this Sickneſs to ſerve for an Admonition to him; That he had already begun to know the Lord, but he was moreover to receive the Sacraments, by which the World is redeemed, Sins are pardon'd, and Grace is diſtributed. The following Letter is addreſs'd to the ſame ſick Perſon, wherein he compares his Cure to that of the Man born blind. In Letter 84th. and 85th. he diſcourſes of the true Treaſures and the true Riches, and ſhews, that none but the Rich are truly happy.

The Funeral Orations upon *Valentinian* and *Theodoſius* are plac'd here after the Letters of St. *Ambroſe*. They are two admirable Pieces. The firſt was ſpoken in 392. in the preſence of the Siſters of *Valentinian*. There he praiſes the Vertues of this Prince, and makes no doubt but he was ſaved, tho' he died before he receiv'd Baptiſm, becauſe Faith and a deſire of receiving the Sacrament ſupplied the want of it. He promiſes to pray for him. In the Second he particularly commends the Clemency, the Charity and Humility of *Theodoſius*, and concludes with comforting his Son *Honorius*, before whom he ſpoke this Funeral Oration in 395.

It cannot be doubted but St. *Ambroſe* compos'd Hymns. St. *Auſtin* in his Book of Confeſſions, *B.* XII. and in his Book of Muſick, *Ch.* 9. commends the Hymn at Veſpers, *Veni creator omnium*, as St. *Ambroſe's*. He could not be deceiv'd in this Matter; but ſince he has not ſet down the number of thoſe Hymns which St. *Ambroſe* compos'd, it may be doubted whether all thoſe that go under his name be his. Thoſe for the daily Office appear to be more certainly his than the reſt; to which may be added the Hymns upon the *Hexameron*. As for the reſt they appear to be in another Stile, and of another Author. 'Tis certain that the *Vexilla Regis* is none of his.

St. *Ambroſe* wrote alſo other Books which we have not at preſent. We have already obſerved, That we have not now his Genuine Book of the Sacraments and of Philoſophy, which is many times cited by St. *Auſtin*. The ſame Saint cites alſo the Commentary of St. *Ambroſe* upon *Iſaiah*, in *B.* IV. to *Boniface*, *Ch.* 62. and *B.* II. againſt *Julian*. St. *Ambroſe* alſo mentions it in his Commentary upon St. *Luke*. We have not now his Inſtruction to *Fritigilda*, which *Paulinus* mentions in his Life, nor the Inſtructions to *Panſophius*.

But if ſome Books of St. *Ambroſe* have been loſt, it muſt be confeſs'd that ſeveral have been attributed to him which are none of his.

Firſt, There have been put out under his Name a multitude of Sermons, and not one of them his: There are 36 of them printed among thoſe of St. *Maximus*, 14 in the Appendix to St. *Auſtin's* Sermons, two of which are in both places. That which was the 64th. is the Tranſlation of a Diſcourſe of St. *Baſil* upon the words of the Rich-man, *I will pull down my Barns*. The Expoſition upon *Ch.* 31ſt. of the *Proverbs* is the 37. Sermon of St. *Auſtin*. The *Benedictines* did not think fit to print theſe, and ſo have only given the Catalogue of them. As for the reſt which are 58 in number, they have publiſh'd them here, but they confeſs that they are none of St. *Ambroſe's*: And indeed there is not one of them which has his Stile and Air.

Secondly, There have been attributed to St. *Ambroſe* ſome Treatiſes upon the Scripture, which having no Author that is known, have paſſed under ſeveral Fathers Names. Such is the Diſcourſe of the Dignity *of the Humane Nature*, which has alſo been attributed to St. *Auſtin*, under the Title of *a Diſcourſe about the Creation of the Firſt Man*, which *Alcunius* cites under the name of *Albinus*, and which has alſo been inſerted entire into the Book *of the Spirit and the Soul*. Such is alſo the Diſcourſe *of the forbidden Fruit*, which is amongſt the Sermons of St. *Auſtin*. The Diſcourſes upon *Elijah* and *Eliſha* are the Sermons of St. *Maximus*.

The Treatiſe of *the* 42 *Stations or Encampings of the People of* Iſrael *in the Deſart*, belongs to a pretty ancient Author, but it has not the Stile of St. *Ambroſe*. It uſes the Latin Tranſlation of *Origen's* Works.

I ſay

I ſay nothing here of a Commentary upon the Epiſtles of St. *Paul*, which is believed to be *Hilary*'s the Deacon, becauſe I have ſpoken of it in another place. St. *Ambroſe*

The Commentary upon the *Revelation* is a very late Author's. He ſpeaks of the *Lombards* and cites St. *Gregory*. The name of the Right Author of this Commentary has been found at the end of on *Oxford*-Manuſcript, where it is attributed to *Berengaudus*, whom *Dionyſius Carthuſianus* cites with *Bede* and *Haimo* in his Commentary upon *Ch.* 10. of the *Revelation*.

To theſe Treatiſes may be added the *Harmony of the Evangeliſts*, *St.* Matthew and *St.* Luke *concerning the Genealogy of Jeſus Chriſt*; for it is not St. *Ambroſe*'s, becauſe this Author follows the Hypotheſis of *Africanus*, which St. *Ambroſe* does not.

Thirdly, There are many Treatiſes upon different Subjects attributed to St. *Ambroſe*, whoſe true Authors have been diſcover'd.

The Treatiſe *upon the Creed*, which is better entituled in the Manuſcripts, a Treatiſe of *The Trinity and the Reſurrection*, is a Collection of Paſſages out of many Fathers. They have taken the liberty in the *Roman* Edition to make abundance of Additions and Alterations in it. The *Benedictines* will publiſh it juſt as it is in the Manuſcripts.

The Book of the Divinity of the Son is probably *Gregory*'s of *Bætica*, as we proved, when we gave an account of the Works of St. *Gregory Nazianzen*.

The Treatiſe entituled *of the Myſteries of* Eaſter, is a Sermon which is improperly divided into Chapters. It has rather the Stile of St. *Maximus* than of St. *Ambroſe*.

The Book *of the Sacerdotal Dignity* is *Gerbertus*'s, under whoſe Name it has been publiſhed by *Mabillon* in his *Analecta*, where 'tis Entituled *A Paſtoral Book*.

The Diſcourſe *to a Virgin conſecrated to God* has a quite different Stile from that of St. *Ambroſe*.

The Book *of the Vocation of the Gentiles* and *the Epiſtle to* Demetrias, are certainly none of St. *Ambroſe*'s, ſince they were written ſince the Birth of the *Pelagian* Hereſy. We ſhall afterwards examine to whom they ought to be attributed.

The 29th Letter to *Florianus* is of a Stile much below St. *Ambroſe*'s, and therefore it is rejected in the Appendix. 'Tis yet more Evident, that the 34th. which is a Relation of the Martyrdom of St. *Agnes*, is the Work of an Impoſter, who having written a Hiſtory as he himſelf pleas'd, added at the end, that it is St. *Ambroſe*'s, who having found theſe Memoirs in ſome Divine Books, wrote them for the Edification of the Church and addreſs'd them to ſome Virgins. The Stile of this Relation ſhows the Author to be a Lyar, and diſcovers the Impoſture.

The 35th. Letter about the Invention of the Reliques of St. *Gervaſius* and St. *Protaſius* relates this Event after quite another manner than St. *Ambroſe* does in his Genuine Works, and is written in a Stile perfectly different from this Father's. The ſame may be ſaid of the 55th. Letter concerning the Invention of the Reliques of St. *Vitalis* and St. *Agricola*, which ends with this Form, *Regnante Chriſto domino Noſtro*, &c. which belongs to the Ages much later than St. *Ambroſe*.

The Two Prayers *for preparation to the Euchariſt*, have nothing at all of St. *Ambroſe*'s Stile. There are found in ſome Editions, many other Meditaions and Prayers of the ſame nature, but none of them have any thing of his Genius.

The Book *of the Combate between Vertues and Vices*, which is alſo attributed to St. *Auſtin* and St. *Leo*, belongs to *Ambroſius Autpertus*, as is obſerved in the Preface to this Work, which is in the Appendix to the Sixth Book of the New Edition of St. *Auſtin*, p. 219.

The Expoſition of Faith is an Abridgment of St. *Ambroſe*'s Book addreſs'd to *Gratian*.

The Book *of the Holy Spirit* is a fragment of ſome more conſiderable Treatiſes written by a Latin Author ancient enough, but different from St. *Ambroſe*.

The Book *of Penance* belongs to one *Victor*, as the laſt Words prove invincibly, *nulla Capiaris oblivione Victoris*. The very name of *Victor* is at the beginning of two ancient Manuſcripts. We ſhall enquire afterwards, whether it ought to be aſcribed to *Victor Cartennenſis*, or to *Victor Tunonenſis*.

'Tis not neceſſary to adverti'e the Readers that the Book *of the Life and Manners of the Brachmans*, is a ridiculous Diſcourſe, and unworthy of St. *Ambroſe*, or any Man of Senſe.

The Stile of St. *Ambroſe* is not always equally lofty, for he proportions it, as St *Auſtin* obſerves, to the things of which he treats. Sometimes it is very careleſs, ſometimes 'tis very labour'd, but 'tis always grave, ſerious and noble; it is ſhort, ſententious, and full of ſtrokes of Wit. The Books that he took pains about, are very ſmart, exact and ingenious, and adorned with Figures and Flowers of Rhetorick. His other Books, tho' they are leſs poliſh'd, yet have their ſweetneſs and ſmoothneſs. His words are choice enough, and his Expreſſions noble. He deverſifies his Matter with a wonderful variety of Thoughts and Words. He is ingenious at finding out the moſt natural and agreeable Turns of Wit. He does not raiſe great Paſſions, but he diverts and inſtructs his Reader, and inſinuates himſelf into his Mind and Heart by ſoft and pleaſant Strains. Neither does his Diſcourſe want ſtrength, and he urges a thing vigorouſly, when there is occaſion. As he joined together in the conduct of his Life a wonderful Generoſity and Inflexibility with all poſible prudence and moderation, ſo he knew how to temper in his Diſcourſes the boldneſs and authority of a Biſhop, with an Air of ſweetneſs and charity. We have already declared, what Judgment is to be made of his Commentaries upon the Scriptures, and of his dogmatical Books. His Books of Morality are certainly the moſt excellent of all his Works, and thoſe he took moſt pains about. There are ſome of his Letters which may paſs for Maſters-peices in their kind, particularly thoſe which are written to the Emperours. He who wrote them, plainly diſcovers that he was a Man brought up at Court, who has ſuch a free

a free Air and eaſie Way as is not acquired but by ſeeing the World. The Conduct and Policy which he obſerved in the greateſt part of his Actions and Diſcourſes, diſcover likewiſe that he had been accuſtomed in his younger Years to manage great Affairs, and that he had a Genius very fit for them. He was but moderately learned, chiefly in Eccleſiaſtical Matters. But being born in an Age of great light, and having great ſharpneſs of Wit, and a wonderful facility of Speaking, and labouring continually in reading the Fathers that went before him, he became able to diſcharge with honour all the Offices of his Miniſtry, and to fill up the place which he poſſeſs'd to his Credit. St. *Ambroſe*

The Firſt Edition of the Works of St. *Ambroſe*, is that which *Maffeius Venia* an *Auguſtin* Monk, dedicated to the General of his Order, *Ambroſius Coranus*. The Time and Place where it was printed is not ſet down. The Second was made at *Milan* by the care of a Prieſt call'd *Cribellius* in 1490. Theſe Two Editions contain but a few Treatiſes.

[*Cornelius à Brughem* in his *Catalogue of Books, printed before the Year* 1500. mentions an Edition of St. *Ambroſe*'s Epiſtles in 1480. in fol. *Of the Generation of* John. at *Augsbourg* 1476. *Of the Flowers of Wiſdom*, Homilies: *Venice* 1488. They ſeem by their Titles to be Spurious.

Two Years after, *Amerbachius* Printer at *Baſle*, made another Edition of the Works of St. *Ambroſe* much larger, but leſs correct. This Edition was reprinted in 1606, by *Johannes Petri* Printer alſo at *Baſle*, who added only a great Index.

Eraſmus undertook a New Edition of the Works of St. *Ambroſe*, which he divided into Four Tomes. The Firſt contains the Moral Works; The Second the Polemical; The Third the Orations, Epiſtles and Sermons; and the Laſt, the Commentaries upon the Old and New Teſtament. Theſe Four Tomes make Two Volumes. This Edition was many times reprinted at *Baſle*, and once at *Paris* by *Chevallon*, in 1529.

The Edition of *Eraſmus* being full of Faults, *Johannes Coſterius* a Regular Canon of *Louvain*, took the Pains to Correct the Text of St. *Ambroſe* by many Manuſcripts, and cauſed it to be printed anew at *Baſle*, in 1555, by *Epiſcopius*.

At laſt, *Gillotius* having gathered together a much greater Number of Manuſcripts, cauſed the Works of St. *Ambroſe* to be Printed at *Paris* by *Merlinus*, in the Year 1568. This Edition, tho' more correct than all the reſt, was little minded, and in a manner wholly Eclipſed, by the Reputation of the *Roman* Edition, which followed ſoon after. Cardinal *Montaltus*, who was afterwards *Sixtus* V. deſiring to purchaſe Reputation among Learned Men, undertook it while he was but a Cordelier and General of his Order, and cauſed Four Volumes of it to be publiſhed when he was Cardinal, in 1579. 1580, 1581, and 1582, which he Dedicated to *Gregory* XIII.

The 5th and 6th appeared under the Pontificate of *Sixtus* V. in 1585, and 1587.

This Edition was after that the Pattern and Original which was follow'd in the Edition at *Paris*, begun in 1586, and in all the other following Editions which are very numerous. 'Twas believ'd that a Book publiſh'd with ſo much oſtentation, valued ſo much by the Publiſher, printed in ſo fine a Character, and with ſo much care, muſt needs be very correct and perfect; and yet this Edition has many eſſential Defects which disfigure it. The firſt and moſt conſiderable is, that the *Roman* Correctors took the liberty to change, cut off, and add what they thought fit, tho' they had no ground to do ſo from the authority of any Manuſcript. They carried it ſo far, as that they did not content themſelves with changing thoſe Terms which appear'd to them harſh, and ſubſtitute others according to their fancy, but they alſo blotted out or added whole Lines and Periods, which made a perfectly new Sence, and altogether different from the Authors, as may be ſeen by comparing the ancient Editions and the laſt, with this *Roman* Edition. Secondly, They have inſerted into the Commentaries the whole Text of the ſacred Books, which hinders the reading the Commentary of St. *Ambroſe* without interruption. Thirdly, The Order which they have obſerv'd in ranging the Books is not natural. They have placed ſome Letters amongſt the Treatiſes upon the Holy Scripture, they have ſeparated Books that ought to follow one upon another, as the complaints of *Job* and *David*, whereof one is placed in the firſt Tome, and the other in the Second; they have joined together ſome Treatiſes which ſhould be ſeparated; they have rank'd the Letters in a very inconvenient Order. In a word, by too much refining they have corrupted all, as *Faber* ſays in a Letter to *Fronto Ducæus*, where he obſerves the Faults of the *Roman* Edition of St. *Ambroſe*. " I have found, ſays he to him, that *nimis* " *fuere ingenioſi in alieno opere*, as in the Books *De interpellatione ſanctorum Job & David*, which they " have ſeparated, and placed the one in the Firſt Tome, and the other in the Second, to do which they " were forc'd, *quædam interpolare minime probabili exemplo*. They have done the ſame *in priore Apologia David*; and in the Second that which is yet worſe; for becauſe it is ſaid in the 8th Ch. that the " Hiſtory of *David* with *Bathſhebah* is not a Hiſtory (which ſhows that this Book is none of St. *Am-* " *broſe*'s, but ſome *Origeniſts*, who allegorizes almoſt all the Bible, as alſo it ſeems by the reading of " it, to be collected and made up out of Two or Three Sermons) they have taken away Five or Six " Lines, which are found in all the ancient Editions. Fourthly, they have made a particular Claſs of ſome ſuppoſititious Books, and yet they have left a great number of them amongſt St. *Ambroſe*'s Genuine Works. There are ſome of them whoſe Forgery is ſo manifeſt, that they cannot be pardoned, ſuch as the Books *de Arbore interdicta*, *de dignitate Hominis*, *de Vocatione Gentium*, the Epiſtle *ad Demetriadem in Symbolum Apoſtolorum*, and many others. They muſt be very ignorant who believed that theſe Books were written by St. *Ambroſe*, and very impudent who left them among his Genuine Works, when they had a Deſign to make a diſtinct Claſs of thoſe that were ſuppoſititious.

St. *Ambroſe*

In ſhort, the Authors of this Edition have made no Notes, or mark'd in the Margin any different Readings; they have only added at the end the Theological and Scholaſtical diſſertations of one *Ferdinand Wellofillus*, which are a Collection of common Places and Paſſages of the Fathers upon different Queſtions, which are of no uſe at all for underſtanding the Text of St. *Ambroſe*.

Now to commend the Edition of the *Benedictines*, I need only ſay that they have avoided all the Faults of the *Roman* Edition: For Firſt, they preſcrib'd it to themſelves as an inviolable Law, that they would put nothing into the Text, which ſhould not be approved by the authority of one or more Manuſcripts, and they have chang'd nothing without acquainting us with the Manuſcript upon whoſe authority they did it. Secondly, They have taken out the Text of the Bible, and left the Commentary of St. *Ambroſe* continued after the ſame manner as he compos'd it, excepting only the diſtinction of Chapters, which is a great eaſe to the Reader. Thirdly, The Order which they obſerved in ranging the Books is plain and natural. Beſides this, they have noted the Chronology of each Diſcourſe, and rang'd the Letters according to the order of their Dates. Fourthly, They have not placed any Book that is manifeſtly ſuppoſititious among thoſe that are Genuine. They have only left among them the Second Apology of *David*, and the Books of the Sacraments, becauſe many learned Men believe them ſtill to be St. *Ambroſe's*, tho' it is very probable that they are not. Laſtly, They have prefix'd to every Chapter moſt uſeful Arguments, wherein they diſcover the time of each Work, and give the Contents of it. They have alſo placed at the bottom of the Pages, ſuch Notes as contain not only the different Readings of the Manuſcripts, but alſo very uſeful explications of difficult places in the Text, whoſe Sence they have diſcovered by the moſt diligent Enquiries with all poſſible exactneſs, without diverting to Queſtions which are of no uſe for underſtanding the Text of their Author. All which give us occaſion to ſay, That this Edition of the Works of St. *Ambroſe* is as perfect as it can be, and comes no ways ſhort of the late Edition of St. *Auſtin*.

St. EPIPHANIUS.

St. *Epiphanius*.

ST. *EPIPHANIUS* was born about the Year 332, in a Village of *Paleſtine*, near the City of *Eleutheropolis*, and paſs'd his Youth in the Monaſtick Diſcipline with St. *Hilarion*, *Heſychius*, and other Monks of *Paleſtine*. He tells us (*Hereſy* 26.) that he was like to have been ſurprized by the Hereticks called *Gnoſticks*, but God of his mercy preſerved him. He was choſen afterwards about the Year 366. Biſhop of *Salamis*, the Metropolis of the Iſle of *Cyprus*. In this place he acquired very great Reputation for his Ability and Piety; and happy had it been for him if he had not been engaged towards the latter end of his Life in the Diſpute of St. *Jerom* and *Theophilus* againſt the Origeniſts, which diſturbed his Repoſe, and created him a great deal of trouble. This Diſpute begun in the Year 391, between St. *Epiphanius* and *John* of *Jeruſalem*. He accus'd this *John* of maintaining the Errors of *Origen*, and going into *Paleſtine*, he Order'd *Paulinianus*, the Brother of St. *Jerom*, Deacon and Prieſt, in a Monaſtery which was not under his Juriſdiction. *John* of *Jeruſalem* complained immediately of this Action of *Epiphanius*, which was contrary to the Canons and the Diſcipline of the Church. St. *Epiphanius* maintains what he had done in a Letter which he wrote to *John* of *Jeruſalem*, produced by St. *Jerom*. This Conteſt farther exaſperated their Minds, which were already very much embitter'd upon the Subject of *Origen*; both the one and the other endeavour to engage *Theophilus* of *Alexandria* on their ſide. This Biſhop, who ſeem'd at firſt to favour the Party of *John* of *Jeruſalem*, at laſt declared againſt *Origen*, condemned his Books in a Council held in 399, and perſecuted all the Monks that were ſuſpected to favour his Memory. Theſe Monks being perſecuted, withdrew to *Conſtantinople*, where they were well enough received by St. *John Chryſoſtom*: Which ſo enraged *Theophilus*, that from that time he conceived a Mortal hatred againſt St. *Chryſoſtom*, as plainly appeared by his following Actions. Nevertheleſs *Theophilus* deſiring to ſtrengthen his Party, acquainted St. *Epiphanius* with what he had done againſt *Origen*, and ſollicited him to do the ſame thing. This Saint who had a great averſion to this Author, aſſembled a Council in the Year 401, in the Iſle of *Cyprus*, wherein he caus'd the Reading of *Origen's* Books to be condemned, and wrote to St. *Chryſoſtom* to exhort him to do the ſame thing: But he not approving of this Propoſition, St. *Epiphanius* came himſelf to *Conſtantinople*, by the perſwaſion of *Theophilus*, to cauſe the Decree of the Council of *Cyprus* to be put in execution there. *Socrates* and *Sozomen* tell us, That before he entered into the City, he Ordain'd a Deacon in a Church depending upon the Juriſdiction of *Conſtantinople*. Cardinal *Baronius* thinks that theſe two Hiſtorians are miſtaken, and that the Ordination of *Paulinianus* made by *Epiphanius* in *Paleſtine*, in a place depending upon *John* of *Jeruſalem*, gave them occaſion to think, that St. *Epiphanius* had ordained a Deacon in the Dioceſs of St. *John Chryſoſtom*. Howſoever this be, St. *Epiphanius* being come to *Conſtantinople*, would not hold communion with St. *Chryſoſtom*, and alſo did all that lay in his power to procure from the Biſhops that were then at *Conſtantinople*, an approbation of the Sentence of the *Cyprian* Council againſt *Origen*; but he found but very few willing to Sign the Condemnation of one that died in the Communion of the Church, upon ſo ſlight Grounds, and others refus'd to approve his Sentence. St. *Epiphanius* not being able to compaſs his Deſign by theſe means, reſolved to be preſent the next day in the Church of the Apoſtles, and there with a loud Voice, before all the People, to condemn the Books of *Origen*, and all thoſe who defended them. But when he was in the Church, St. *Chryſoſtom* advertiz'd him by his Deacon *Serapion*, that he he went about a thing that was againſt the Eccleſiaſtical Laws, and which would expoſe him to great danger, for it was to be feared, that the People would make ſome Sedition, of which he himſelf being the Author could

could not complain, after he had been forewarn'd of it. This conſideration put a ſtop to St. *Epiphanius's* undertaking, who was ſo tranſported againſt *Origen*, that when the Empreſs *Eudoxia* had recommended to his Prayers the younger *Theodoſius*, who was ſeized with a dangerous Sickneſs, he caus'd this to be told her for an anſwer, That the Prince her Son ſhould not die, provided ſhe would ſhun the converſation of *Dioſcorus* and the other Defenders of *Origen*. The Empreſs being ſurprized with this Anſwer, which ſhe did not expect, ordered him to be told, That if God would take away her Son, ſhe would ſubmit to his Will, That it was in his power to take him away as he had given him to her, but it was not in the power of St. *Epiphanius* to raiſe him again from the dead, ſince he ſuffered his Archdeacon to die a little while ago. The heat of St. *Epiphanius* was a little abated, after he had ſpoken to *Ammonius* and his Companions, whom *Theophilus* had driven away for *Origeniſm*, for thoſe Monks gave him to underſtand that they maintain'd no heretical Doctrine, and that he had condemned them with too much precipitation. Whereupon he departed immediately to return to *Cyprus*, and 'tis ſaid, that being ready to embark, he told the Biſhops that conducted him to the Ship. *I leave you the City, the Palace, and the Theatre.* He died by the way, or ſoon after his Return in 402, or 403. St. *Epiphanius.*

The Books of St. *Epiphanius*, are Firſt of all his great Work of Hereſies, entituled, Παναρειον or Κιβώτον, that's to ſay, an Apothecary's-Shop, or Repoſitory of Remedies, which is divided into three Parts.

The firſt contains the Hereſies before Jeſus Chriſt, which amount to 46; The Second contains 23 of them, and the third eleven of them, ſo that this Book contains in all the Hiſtory of 80 Sects or Hereſies, the Catalogue of which may be ſeen.

The Letter written to two Monks ſerves for a Preface to the whole Work, and for an Anſwer to a preceeding Letter of thoſe two Monks, wherein they had deſired St. *Epiphanius* to ſet down in writing what he knew concerning Hereſies. He ſeems to have begun this Book in the Year 374, and ended it about the Year 376. In it he not only gives an Account of the Hiſtory, and the Errors of the Sects and Hereſies he writes about, but he alſo refutes them as well as he could, and employs one part of his Diſcourſe in eſtabliſhing the Doctrine of the Church.

The Second Work of St. *Epiphanius* is his *Anchoratus*, ſo called, becauſe it is a ſort of an Anchor to which the Faithful may adhere. In it he explains the Doctrine of the Church concerning the Myſtery of the Trinity; he proves the Reſurrection, and refutes the Errors of the *Pagans*, the *Manichees*, *Sabellians* and *Arians*. This Book was compos'd for the Chriſtians of *Pamphylia* before the foregoing Book, as appears by the Preface, where it is noted, that he wrote it in the 10th Year of the Emperour *Valens*, which is the Year 373.

After this Book followed his *Anacephalæſis*, or Recapitulation, which is an Abridgment of his great Book of Hereſies.

In the Treatiſe *of Weights and Meaſures*, having explained the ſignification of the different Notes that are to be found in the Greek Bibles, he gives an Account of the Weights, the Meaſures, and the Money of the Jews, and other Nations. In this Book he gives a Catalogue of the Canonical Books of the Old Teſtament, according to the Canon of the Jews, which comprehends the Books of *Ruth* and *Eſther*, and he writes the Hiſtory of the Greek Verſions of the Text of the Bible. He is of Opinion, that the Lxx Interpreters tranſlated all the Books of the Bible, and that they made this Verſion in ſeparate Cells, being all inſpir'd of God to compoſe it after the ſame manner. There is much Learning in this Treatiſe.

The *Phyſiologus* is a Treatiſe of a very particular Deſign, wherein he relates the true or falſe Properties of many Animals, and draws from them ſome Moral Reflections, good and bad, as well as he could.

The Treatiſe *of the Twelve precious Stones*, which were upon the Pontifical Garments of the High-Prieſt of the Jews, is an Hiſtorical Explication of the Names, the Figures and Properties of thoſe precious Stones. This Book has been cited by St. *Jerom*, in his Epiſtle 288 to *Fabiola*, and *Anaſtaſius* has made an Abridgment of it, which goes all under the Name of St. *Epiphanius*.

The Book *of the Life and Death of the Prophets*, is a Collection of an infinite Number of Fables and Trifles, which cannot be attributed to St. *Epiphanius*, without making him paſs for an Enthuſiaſt.

If we believe *Petavius*, the Nine Sermons, and the Treatiſe *of the Myſteries of Numbers*, which bear the Name of St. *Epiphanius*, are not this Biſhop's of *Salamis*, but ſome other Biſhops who had the ſame Name, as may be diſcerned by the Stile, and other Marks. Tho' I cannot perceive that theſe Books are more unworthy of St. *Epiphanius* than the *Phyſiologus*, neither do I find ſo great a difference in the Stile.

The Letter to *John* of *Jeruſalem*, tranſlated by St. *Jerom*, is made up of two Parts.

The firſt is about the Difference which he had with this Biſhop about the Ordination of *Paulinianus*, and concerning *Origeniſm*.

The Second contains a particular Matter of Fact, which St. *Epiphanius* relates in theſe Words: "When I entred into the Church of a Village of *Paleſtine*, called *Anablatha*, I found there a Cur-
"tain hanging over the Door, whereon was painted an Image like that of Jeſus Chriſt, or ſome
"Saint, (for I do not remember whoſe Picture it was, ſays he): But ſeeing in the Church of Chriſt
"the Image of a Man, contrary to the Authority of Holy Scripture, I tore it, and gave Order to the
"Church-Wardens, to bury ſome dead body in this Curtain, and when they anſwer'd me in a mur-
"muring way, that if I would tear this Curtain, I ſhould give them another, I promiſed to do it,
"and now I perform my Promiſe.

The

St. *Epiphanius.*

The Firſt Part of this Letter is acknowledged by all the World as a Genuine Piece, but *Baronius*, *Bellarmin*, and ſome others are of Opinion, that this Second is ſuppoſititious. They alledge many conjectures to prove it, but I find only three that have any probability.

The Firſt is, That this Letter ſeems to be finiſhed before the Relation of this Hiſtory.

The Second is, Becauſe St. *Epiphanius* condemns in it the Uſe of Images as a thing contrary to the Authority of the Holy Scripture, and the practice of his own time.

The Third, Becauſe St. *Jerom* making an Extract out of this Letter in his Epiſtle to *Pammachius*, ſays nothing concerning this Hiſtory. Theſe Reaſons, however, appear not to me ſtrong enough to make me abſolutely reject this Letter. For firſt, altho' what concerns the principal Subject of the Letter was ended before the Second Part, yet it cannot be proved that the Letter was perfectly finiſh'd: And St. *Epiphanius* being to write of this particular Matter of Fact, could not do it, before he had made an end of the principal Affair, for which he wrote; beſides, no Man can ſay, that this Letter was finiſhed before theſe Words which are at the end of all, *I wiſh that God may have you in his Holy keeping*; Secondly, It is very poſſible that the Uſe of Images, which had been very rare in the firſt Three Ages of the Church, was not yet eſtabliſhed in *Palæſtine* and *Cyprus*, and that St. *Epiphanius*, who was a plain zealous Man, thought it was dangerous to introduce it, and that he alſo ſpoke in too rigid a manner againſt this Cuſtom. Laſtly, Tho' St. *Jerom* has tranſlated this whole Letter, yet he cites no part of it in his Apology to *Pammachius*, but thoſe places which were to his purpoſe, neither does he recite the whole Firſt Part, and we muſt not wonder, that he ſays nothing of the Second, ſince it did no way concern the Conteſt which he had with *John* of *Jeruſalem*. Moreover, this Second Part has the ſame Stile with the Firſt, and it agrees well enough with what St. *Epiphanius* ſays in *Hereſy* 27th. It is cited by the Author of the *Caroline* Books, *B.* IV. *Ch.* 25. and 'tis ſaid in the 7th Council, *Art.* 6. *Tome* 5. that the *Iconoclaſts* alledg'd, St. *Epiphanius* was of Opinion that Images ſhould be taken away, which cannot be meant of any other place but of the Second Part of this Letter. Thus tho' it be true, as appears by the Teſtimony of *Gregory Nyſſen*, in his Panegyrick upon *Theodorus*, and in his Treatiſe of the Divinity of the Son and the Holy Spirit, that from that time there were Pictures in ſome Churches, which repreſented the Hiſtories of Scripture, and of the Actions of Saints and Martyrs, yet it cannot be ſaid, that this Cuſtom was general; and it muſt be confeſs'd that St. *Epiphanius* diſapproved it, tho' without reaſon, and that he was miſtaken in ſaying, that it did not agree with the Holy Scripture: For I believe that it would be contrary to the Candor and Sincerity that Religion requires of us, to attempt to give another Sence to his Words.

Laſt of all, we have a Letter of St. *Epiphanius* written to *Diodorus* of *Tarſus*, related by *Facundus* in *Ch.* 3. of his IVth *B.* which is a kind of a Preface to the Book of the Precious Stones in the Garment of the Jewiſh High-Prieſt, written by St. *Epiphanius* at the requeſt of this Biſhop.

I ſhall not ſtay to give an Abrigment of St. *Epiphanius*'s Treatiſe of Hereſies, which would be an uſeleſs and troubleſome Buſineſs: I ſhall content my ſelf with producing in ſhort the chief Dogmes, which he eſtabliſhes contrary to the Errors of the Hereticks.

Firſt, He proves the Unity of God againſt the *Pagans*, againſt the *Valentinians*, the *Marcionites* and the *Manichees*. He eſtabliſhes his Immenſity, his Almighty Power, his Infinite Greatneſs, his Spirituality, and his other Attributes, by refuting the Hereticks who believ'd the contrary. He proves the Myſtery of the Trinity, the Divinity of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, in many places, and chiefly in *Hereſies* 62, 69, 71, 74, and in his *Anchoratus*.

In *Hereſ.* 23 and 65, he ſhows that God created the World and the Angels.

He endeavours to explain in *Hereſ.* 70. in what Sence Man is created after the Image of God.

In *Hereſ.* 24 and 36. he ſhows that Sin is not a Subſtance, and that God is not the Author of it.

He explains the Myſtery of the Incarnation in *Hereſ.* 77, 30, 69. and ſhews that Jeſus Chriſt was one Perſon only, compos'd of the Divine and Humane Nature.

He ſhows in *Hereſ.* 77. that the two Natures were not confounded after their Union, and that they kept their own Properties.

He proves the Reſurrection in *Hereſ.* 42 and 64. and in the *Anchoratus*, where he maintains, That the ſame Fleſh which we now have ſhall be raiſed again.

He holds in *Hereſ.* 24 and 46. that Jeſus Chriſt deſcended into Hell, to ſave thoſe that had lived well and believed in God.

He teaches that the Soul is immortal and Spiritual, and that it partakes of Happineſs after Death. See what he ſays about this in *Hereſ.* 75.

In *Hereſ.* 8. he ſhows, that the Sacraments of the New Law are more Excellent and more Efficacious than thoſe of the Old.

In his *Anchoratus* he ſpeaks of Faith as a Diſpoſition neceſſary to the receiving of Baptiſm. Tho' he ſpeaks obſcurely enough of the Euchariſt in his *Anchoratus*, yet he ſays enough of it to make us underſtand, that it is truly the Body of Jeſus Chriſt, and that the words of his Inſtitution are to be underſtood according to the Letter, and without any Figure or Metaphor.

He acknowledges Free-will in *Hereſ.* 16. and yet he admits the Grace of Jeſus Chriſt.

In *Hereſ.* 30. he ſpeaks of the wonderful Effects of the Sign of the Croſs.

He proves the neceſſity of Eccleſiaſtical Traditions in many places, and chiefly in *Hereſ.* 69, 51, and 57. He ſhows the neceſſity and uſefulneſs of Faſting, in the *Hereſ.* 33, 75, and 80. There he obſerves. That the Chriſtians faſted during Lent, and every *Wedneſday* and *Friday* in the Year, except after *Eaſter* until *Whitſunday*. He ſuppoſes that theſe Feaſts are of Apoſtolical Tradition, and that

that we are obliged to observe them, and that we must abstain from Meat in the time of a Fast: He says, that in the last Week of Lent, nothing but plain Meats were eaten, that's to say, Bread and Water, and that many pass'd the two or three last Days without eating any thing. St. *Epiphanius.*

In *Heref.* 76. he establishes the distinction between Bishops and Priests.

He ranks in the Order of the Clergy, Bishops, Priests, Deacons, and Sub-Deacons. The other Ministers, according to him, do not partake of Holy Orders.

These inferiour Ministers are the Readers, Deaconesses, Exorcists, Interpreters, Diggers and Porters.

He observes in *Heref.* 75. and at the end of *Heref.* 80. that the Assemblies of People in the Church were chiefly made on *Wednesday*, *Friday*, and *Sunday*, and also in some places on *Saturday*: That Baptism and the Celebration of the Eucharist were attended with such Ceremonies as were prescribed either by the Gospel, or by the Tradition of the Apostles. That Mattins were sung, and that Christians kneeled at their Prayers Day and Night. That Hereticks, Idolaters, and all those that were guilty of enormous Crimes, were excommunicated, and their Oblations not received.

He proves Prayers for the Dead in *Heref.* 76. and refutes *Aëtius* who said the contrary.

He says, in *Heref.* 78. that the Saints enjoy eternal Happiness, and that we ought to honour them.

As to the honour due to the Virgin, he keeps a middle way between the *Antidicomarianites*, who dishonoured her, by saying, That she had other Children besides Jesus Christ, and the *Collyridians* who ador'd her. He says, That we must honour her, but we must not adore her, nor give her superstitious Worship. Read the Heresies 78 and 79: where he testifies, that there is nothing certainly known concerning her Death, nor about the place where her Body is: yet it seems that his Piety induces him to believe that she never died, but he does not deliver this Opinion as a certain Truth.

He praises Virginity in *Heref.* 4, 8, 5, 61, and 80. but he does not condemn Marriage, nor yet second Marriages. There he declares plainly, that the Church does not admit any to Holy Orders, but such as will observe Celibacy, and that she excludes Bigamists.

And yet he confesses in *Heref.* 59. that there are still some place, where the Deacons and Subdeacons do not observe Celibacy; but he adds, That this is done upon sufferance, because of the weakness of Men, or the multitude of People. Lastly, he says, That 'tis a great sin to violate the Vow of Virginity.

He says in *Heref.* 59. That a Husband, who having divorced his Wife for Adultery *or some other Crime*, marries another, is free from Sin, according to the Authority of Scripture; and that he is no-wise unworthy of Eternal Life, and that he ought to be permitted to continue in the Church.

He would not have Women undertake any Ecclesiastical Function; and he proves in *Heref.* 79 That this ought not to be suffered. In short, If one would have an abridgment of the Doctrine, the Discipline, and the Morality of St. *Epiphanius*'s time, he needs do no more but read what St. *Epiphanius* has said of them at the end of his Book about *Heresies*, where he has given the sum of them, so as to serve for an Antidote against all the Errors of Hereticks.

Any one that gives the least attention to the Doctrine of *Epiphanius*, which we have now represented, may easily perceive, that there is scarce any Author, who has made more Observations concerning the Doctrine and Discipline of the ancient Church, contrary to the Errors and Disorders of the Innovators of our Times: Yet they have endeavoured to find in his Writings part of their Errors, and have had the boldness to impute to us the Heresies which he refutes. This *Scultetus* has done with so much fraud, that 'tis impossible to read what he says about it, without conceiving an indignation against so unjust a procedure. He says First, That St. *Epiphanius* rejected the Invocation of Saints and the Virgin, in *Heref.* 79. but this is a meer Cheat. St. *Epiphanius* indeed there condemns those who adored the Virgin, and gave her that Soveraign Worship which is due to God only: He maintains that the Church neither adores the Virgin nor the Saints, although she has an Honour and due Respect for them. And do not we say the same thing? And can any other Doctrine be imputed to us, without a palpable Calumny? But, says *Scultetus*, St. *Epiphanius* says, in *Heref.* 75. That the Saints were prayed for, and therefore he cannot approve of their Invocation. This Author methinks should not have cited a place which so plainly opposes the Opinions which he maintains, which I shall set down entire. " As to what concerns the custom of reciting the Names of the Dead, what can " there be more useful and more reasonable? This is, First of all, to perswade those that are present " that the Souls of the Dead are still alive, and that they are not annihilated. Secondly, To make us " apprehend that there is good hopes of those that are dead. Moreover, Prayers are not only useful to " the Living, but also to the Dead; tho' they do not blot out all their Sins, yet they serve to expiate " some of those which they committed in this Life. We mention Sinners and Righteous Men; Sinners, " to implore the Mercy of God for them; Righteous Men, such as the Fathers, the Patriarchs, the Pro- " phets, the Apostles, the Evangelists, the Martyrs, the Confessors, the Bishops, the Hermites, and " all Christians, that Jesus Christ may be distinguished from all his Creatures, and that we may learn " to give to him the Worship that is due to him only; being perswaded that we ought not to " equal Mortal Men to the Lord, whatsoever Righteousness and Holiness they have. After this he " distinguishes Two Sorts of Saints, those that are on Earth, and those that are in the Heavenly *Jeru-* " *salem*; and he adds, that the Church does well to observe a Custom which she has received by Tra- " dition; That the Laws of our Fathers cannot be subverted, nor the Commands of our Mothers de- spised without impiety, according to the Words of *Solomon*, *Hearken, my Son, to the Commands of*

St. *Epiphanius.* " *your Father, and do not reject the Admonitions of your Mother.* Jeſus Chriſt our Father has taught " us his Doctrine by Writing and by Tradition: The Holy Church our Mother has Laws which can- " not be deſtroyed nor abrogated. Nothing is greater nor more admirable than thoſe Laws, and all " thoſe who would oppoſe them, are ſelf-convicted of an Error. Can there be any thing more agree- able to the Doctrine of the Church, or more contrary to the principal Errors of the Innovators! *But,* ſays *Scultetus, theſe* Arabian *Women who offered Sacrifices to the Virgin, did not believe her Eternal or In- finite.* But tho' theſe Women did it, it may be, think ſo, yet they gave her that Worſhip which is due only to a Sovereign and Infinite Being, by offering Sacrifices unto her, and placing all their Religion in doing ſo.

The Second Objection of *Scultetus* is about the uſe of Images, which St. *Epiphanius* condemns in his Letter to *John* of *Jeruſalem*, and which he ſeems alſo to reject as contrary to the Law of the Goſpel. We have already anſwered this Objection, by ſaying, That indeed St. *Epiphanius* ſeems to have diſallow'd the uſe of Images, becauſe this Cuſtom was not then eſtabliſhed in his Country: But 'tis certain, and *Baillée* himſelf does not deny it, that 'twas then eſtabliſh'd in other Churches. Moreo- ver, we muſt not wonder, that St. *Epiphanius* ſpeaks of it as a Practice contrary to the Goſpel: For 'tis well known, that thoſe who ſpeak againſt Cuſtoms that were not eſtabliſhed in their own time, do ſometimes make uſe of expreſſions too vehement in rejecting them; as for Example, St. *Cyprian* condemning the practice of thoſe who did not put Water into the Chalice, makes no ſcruple to ſay, that their Cuſtom was contrary to the Law of Jeſus Chriſt. Many other Examples may be brought of this nature, and the *Calviniſts* themſelves muſt acknowledge, that the ſame is to be ſaid of the Words of St. *Epiphanius*, ſince they cannot affirm, that the uſe of Images, whereof St. *Epiphanius* ſpeaks in this place, is contrary to the Goſpel.

[This Excuſe is not defenſible: The New Teſtament is as ſevere againſt Ido- latry, as the Old was, and more, if we conſider upon how much nobler Foundations it is conſtituted. Neither is this only a Matter of Diſcipline; or if it is, yet it is not an indifferent thing. The Church of *Rome* was very ſenſible of this, when ſhe removed the Second Commandment out of the Catechiſms, by which ſhe orders her People to be inſtructed. If the Abu- ſes occaſioned by placing of Images in Churches, had never been more dangerous than they were in St. *Epi- phanius*'s time, this Plea might have been valid, for thoſe Churches which ſtill deſired to retain them; or if the Church of *Rome*, in her Offices, Catechiſms, and Directions to her Prieſts, to guide them in their Sermons and Exhortations to the People, had taken all poſſible care to obviate all Objections whatſoever which could have been raiſed, ſhe could then have juſtly urged it. But Mr. *Du Pin* knows very well, that her conſtant connivance, if not Command, has long ago precluded her from all Pretences of this nature. She knows alſo, that the Laiety in all Countries of the Communion of the Chuch of *Rome*, where they have not been over-aw'd by a promiſcuous converſation with Proteſtants, have without check paid as groſs Acts of Worſhip to ſenſeleſs Ima- ges of (ſometimes fictitious) Saints, as ever the Heathens of old paid to the Images of *Jupiter* or *Apis*; and laſtly he knows, that his Church is in this point wholly inexcuſable, becauſe it has eſtabliſh'd, and ſtill maintains, a Cuſtom not mentioned at leaſt, if not expreſly forbidden in Scripture; unknown to the pureſt Ages of Chriſti- anity, oppoſed as contradictory to the Law of God at its firſt appearance, by Men eminent for Piety and Learn- ing, in the Time when they lived, and received as Saints by the Catholick Church after their Deaths, and abu- ſed by the ignorant People to the baſeſt Idolatry and Superſtition, in all Conntries where-ever it has been allowed.]

The Third thing which *Scultetus* pretends to find in the Books of St. *Epiphanius* contrary to the Doctrine of the Church, is the condemnation of the Sacrifice of the Maſs. He endeavours to prove that St. *Epiphanius* never taught it, beacuſe he ſays, in *Hereſ.* 55 and 42. That Jeſus Chriſt came to aboliſh the Sacrifices of the Old Law, by one Sacrifice only. The meaneſt Writer of Controverſies would eaſily anſwer this Objection, by ſaying, Firſt, That St. *Epiphanius* in this place ſpeaks only of the Sacrifices of the Old Law, to which he oppoſes that of Jeſus Chriſt upon the Croſs, and that he does no ways exclude the unbloody Sacrifice of the Euchariſt. Secondly, That the Sacrifice of the Euchariſt, properly ſpeaking, is not different from that upon the Croſs, and that it is always the ſame thing which is offer'd, tho' after a different manner. Thirdly, That St. *Epiphanius* acknow- ledges, that the Prieſthood of *Melchiſedeck*, and conſequently the Sacrifice, continued under the New Law.

The Fourth Objection of *Scultetus* is about Purgatory. He affirms that St. *Epiphanius* did not own it, becauſe he ſays in *Hereſ.* 59. *That no Man can change his Condition after his death,* and *that then there is no more room for any one to repent and to merit Glory.* But does it follow from this Pro- poſition which all Catholicks acknowledged, that thoſe who died in a State of Damnation could no longer hope for Salvation? Does it follow, ſay I, that thoſe who died in the Guilt of ſome ſmall Sins could not be purified from it after their deaths? All the Catholicks deny this Conſequence, and St. *Epiphanius* has plainly owned it to be falſe, when he ſays in *Hereſ.* 75. that Prayers for the Dead could expiate ſome Sins, tho' they could hot blot out great Crimes.

The Fifth Dogm of the Church which *Scultetus* oppoſes by St. *Epiphanius*, is the Vow of Con- tinence: But the Paſſages which he alledges, are ſo far from oppoſing it, that they plainly diſcover that it was uſed in the time of this Father, and that the Church puniſh'd thoſe very ſeverely who vio- lated it.

The laſt is about Baptiſm adminiſtred by Women. St. *Epiphanius* in *Hereſ.* 76. ſays, that it was not lawful for them to Baptize. Do not we ſay ſo alſo? But does it follow from thence that their doing of it in a caſe of neceſſity is not valid? This is what *Scultetus* ſhould prove, but it is not the Queſtion of St. *Epiphanius.*

Theſe

These are the false Consequences which *Scultetus* urges to oppose the Doctrine of the Church: But he does so grosly calumniate us, by charging upon us the detestable Opinions of some Hereticks, that he must have renounced all kind of Modesty, to affirm such manifest Untruths with so much boldness. St. *Epiphanius.*

First of all, He accuses us of making Women the Ministers of Baptism, as the *Marcionites* did. But where is it found that Women do administer Baptism in our Churches? They never do it but in great necessity. And 'tis no Heresy to say, That in this Case all Sorts of Persons may administer it, 'tis no part of the Error of the *Marcionites* or the *Collyridians.*

Secondly, He charges us with trusting to Revelations and Miracles, as the *Nazarens* did. But it is an Error to believe that there have been, and that there may be Revelations? That Man must have no Religion who says the contrary. The Hereticks are to blame for feigning false Miracles, but the Catholicks are not to blame for believing true ones.

Thirdly, He compares Transubstantiation to the Enchantments of *Marcus*, who having put white Wine into a Glass, made one part of the Liquor appear Red as Blood, another of a Purple colour, and a Third of a Blew. But what Affinity is there between our Holy and Sacred Mysteries, and the Diabolical Actions of these Ministers of *Dæmons*? What relation has our Doctrine to these Impieties?

The other accusations of *Scultetus* are no less Calumnious: For do we offer the Sacrifice of the Mass in honour of the Virgin, as the *Collyridians* did? Do we teach that Concubinate is lawful, as *Aëtius* did? Do we adore Idols? The Images to which we pay a bare External Respect, are they the Images of *Simon* and *Helena*, and other Hereticks? Are they not the Images of Jesus Christ and the Saints, to whose Persons only all our Worship is referred? Do we condemn Marriage and the use of Meats, as *Tatian* and the *Encratites* did? Do we believe that the Souls of the Wicked may be delivered out of Hell? In short, Is there any Similitude between all the Errors of the Hereticks related by St. *Epiphanius*, and the Doctrines of the Church? Do not we believe what the Church believed in his Time? Do not we Practise what she Practis'd? On the contrary, are not they the Innovators of our Time, who take part with the Hereticks of that Time against the Church? Do not they deny with *Aëtius* the distinction of Bishops and Presbyters? Do not they find fault with Prayers for the Dead, and the Honour which is given to Saints? Do not they condemn the Celibacy of Priests, the Vow of Virginity, the Monastick State, the Ceremonies, the Sign of the Cross the Solemn Prayers? These are the Errors which St. *Epiphanius* condemns in the Hereticks of his Time, and which he refutes by the Practise and Tradition of the Church And therefore that may justly be charged upon the Sect of Innovators, which *Scultetus* has unjustly charged upon Us, *That their Doctrine is a Garment patched together, and made up of many Pieces, and many Shreds of ancient Heresies.*

[Who is most in the right, *Scultetus* or our Author, will not be hard to judge, to any one who is acquainted with *undisguis'd* Popery; I say *undisguis'd*, because Mr. *Du Pin* goes upon the palliating Principles laid down by the Bishop of *Meaux*. There is no question but the Seeds of those Corruptions began to spring up in St. *Epiphanius*'s Time, which afterwards grew so high in the Church; yet tho' they honoured the Dead who died in the Lord, and prayed for those who were guilty of lesser Sins, they neither called upon the former, nor believed a middle State for the latter, if St. *Epiphanius*'s Authority be decisive, in those places which are faithfully urged by *Scultetus*. In the case of Images in Churches, Mr. *Du Pin* gives it up, because St. *Epiphanius* says expressly that it was against the Word of God: *Contra auctoritatem Scripturæ.* In the Matter of *the Real Presence* our Author and *Petavius* before him, lay great Stress upon a Passage in the *Anchoratus* Sect. 57. wherein speaking of the Sacrament as Christ's Body, he says, ὁ γὰρ μὴ πιστεύων εἶναι αὐτὸν ἀληθῶς, ὡς εἶπεν, ἐκπέπτωκε τῆς ζωῆς καὶ τῆς σωτηρίας; *He that does not believe it to be the real Body of Christ, as he said himself, is fallen from Grace and Salvation.* Now to know the full meaning of St. *Epiphanius* in these Words, we are to go back to the beginning of Sect. 55. There he raises a dispute of the meaning of *Adam*'s being created after the Image of God, since there is so great disparity between their Natures: And he finds that this cannot be Physically understood, because to be κατ' εἰκόνα, and to be κατὰ φύσιν, are very different things; yet since it said in Scripture, we ought to believe it.

Now to prove this Assertion he urges the Institution of the Lord's Supper: Our Saviour said (says he) of the Bread, This is my Body; and yet it is not like Flesh in the least, so as to resemble Christ's Humane Nature, nor like the invisible Godhead, so as to resemble his Divinity: But because he has said it, we must not dispute it, since if we should dispute it, we should fall away from Grace and Salvation. This Illustration therefore cannot in reason be carried farther then the Original Question, which it was designed to illustrate; wherefore seeing that St. *Epiphanius* confessed, that when we say, that Man is created *after the Image* of God, we do not mean that he is created *after the Nature* of the Invisible, Incomprehensible, and Spiritual God; it is plain that his illustration of the Eucharist is equally figurative as this Expression of Man's Nature, which he is now explaining.

But it is needless to run through all the rest of the Articles here particularly named. St. *Epiphanius*'s Authority is decisive of neither side; if it were, we must believe that divorces are lawful for other Causes besides Adultery, and that such Divorces perfectly dissolve the Marriage Bond; for this was his Opinion, as apperrs from *Heref.* 59. Sect. 4.]

The Stile of St. *Epiphanius* is neither beautiful nor lofty, on the contrary, it is plain, low, and mean, it is rude and unpolished; without Coherence and Connexion. He had much Reading and Learning, but no Faculty of discerning, nor exactness of Judgment. He often uses such things for Reasons to refute the Hereticks which are False. He was very Credulous and not very Accurate.

St. Epiphanius.

Accurate. He is miſtaken in many places about very conſiderable Matters in Hiſtory, and gave Credit too lightly to falſe Memoirs, or to uncertain Reports. He had much Zeal and Piety, but little Conduct and Policy.

The Works of St. *Epiphanius* were printed in Greek at *Baſil* by *Oporinus* in the Year 1544. *Cornarius*'s Tranſlation of this Work, had been publiſhed and printed at *Baſle* by *Robertus Ullinterus*, in 1533. The ſame Printer cauſed it to be re-printed in 1540, and in 1545. It was alſo re-printed at *Paris* in 1564, at *Baſle* in 1560, and in 1578, and at *Paris* in 1612. with ſome Corrections of *Jacobus Billius*: The *Phyſiologus* was publiſhed by *Gonſalus Ponce de Leon* at *Rome*, in 1587. and printed afterwards at *Antwerp* in 1588. The Book *of the Lives of the Prophets*, was publiſhed in Greek and Latin with the Notes of *Zehennerus*, and printed at *Scheuling* in 1612. The Oration *concerning the Burial of Jeſus Chriſt*, was publiſhed in 1614.

At laſt, *Petavius* undertook a New Edition of St. *Epiphanius*, and having found the Verſion of *Cornarius* very defective, he made a new one, which he printed at *Paris* in 1622, together with the Greek Text review'd and corrected by two Manuſcripts. This Edition is in Two Volumes *in Folio*; The Firſt contains the Book of Hereſies; The Second contains the Anchorate, the Recapitulation, and the Book of Weights and Meaſures, of *Petavius*'s Tranſlation, the *Phyſiologus*, the Book of Precious Stones, and the Homilies, together with the ancient Verſions of his Works, the Letter to *John* of *Jeruſalem*, the Life of St. *Epiphanius* written by *Metaphraſtes*, and the Animadverſions of *Petavius*, which are rather Critical and Chronological Diſſertations, than Notes to explain the Text of St. *Epiphanius*. This Edition was lately re-printed in *Germany*.

PHILO CARPATHIUS.

Philo Carpathius.

'TIS ſaid in the Life of St. *Epiphanius*, that this Saint Ordain'd one named *Philo*, Biſhop of *Carpaſus*, and that he committed to him the Charge of making Ordinations at *Salamis* in his abſence. Upon this Ground it has been thought that this Man lived in the time of St. *Epiphanius*, and that he was Biſhop of the Iſle of *Carpathus*, which is upon the Coaſt of *Aſia*, near the Iſle of *Crete*: There has alſo been attributed to this *Philo*, a Commentary upon the *Canticles*. But all theſe Suppoſitions are found to be Falſe: For, Firſt, The Life of St. *Epiphanius*, which is fill'd with an infinite Number of Fables and Forgeries, was written by a Modern *Greek*, and has no Authority, and can no more prove that there was a *Philo*, than that there was a *Papius*, or an *Eudemon*, or a *Polybius*, or a great many others, whom this Fabulous Author has feign'd to embelliſh his Hiſtory. Secondly, He does not ſay, that this *Philo* was Ordain'd Biſhop of the Iſle of *Carpathus*, which was not under the Juriſdiction of St. *Epiphanius*, but of a City call'd *Carpaſus*, which was in the Iſle of *Cyprus*, mentioned by *Pliny*. Now it does not appear that this City ever had a Biſhop. In ſhort, the Commentary upon the *Canticles*, is the Invention of ſome Modern *Greek*, which contains many things that may be found word for word in the Commentary of *Gregory* the Great. And tho' it were true that theſe places were added, as ſome Authors have ſuſpected, we cannot lay much ſtreſs upon an Author ſo little known as he is

Q. JULIUS HILARION.

Q. Julius Hilarion.

THIS Author, of whom the Ancients make no mention, has written a Chronicle, or a Book of the Duration of the World, from the beginning of the World down to the Year 397. which makes it credible that he lived about this time. He ſpeaks of a Treatiſe which he wrote about *Eaſter*; he believed that the World would be at an end 470 Years after Jeſus Chriſt, and he held the Opinion of the Millenaries, which ſtill confirms his Antiquity. His Treatiſe was firſt publiſhed by *Pithæus*, and inſerted into the *Bibliothecæ Patrum*.

OF

OF THE COUNCILS Held in the Fourth AGE of the CHURCH.

Of the Pretended COUNCIL *of* Sinueſſa.

THIS Council of *Sinueſſa* would be the firſt Council held in this Century, if the Acts which bear the Name of this Council were Genuine: But it notoriouſly known among all Learned Men, that they are ſuppoſitious, and that the Story on which they are grounded is a Fable, which has no Foundation in Antiquity. It is ſuppos'd in thoſe Acts, That this Council was aſſembled at the beginning of the Fourth Century, upon occaſion of the Fall of the Pope *Marcellinus*, who had ſacrificed to Idols; That it was held at *Sinueſſa* in a Grotto; That there were 300 Biſhops preſent at it; That the Pope *Marcellinus* having confeſs'd his Fault condemned himſelf, and that the Biſhops durſt not depoſe him, till he had pronounced Sentence upon himſelf. None of theſe things have any probability: For, Firſt, This Hiſtory is not founded upon the Teſtimony of any ancient Author: Secondly, St. *Auſtin* in his Book againſt *Petilian*, Ch. 16. defends the Innocence of *Marcellinus* againſt this *Donatiſt*, who accus'd him of having ſacrificed to Idols; and therefore to maintain the Acts of the Council of *Sinueſſa*, is to take part with the *Donatiſts* againſt the Church. 'Tis more probable that they were forg'd by the *Donatiſts*, to ſupport the Accuſation which they had made againſt this Holy Biſhop without Foundation. Thirdly, What probability is there that 300 Biſhops could be aſſembled in the time of the moſt violent Perſecution that ever the Church ſuffer'd, ſince it was all that *Conſtantine* could do, to aſſemble a Council ſo numerous, at a time when the Church was flouriſhing, and much farther ſpread. And certainly, if the Catholick Biſhops at the Conference of *Carthage* could reject the Acts of the Council of *Cirtha*, by ſaying, that there was no probability that a Council could be aſſembled in the time of Perſecution, tho' this Council was but a Synod of ſome *African* Biſhops, What may not be ſaid againſt a Synod that is ſuppos'd to conſiſt of 300 Biſhops? Fourthly, The Stile of theſe Acts is barbarous. and contain many things which do not in the leaſt belong to *Marcellinus's* Age. They make the Pagan High-Prieſt (whom they ridiculouſly call the *Pontiff* of the *Capitol*) produce what is ſaid in Holy Scripture of the Adoration of the Wiſe Men, to prove that Incenſe ſhould be offered to Idols. 'Tis ſaid, That 100 Chriſtians run to the Temple of *Veſta* to ſee Incenſe offered by *Marcellinus*: Their Names are recited, which are either almoſt all *African* Names, or ſuch as are ridiculous. 'Tis ſaid that 72 were choſen out of them to be Witneſſes of this Pope's Sacriledge. The ſynodical Part of theſe Acts is no leſs contrary to the Diſcipline of that time, than what is ſaid of the Fall of *Marcellinus* is contrary to the Hiſtory. 'Tis ſaid, That *Marcellinus* at firſt denied his Fault; That the Synod declared to him he ſhould be his own Judge; that the Biſhops durſt not judge him, becauſe it was not lawful for any body to judge the Firſt See. I ſay nothing of the Impertinences, which ſome of the Biſhops are made to ſay, that are unworthy of the Gravity and Simplicity of the Chriſtians of the Firſt Ages. Laſtly, He who forg'd theſe Acts, ſays, that *Diocleſian* was inform'd of the Condemnation of *Marcellinus*, when he was at War with the *Perſians*; which yet further diſcovers that theſe Acts are not ancient, ſince the *Perſian* War was ended before the Perſecution of *Diocleſian*, from whence it follows, that he who fell into ſo groſs a Fault in Chronology, is a modern Author, unworthy of any Credit.

The *Council* of *Sinueſſa*, 303.

Of the COUNCIL *of* Cirtha.

THE Violence of the Perſecution being a little abated in *Africk*, in the Year of Jeſus Chriſt 305. ſome Biſhops of *Numidia* aſſembled at the beginning of the Month of *May* in the City of *Cirtha*, in the Houſe of one *Donatus*, becauſe the Churches were not yet reſtor'd. The occaſion of this Synod was the Ordination of a Biſhop into the See of the City of *Numidia* in the room of *Paul*. The Biſhops which were preſent there, were *Secundus* of *Tigiſis*, *Donatus* of *Maſcula*, *Marinus* of *Aquæ Tibilitanæ*, *Donatus* of *Calama*, *Purpurius* of *Limata*, *Victor* of *Garbis*, *Felix* of *Rotarium*, *Nabor* of *Centurio*, and *Secundus* the younger. A Biſhop call'd *Menalius* would not be preſent for fear of being accus'd and convicted of having ſacrificed to Idols. Theſe Biſhops, who were afterwards

Of *Cirtha*, 305.

The *Councils.*

the Heads of the *Donatiſt* Faction, accus'd one another mutually in this Council, and all of them fearing leſt they ſhould be convicted of the Crimes of which they had accus'd one another; they pardon'd one another, referring themſelves to the Judgment of God: After which they ordained *Silvanus* Biſhop of *Cirtha*. You have the Acts of this Council in St. *Auſtin*, in his Third Book againſt *Creſconius*, Chap. 27.

Of the COUNCIL *of* Alexandria, *under* Peter *Biſhop of that Church.*

Of *Alexandria* 306.

IN the Year 306. *Peter* of *Alexandria* held a Council, wherein he depoſed *Meletius*, being convicted of having ſacrificed to Idols. We have not the Acts of this Council, and we know nothing more in particular of it.

Of the COUNCIL *of* Eliberis *or* Elvira.

Of *Eliberis* or *Elvira*, 305.

THE place [a] and time [b] of the Council of *Eliberis* are very uncertain. Some have thought that this Council was aſſembled in the City of *Gallia Narbonenſis*; others ſay, that this City was in *Bætica*; and the moſt Learned think that this City of *Eliberis* was the ſame with *Granada*. As to the time, ſome Authors have placed it at the end of the Third Century, others have remov'd it unto the end of the Fourth, but the moſt probable Opinion is, that it was aſſembled at the beginning of the Fourth Century, before the Councils of *Arles* and *Nice*, about the Year 305. The little Order that is obſerved in the Canons of this Council, the great variety of Rules that are to be found in it, and the multitude of Canons about different Matters, make ſome Learned Men think, probably enough, that the Canons attributed to this Council are an ancient Code, or an ancient Collection of the Councils of *Spain*. However this be, it cannot be doubted, but theſe Canons are very Ancient and very Authentick.

The Diſcipline which they eſtabliſh is very rigorous.

In the 1ſt Canon they are depriv'd of Communion, *i. e.* of Abſolution, even at the point of Death who have voluntarily Sacrificed to Idols after they were baptized.

The 2d eſtabliſhes the ſame Penalty againſt thoſe, who taking upon them after their Baptiſm, the Office of Prieſts to Falſe Gods, were obliged to offer up Sacrifices to Idols by themſelves or others, and who have alſo encreaſed their Guilt by Murders or Adulteries.

The 3d moderates this Penalty to thoſe who have only cauſed profane ſhows to be repreſented, and grants them Communion at the point of Death, provided they put themſelves under Penance, and that they do not afterwards fall into Adultery.

The 4th is, That if the Catechumens cauſe themſelves to be choſen Prieſts to falſe Gods, and act in profane Shows, their Baptiſm ſhall be delayed for three Years.

The 5th impoſes Seven Years Penance upon a Woman that ſhall beat her Servant-Maid in ſuch a manner, that ſhe dies within three Days after, if the Woman had a deſign to kill her; and Five Years Penance if ſhe had no ſuch deſign: She is acquitted if the Maid dies more than Three Days after.

In the 6th Canon it is ordain'd, That Abſolution ſhall be refus'd even at Death, to him who ſhall kill another by Treachery.

The 7th is, That thoſe who relapſe into Adultery after they have undergone Penance, ſhall not be received even at Death.

The 8th ſubjects a Woman to the ſame Penalty, who has forſaken her Husband without cauſe, to marry another.

The 9th declares, That 'tis not lawful for a Woman, tho ſhe has forſaken her Husband, becauſe of Adultery, to marry another; and that if ſhe does it, ſhe ought not to be admitted to Communion, till he whom ſhe has married be dead, or at leaſt till the extremity of Sickneſs make it neceſſary to grant it her.

The 10th allows Husbands to be Baptiz'd who have forſaken their Wives, and Wives who have forſaken their Husbands for Adultery, while they were Catechumens. But if a Chriſtian Woman marries a Man who has forſaken his Wife without reaſon, the Canon ordains, That the Communion of the Church ſhall be refus'd her, even at the point of Death.

The 11th ordains, That Baptiſm ſhall be delay'd for the ſpace of Five Years to a Catechumeneſs who has married a Husband that had divorc'd his Wife without cauſe.

[a] *The Place.*] The Name of this Council is very various; Some call it *Libertinum*, others *Elibertinum*, others *Heberitanum*, and ſome *Eliberinum*; but the more common Name is *Eliberitanum*, or *Illiberitanum*. The ancient Geographers mention only Two Cities call'd by this Name, whereof one was in *Gallia Narbonenſis*, and the other in *Bætica*. 'Tis thought that the firſt is *Perpignan* and the other in all probability is the City of *Granada*. The Firſt was deſtroy'd in the time of *Pliny* and *Mela*, and 'tis no wiſe probable that the Biſhops of *Spain* ſhould come ſo far to hold a Council. Wherefore it is much more probable that this Council was held at the *Spaniſh Elvira*, i.e. *Granada*.

[b] *The Time.*] Thoſe who ſaid that this Council was held after the Year 400. affirmed what is manifeſtly falſe, ſince at that time the enjoining Penance for thoſe who had ſacrific'd to Idols, was not debated: The ſame Reaſon proves that there is no probability that it was aſſembled after the Council of *Nice*. It ſeems to have been called before that of *Arles*; but I do not believe that it was called before the Perſecution of *Dioclefian*. There is more probability, that it was aſſembled when the Perſecution ended in the Weſt, and when *Dioclefian* had abdicated the Empire in the Year 304.

The

The 12th Canon denies Communion at death to Women who proſtitute their Daughters.

The 13th ſubjects to the ſame Penalty the Virgins conſecrated to God, who ſpend their Life in Licentiouſneſs, but it grants Abſolution at the Point of Death to thoſe who do Penance for their Fault.

The 14th treats Virgins with much moderation who have loſt their Virginity, if they marry thoſe who have abuſed them; for it ordains, That they ſhould be reſtored to Eccleſiaſtical Communion at the end of One Year, without being oblig'd to do Penance; but then it impoſes Five Years Penance, if they have had to do with other Men.

The 15th and 16th forbid the Faithful to beſtow their Daughters in Marriage upon Pagans, Jews or Hereticks, how great ſoever the number of Virgins be among Chriſtians; and it Ordains, That the Fathers who do it ſhall be ſeparated from Communion for the ſpace of Five Years.

The 17th denies Abſolution, even at the Point of Death, to thoſe who give their Daughters in Marriage to the Prieſts of falſe Gods.

The 18th forbids Biſhops, Prieſts and Deacons, to leave their Churches to exerciſe Merchandize, and go to Fairs; but it allows them to Traffick in their own Province, and to ſend their Children, their Friends and their Servants to trade in Foreign Countries.

The 19th ordains, that Communion ſhall be refuſed, even at the Point of Death, to Biſhops, Prieſts and Deacons, who have committed Adultery.

The 20th declares, That a Clergyman who is diſcovered to take Intereſt, ſhould be depoſed and removed: That the ſame Crime ſhould be pardoned in a Layman if he promiſes to amend it, but if he relapſes he is to be caſt out of the Church.

The 21ſt Canon is, That if any Inhabitant in a City ſhall be abſent from the Church for three *Sundays* together, he ſhall be ſeparated from Communion for ſome time, to ſignifie that he has been puniſhed for his Fault.

The 22d declares, That he who has abandoned the Church, to go over to a Sect of Hereticks, ſhall not be received back into the Church again, till he has done Penance for Ten Years: As for thoſe who were Children when they were entred into an Heretical Sect and return to the Church, The Canon ordains, that they ſhall be received without any delay.

The 23d declares, That the ordinary Faſts ſhall be obſerved except in the Months of *July* and *Auguſt*, becauſe of the weakneſs of ſome of the Faithful.

The 24th forbids thoſe to be admitted to Sacred Orders, who have been Baptiz'd out of their own Country, becauſe their Life is not known.

The 25th declares, That Credit ſhall not be given to the Letters of a Confeſſor, but only to Letters of Communion.

The 26th forbids Faſting on *Saturdays*.

The 27th forbids Biſhops and Clergymen to have in their Houſes ſtrange Women.

The 28th forbids Biſhops to receive Preſents from thoſe that are not in the Communion of the Church.

The 29th forbids to recite at the Altar the Names of thoſe that are poſſeſs'd, and does not permit them to make any Offering themſelves in the Church.

The 30th ordains, That the Orders of Sub-deacon ſhall not be given to thoſe who have committed Adultery in their Youth, leſt they ſhould riſe to a higher Degree, and that thoſe who have been Ordained ſhall be degraded.

The 31ſt declares, That thoſe may be admitted to Communion who have committed Adultery after Baptiſm, provided they have fulfilled their Canonical Penance.

The 32d declares, That when any Perſon fall ſick, they ought to be received into Eccleſiaſtical Communion by the Biſhop; but yet if the ſickneſs be violent, the Prieſt may grant them Communion, and even the Deacon if the Biſhop command him.

The 33d Canon preſcribes Celibacy to Prieſts and Deacons.

The 34th Canon is very obſcure: It declares, That Wax-Candles are not to be lighted in the Cœmeteries, becauſe we muſt not diſturb the Spirits of the Saints. Some underſtand by the Spirits of the Saints the Souls of the Dead: I think that it is more natural to underſtand by it, the Repoſe of the Spirits of the Faithful that are alive and may be troubled with a great multitude of Lights in the day-time.

The 35th redreſſes a dangerous Abuſe; it is ſet down in theſe Words. " We have thought fit to " hinder Women from ſpending the Night in the Cœmeteries, becauſe oftentimes under pretence of " praying they commit in ſecret great Crimes.

The 36th has very much exercis'd Divines. Thus it is expreſſed, " We would not have Pictures " placed in Churches, leſt the Object of our Worſhip and Adoration ſhould be painted upon the " Walls. Many Explications have been given of this Paſſage, but to me it ſeems better to underſtand it in the plaineſt Sence, and to confeſs that the Fathers of this Council did not approve the uſe of Images, no more than that of Wax-Candles lighted in full day-light: *But theſe things are Matters of Diſcipline, which may be uſed or not, without doing any prejudice to the Faith of the Church.*

The 37th Canon permits Baptiſm to be given at the Point of Death to thoſe who are acted by an Evil Spirit, and to Catechumens, and does not deprive them of Communion if they be faithful. Provided, adds the Canon, That they do no not publickly light Lamps, This addition is very abſcure, and there is no great neceſſity of explaining it.

The

The *Councils*

The 38th declares, That a Chriſtian who is neither Penitent nor Bigamiſt, may Baptize in a caſe of Neceſſity, thoſe who are on a Journey, being at a great diſtance from a Church, upon Condition that he preſent him to the Biſhop if he ſurvive, to be perfected by Impoſition of Hands.

The 39th ordains, That Impoſition of Hands ſhall not be deny'd to Pagans who deſire it after they are fallen into ſome Diſeaſe, provided they have led an honeſt Life. This Canon muſt be underſtood of that Impoſition of Hands, by which Pagans were plac'd in the Rank of Catechumens, which this Council calls making them Chriſtians.

The 40th forbids Land-Lords to allow their Farmers or Receivers what they have given for Idols; and if they do it, it impoſes upon them a Penance of Five Years.

The 41ſt declares, That the Faithful muſt be admoniſhed not to ſuffer Idols in their Houſes.

The 42d ordains, That thoſe who give in their Names to be entred into the Church, ſhall be Baptiz'd two Years after, if they lead a regular Life; unleſs they are obliged to relieve them ſooner upon the account of any dangerous Sickneſs, or that it is judg'd convenient to grant them this Grace ſooner becauſe of the fervor of their Prayers.

The 43d forbids the Celebration of the Feaſt of *Whitſunday* before *Eaſter*.

The 44th allows a Woman to be received who has formerly led a lewd Life, when ſhe is converted, and would be made a Chriſtian, after ſhe has renounc'd her Sins.

The 45th allows Baptiſm to be given a Catechumen, tho he has been long abſent from Church.

The 46th Impoſes ten Years Penance upon one of the Faithful, who has lived long in the practice of the ſame Sin, which it looks upon as an Apoſtacy.

The 47th ordains, That if one of the Faithful, who has a lawful Wife, has committed many Adulteries, fall Sick, and promiſe to commit this Sin no more, Communion ſhall not be deny'd him; but if after his Recovery he relapſe in his Sin, it ſhall never more be granted to him.

In the 48th it is ordain'd, That the Baptiz'd ſhall not put any more Money into the Boxes or Baſons, as was commonly done, leſt it ſhould be thought, that the Prieſt gave for Money what he had freely received. It adds, That not the Prieſts but the Miniſters ſhall waſh the Feet of the Baptiz'd.

The 49th forbids thoſe who poſſeſs an Eſtate in Land, to ſuffer the Fruits of it to be bleſs'd by the Jews.

The 50th ordains, That thoſe who eat with Jews ſhall be ſeparated from the Church.

The 51ſt forbids to admit into the Clergy thoſe who return from Hereſy, and pronounces the Sentence of Depoſition againſt ſuch if they are Ordain'd.

The 52d declares thoſe worthy of an Anathema, who publiſh Deformatory Libels.

The 53d declares, That a Perſon excommunicated cannot be received but by the Biſhop who excommunicated him, and forbids all others to receive him into Communion without the conſent of his own Biſhop.

The 54th ordains, That thoſe Pagans ſhall be ſeparated from the Church for three Years who have violated their Promiſe of Eſpouſals, unleſs one of the Parties contracted be found guilty of ſome Crime which hindered them from Marriage.

The 55th declares, That they ſhall be received into Communion at the end of two Years who were Prieſts of Falſe Gods, who have carried a Crown, but have not ſacrific'd nor laid out any Money to the Honour of Idols.

The 56th ſeparates from the Church a Pagan Magiſtrate, during the time that he diſcharges his Office.

The 57th excommunicates for three Years, thoſe Chriſtian Women who lend their Garments for a profane ſhow.

The 58th ordains, That thoſe who bring Letters of Communion ſhall be examined in all the Churches, and chiefly in that where the firſt Epiſcopal Throne is ſettled, that is, in the Metropolitical Church.

The 59th forbids Chriſtians to aſcend into the Capitol to Sacrifice there, or to ſee ſacrificing there, and impoſes ten Years Penance upon thoſe that fall into this Fault.

The 60th deprives thoſe of the Title of Martyrs, who are kill'd for overthrowing Idols publickly, becauſe the Goſpel commands us not to do any ſuch thing, and we never read that it was practis'd by the Chriſtians in the times of the Apoſtles.

The 61ſt impoſes a Penance of five Years upon him that marries his Wife's Siſter, unleſs the extremity of Sickneſs oblige us to give him the Peace of the Church ſooner.

The 62d declares, That an Actor of Plays or a Comedian who would be made a Chriſtian, ſhall not be received till he has renounced his Profeſſion.

The 63d denies Communion even at the Point of Death, to ſuch Women as being guilty of Adultery have murder'd their Infants.

The 64th treats with the ſame Rigor, thoſe Women who have continued all their Life-time in the habitual practice of Sin and Adultery; but as to thoſe who acknowledg'd their Crime before they were ſick, and forſook the Man with whom they had committed this Sin, it grants them Communion after ten Years Penance.

The

The 65th declares, That if a Clergy-man knows that his Wife commits Adultery and ſends her not away, he is unworthy of the Communion of the Church, even at the Point of Death, leſt it ſhould be thought that thoſe who ought to be a Pattern of a regular Life, ſhow an example of Licentiouſneſs. [This Canon is an authentick Evidence of the Marrying of the Clergy of the Church of *Spain* at this time.] The *Councils.*

The 66th declares, That he who marries his Daughter-in-law, ſhall not receive the Communion even at Death.

The 67th forbids Women that are of the Faithful or Catechumens, to have Footmen or Pages that are beautiful and well-ſhap'd.

The 68th delays the Baptiſm of a Catechumeneſs to the Hour of Death, who having committed Adultery, murder'd her Child.

The 69th impoſes but Five Years of Penance upon thoſe who have faln but once into the Sin of Adultery.

The 70th declares, That if a Woman commit Adultery with the conſent of her Husband, he is unworthy of the Communion at the Point of Death; nevertheleſs if he divorces her, he may be received after Ten Years Penance.

The 71ſt denies Communion even at the Point of Death to thoſe who have committed moſt infamous Crimes. [By *infamous Crimes* here is meant, abuſing their Bodies with Mankind.]

The 72d declares, That if a Widow commit Adultery, and afterwards marries the ſame Man with whom ſhe had committed this Sin, ſhe ſhall be diſcharged for Five Years Penance; but if ſhe marry another, ſhe cannot be reconcil'd, even at the Point of Death, and that if he to whom ſhe marries be one of the Faithful, he ſhall be put under Penance for Ten Years.

The 73d denies Communion, even at the Point of Death, to thoſe who have been the cauſe of the Condemnation or Death of any Man by their falſe Accuſations, and impoſes Five Years Penance if the Matter be of leſs conſequence.

The 74th Ordains, That a falſe Witneſs ſhall be puniſh'd proportionably to the greatneſs of the Crime of which he teſtified falſly: That if the Crime did not deſerve Death; and he proves, That he gave teſtimony with reluctancy, and that he continued long before he was willing to ſay any thing, he ſhall be acquitted for Two Years of Penance: But if he does not prove that he was conſtrain'd to give this falſe Teſtimony, he ſhall not be received into the Communion of the Church till Five Years after.

The 75th deprives thoſe of Communion, even at the Point of Death, who have falſly accus'd a Biſhop, a Prieſt, or a Deacon.

The 76th Ordains, That if a Deacon being guilty of a Crime ſuffers himſelf to be Ordain'd, he ſhall be put under Penance for Three Years, if the Crime be diſcovered by his own Confeſſion; and Five Years, if it be detected by the teſtimony of another,

The 77th declares, That if a Deacon who governs a People, Baptize any Catechumens without a Biſhop or without a Prieſt, the Biſhop ought to conſummate, as one may ſay, the Baptiſm by his Benediction; but if they die before this be done, they may be ſaved by the Faith which they had.

The 78th impoſes upon him who commits Adultery with a *Pagan* or *Jewiſh* Woman, a Penance of Three Years, if he himſelf confeſs his Sin, and one of Five Years, if he be convicted of it.

The 79th forbids playing at Games of Chance, and declares, that if any of the Faithful make profeſſion of playing, he ſhall be depriv'd of Communion; but if he forſakes this Cuſtom he may be reconciled at the end of one Year.

The 80th Ordains, That Freed-men whoſe Patrons are Secular Men, ſhall not be ſuffer'd to enter into the Clergy.

The laſt Canon forbids Women to write to Lay-men in their own Names. This Canon is difficult enough, *Albaſpinæus* underſtands it of Eccleſiaſtical Letters. I ſhould more willingly underſtand it of Familiar Letters.

I know very well, that are many Difficulties about the true Sence of many of theſe Canons. I have endeavour'd to explain them in the Extract which I made out of them, wherein I follow'd that Sence which appeared to me moſt natural, and moſt agreeable to the Genius of the Ancients. Thoſe that would inform themſelves more fully in this Matter, may read the Notes of *Albaſpinæus*, and the great Commentary of *Mendoza*, which contains many things that are no-wiſe uſeful for underſtanding theſe Canons; which are not ſo difficult when they are read without prejudice to one that underſtands ſomething of the Ancient Diſcipline.

Of the Pretended COUNCIL *of* Carthage *againſt* Cæcilian.

AFter the death of *Menſurius* Biſhop of *Carthage*, ſeveral Perſons who had a mind to the Biſhoprick of this City, aſſembled the neighbouring Biſhops, to Ordain a Biſhop of *Carthage*, without citing thither the Biſhops of *Numidia*. The deſign of thoſe Perſons did not ſucceed according to their deſires, for not one of them was choſen Biſhop, and there was placed in the room of *Menſurius*, *Cæcilian* Archdeacon of *Carthage*, who was Ordain'd by *Felix* Biſhop of *Aptungis*. The Biſhops of *Numidia* being offended becauſe they were not call'd to the Ordination of *Cæcilian*, and being ſolicited by ſome of his Enemies, came to *Carthage* in the Year 311. to the number of 70. They durſt not Of *Carthage*, 311.

enter into the Church where *Cæcilian* was, but being received by thoſe who call'd them, they cited him to come before them and defend himſelf. This Biſhop, without being daunted, anſwer'd them boldly; *If there be any Proofs againſt me, let my Accuſer appear and produce them.* But his Enemies having nothing Perſonal to object againſt him, accus'd *Felix* of *Aptungis* who had Ordain'd him, and ſaid that this Biſhop having been a Traditor could not give a valid Ordination, and conſequently *Cæcilian* was not then a Biſhop. *Cæcilian* either becauſe he miſtruſted the innocence of *Felix*, or becauſe he would not enter upon this Controverſie, made anſwer to his Enemies, *That if* Felix *had not confer'd upon him Epiſcopal Orders, they might ordain him a-new as if he had been ſtill a Deacon.* *Purpurius* Biſhop of *Limata*, a cunning and dextrous Man, adviſ'd thoſe of his Party, to make a ſhow of accepting this Propoſition; and when *Cæcilian* ſhould come to receive Ordination, then to put him under Penance, inſtead of laying hands on him to Ordain him Biſhop. This advice had been put in execution, if *Cæcilian* had not been detain'd by his Friends, who would not ſuffer him to truſt himſelf to the fury of his Enemies. Then the Biſhops of *Numidia* condemn'd him, tho' abſent, and Ordain'd *Majorinus* in his room. They alledg'd Three Reaſons for the Depoſition of *Cæcilian*. The Firſt was, Becauſe he would not appear before the Council. The Second, Becauſe he had been Ordain'd by Traditors. The Third, Becauſe being Arch-deacon, he had hindred, ſay they, the carrying of Victuals to the Confeſſors of Jeſus Chriſt, who were in Priſon. We have only one Article pronounced by the 70 Biſhops produc'd by St. *Auſtin*, in his Book againſt *Fulgentius* the *Donatiſt*. It is expreſs'd in theſe Words, by the Biſhop who pronounc'd it, call'd *Marcianus*: *Our Lord has ſaid in the Goſpel, I am the true Vine, and my Father is the Husbandman; he will cut off and caſt forth every Branch that is in me, and beareth not Fruit. And therefore ſince it is ſaid, That the Branch which beareth not Fruit ſhould be caſt forth, we may truly ſay, That neither Traditors nor Idolaters, nor thoſe who are Schiſmatically Ordain'd by Traditors can continue in the Church of God, unleſs they be reconcil'd by Penance, after they have acknowledged and bewailed their Sin. Wherefore* Cæcilian *being Schiſmatically Ordained by Traditors ought to be Excommunicated.* After the Biſhops had thus pronounc'd ſeverally their Sentences againſt *Cæcilian*, and Ordain'd *Majorinus*, they ſent a Circular Letter to all the Biſhops of *Africa*, exhorting them to ſeparate themſelves from the Communion of *Cæcilian*: But notwithſtanding this Letter, *Cæcilian* continued in Communion with a great part of the Biſhops of *Africa*, and with all the other Biſhops of the World, who declar'd themſelves in his favour, againſt the *Numidians* who made the Schiſm, and were call'd *Donatiſts*. Thus *Cæcilian* continued in his See, notwithſtanding the Judgment of this Synod, and did not ſo much as aſſemble a Council to abſolve himſelf from this Sentence, believing himſelf ſufficiently ſecur'd againſt the Conſpiracy of his Enemies, ſays St. *Auſtin*, by the Communion of the *Roman* Church, and of all the other Churches beyond the Sea, from whom he received, and to whom he wrote Letters of Communion. What we have ſaid of this Council is taken out of *Optatus* and St. *Auſtin*.

The *Councils.*

Of the COUNCIL *of* Rome.

Of *Rome*, 313.

Conſtantine becoming Maſter of *Africk*, after he had Conquered the Tyrant *Maxentius*, wrote to *Anulinus* Proconſul of *Africk*, to maintain the Party of *Cæcilian*, and to endeavour to reeſtabliſh Peace in the Church of *Africk*. This wiſe Magiſtrate ſent for *Cæcilian*, and his Adverſaries, read to them the Emperour's Letter, and exhorted them to be reconcil'd to one another: But ſome Days after, thoſe of *Majorinus*'s Party preſented to him two *Memorials*; one was entitled, *A Manifeſto of* Cæcilian's *Crimes, preſented by* Majorinus's *Party*: And the other was a Petition, wherein they prayed that ſome Biſhops of *Gaul* might be given them for Judges. Thoſe who preſented theſe two Papers to *Anulinus*, earneſtly prayed him to ſend them to the Emperour. He did ſo, and the Emperour having regard to their Petition, gave them for Judges, *Miltiades* Biſhop of *Rome*, together with *Rheticius* Biſhop of *Autun*, *Marinus* Biſhop of *Arles*, and *Maternus* Biſhop of *Cologn*. *Miltiades* joyned to theſe Four, Fifteen Biſhops of *Italy*, and theſe Nineteen Biſhops aſſembled in the City of *Rome*, in the Year 313. and undertook to judge the Cauſe of *Cæcilian*. The firſt Day that they aſſembled, *Majorinus*'s Party preſented to the Council a Memorial of the Crimes, whereof they accus'd *Cæcilian*: But the Judges having deſir'd them to produce their Accuſers and Witneſſes, they introduc'd ſome who were oblig'd to withdraw immediately, becauſe they declar'd, that they had nothing to ſay againſt *Cæcilian*. He for his part accus'd *Donatus* of having made a Schiſm at *Carthage*, and urged him to preſent before the Council, the Witneſſes and Accuſers which he had brought. *Donatus* promiſed that he would preſent them, and in the mean time was convicted of having re-baptiz'd, and re-ordain'd. The Second Day a New Memorial was given in againſt *Cæcilian*, but ſufficient Evidence could not be produc'd. The Judgment of the Seventy Biſhops of *Numidia* was alledg'd, for which the Judges had no great reſpect. The Third Day, the whole Cauſe was determin'd, *Donatus* was condemn'd, as being convicted of having re-baptiz'd, and laid his Hands upon Biſhops who were already Ordain'd: And *Cæcilian* was abſolv'd by the Sentence of all the Biſhops, and even by the ſuffrage of *Miltiades* who concluded the Deciſion. The Council having thus judg'd the Cauſe of *Cæcilian* and *Donatus*, endeavour'd to reſtore Peace among the other Biſhops, by ordering, that in thoſe Places where there had been a Biſhop of each Party, he who had been Ordain'd firſt ſhould continue Biſhop, and Care ſhould be taken to give another Biſhoprick to the other. Letters of Communion were alſo offer'd to be ſent to the Biſhops of *Majorinus*'s Party, provided they would be Reconcil'd. At laſt, the Biſhops wrote to *Conſtantine*, inform'd him of their Deciſion, and aſſur'd him, that they had given their Judgment according to Juſtice and Equity. The Acts of this Council were extant in St. *Auſtin*'s time, and they were alſo produced in the Confe-

rence

rence of *Carthage*, but now they are loſt. We have taken what we have ſaid, out of *Optatus* in Book Firſt, and out of St. *Auſtin* in his Abridgment of the Conference on the Third Day, in *Ch.* 11. of his Letter 162. now the 43d. and of Letter 50. now the 185.

Of the COUNCIL *of* Arles.

THE Biſhops of *Majorinus*'s Party having loſt their Cauſe in the Council of *Rome*, addreſs'd themſelves to the Emperour, and complain'd of the Judgment which was given at *Rome*, ailedging that their Judges did not hear all that they had to ſay. The Emperour deſiring they might be ſolemly Judg'd, that ſo they ſhould have nothing to reply, call'd [a] a Conncil in the Year 314. in the City of *Arles*. This Council was compos'd of 33 Weſtern Biſhops [b], with ſome Prieſts and ſome Deacons. *Marinus* Biſhop of *Arles* preſided there; the Legates of Pope *Sylveſter* were preſent [c], but that the Emperour was not there [d]. The Council heard the Accuſations which were form'd againſt *Cæcilian*; but when his Accuſers could not prove him guilty of the Crimes whereof they accus'd him, they were rejected or condemned by the Council. After this Cauſe was judged, the Biſhops thought it their Duty, ſince they were aſſembled, to make ſome Rules concerning the Diſcipline of the Church; and they made 22 Canons. Of *Arles*, 314.

In the 1ſt they ordain, That the Feaſt of *Eaſter* ſhould be celebrated on the ſame *Sunday* in all the Churches of the World, and that the Biſhop of *Rome* ſhould give notice of the Day to the Churches according to Cuſtom.

In the 2d they enjoyn Miniſters to continue in the Churches where they were ordained.

In the 3d they excommunicate thoſe who make uſe of Arms in a time of Peace.

In the 4th they Ordain, That thoſe who run Races in the Cirque, ſhall be ſeparated from the Communion while they follow that employment.

In the 5th they make the ſame Regulation for thoſe who act upon the Theatre.

In the 6th they ordain, That Impoſition of Hands ſhall be given to thoſe, who having fallen Sick, declare, that they deſire to believe in Jeſus Chriſt.

In the 7th they permit the Faithful to enter upon Offices, without being deprived of the Communion of the Church; but upon Condition that the Biſhop of the place where they ſhall take an Office, ſhall ſuperintend their Conduct, and that if they do any thing contrary to the Diſcipline of the Church, they ſhall be ſeparated from his Communion.

The 8th determines the famous Queſtion about the re-baptization of Hereticks, and ordains concerning the *Africans*, who had always re-baptized them, That if any one leave a Hereſie, and return to the Church, he ſhall be ask'd concerning the Creed, and if it be known that he was baptized in the Name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt, Impoſition of Hands only ſhall be given him, that he may receive the Holy Spirit; but if he does not acknowledge the Trinity, he ſhall be re-baptized.

The 9th declares, That in order to their being received into Communion in a Foreign Church, they ſhould not any longer carry Letters of Recommendation from the Confeſſors, but Letters of Communion from their Biſhop.

In the 10th they ſay, That thoſe who find their Wives in the Act of Adultery muſt be counſelled not to marry others, while they are living, tho' the Laws permits them to do it.

In the 11th they ſeparate for ſome time from the Communion of the Church the Chriſtian Virgins that marry Infidels.

In the 12th they excommunicate the Clergy that are Uſurers.

[a] *Call'd.*] 'Tis certain that the Emperour call'd this Synod. We have in *Euſeb. B.* X. of his Hiſt. *Ch.* 5. the Letter which he wrote to *Chreſtus* Biſhop of *Syracuſe*, wherein he commands him to be preſent at this Council of *Arles*; he wrote of it likewiſe to all the other Biſhops. Some have ſaid that the *Donatiſts* appeal'd to a Council after the Deciſion of *Rome*, but St. *Auſtin*, who had ſtudied this Hiſtory exactly, ſays in an infinite number of places, that they complained only of the Judgment given at *Rome*, but did not Appeal till after the Deciſion of the Council of *Arles*.

[b] *Compos'd of* 33 *Weſtern Biſhops.*] *Baronius* thought that this Council conſiſted of 200 Biſhops, which he grounded upon a Paſſage of St. *Auſtin*, in his Book againſt the Epiſtle of *Parmenianus*, Ch. 5. but he miſunderſtood that Paſſage, for there he does not ſpeak of the Council of *Arles*, but of the Council of *Rome*, which conſiſted only of 19 Biſhops, and not of 200. as they are reckon'd in the Text of St. *Auſtin*, according to the common Editions; but this place has been reſtored in the laſt Edition, by a Manuſcript of the *Vatican* Library, and inſtead of reading as it was, *Ut ducentos Judices apud quos vicli ſunt, victis litigatoribus credant eſſe poſtponendos*, it is now thus reſtored, *ut contra Judices, apud quos victi ſunt, victis litigatoribus credant*, &c. There are but 33 Names at the head of the Councils Letter; but of theſe 33 there are 4 Prieſts and one Deacon, and 6 Exorciſts. They endeavour to prove that there was a greater number of Biſhops at this Council, becauſe *Conſtantine* in his Letter to *Chreſtus*, and the ſecond Council of *Arles* teſtify, That there were Biſhops in it from all Parts of the World: But theſe 19 Biſhops are found to be from all Parts of the Weſt, and ſo it is not neceſſary to admit a greater number of them, to verifie what is ſaid by *Conſtantine* and the Fathers of the ſecond Council of *Arles*. *Ado* ſays, that 600 Biſhops were preſent at this Council; but this is no-wiſe probable.

[c] Marinus *Biſhop of* Arles *preſided there*, &c.] His Name is at the head of the Biſhops, named at the beginning of the Epiſtle to St. *Sylveſter*, before thoſe of the Pope's Legates.

[d] *That the Emperour was not there.*] Some Authors have ſaid that he was, but they are miſtaken; for it appears by the Letter of *Conſtantine*, written after the Synod, that he was not, and the *Donatiſts* would not have appeal'd to his Judgment, if he had been preſent at the Sentence given by the Synod, and approved it.

In

The *Councils.*

In the 13th they ordain, That thoſe ſhall be turned out of the Clergy, who ſhall be proved by the Publick Acts to have delivered up the Holy Scriptures; but thoſe who they had ordained ſhall continue in their Station. They forbid Men to hearken to theſe Accuſations, unleſs they be proved by the Publick Acts.

In the 14th they ſeparate from the Communion until the Point of Death, thoſe who falſly accuſe their Brethren.

In the 15th they ſay, That the Deacons ſhould not offer, as they did in many places.

In the 16th they ordain, That thoſe who are ſeparated from the Communion, ſhall be reſtored no where elſe, but in the place where they were Excommunicated.

The 17th Ordains, That one Biſhop ſhall not deſpiſe the Judgment of another. This is rather a conſequence of the preceding Canon, than a Canon by it ſelf.

The 18th enjoyns Deacons in Cities to reverence the Prieſts.

The 19th grants to Foreign Biſhops the Power of celebrating the Oblation.

In the 20th the Biſhops of this Council forbids one Biſhop alone to ordain another Biſhop; they would have Seven of them meet if it be poſſible; but if this cannot be done, they do abſolutely forbid any one to Ordain, unleſs he has three Biſhops with him.

In the 21ſt they forbid Prieſts and Deacons, under pain of Depoſition, to relinquiſh the Churches, in which they were fixed by their Ordination.

In the 22d they declare, That Communion is not to be given to thoſe who having Apoſtatized, continue a long time out of the Church without doing Penance, waiting till they fall Sick to ask Communion; unleſs they recover their Health, and give Signs of a ſincere Repentance.

At laſt, the Biſhops of this Council wrote to St. *Sylveſter* Biſhop of *Rome*, as the chief Biſhop of the World, an Account of every thing that they had Ordained, that he might publiſh theſe Canons throughout the Catholick Church. They aſſure him in this Letter, that they were very ſorry, that he could not be preſent himſelf in Perſon at this Council, and they pray him to publiſh their Deciſions over all the World.

Of the COUNCILS *of* Ancyra *and* Neo-Cæſarea.

Of *Ancyra* and *Neo-Cæſarea*, 314.

THE Councils of *Ancyra* and *Neo-Cæſarea*, were held much about the ſame time as the Council of *Arles*. We know nothing of the Hiſtory, nor particular Circumſtances of theſe two Councils; we have only their Canons, which the ancient Church look'd upon as Rules that ought to be obſerv'd every where, ſince they have been put into the Code of the Canons of the Univerſal Church.

There are 25 Canons of the Council of *Ancyra*. The Firſt preſerves the Honour of the Prieſthood to thoſe Biſhops, who having ſacrificed to Idols repented of their Fault, and afterwards ſuffered for the Faith of Jeſus Chriſt. But it forbids them to exerciſe any part of the Sacerdotal Function, and will not ſo much as allow them to make the Offering or Preach. The Second uſes the ſame moderation to Deacons; but it permits Biſhops to ſhow them more Favour if they think it convenient.

In the 3d Canon it is Ordain'd, That thoſe who have been made to offer Incenſe, or to eat of Meats Sacrific'd to Idols, by Force and Violence, are not at all guilty, that they ought to be admitted to Communion, and that they may even be promoted to Eccleſiaſtical Dignities; provided they have teſtified their ſorrow for what happen'd to them: But for thoſe who were preſent at the Feaſts made to the Honour of Idols with mirth and jollity, it impoſes upon them Five Years Penance, One Year in the rank of Hearers, Two Years in the rank of Supplicants, and Two Years in the number of thoſe that are preſent only at the Prayers. Whereas thoſe who were preſent in mourning Apparel, and who lamented during the time of the Feaſt, if they did eat of the Profane Meat, it places them in the rank of Supplicants, or proſtrate Penitents for three Three Years, and afterwards it would have them receiv'd without having any ſhare in the Oblation; and if they did not eat at all, it leaves them only Two Years in the rank of the proſtrate Penitents, and permits them to partake of the Sacraments at the end of the Third Year. Nevertheleſs, it gives power to the Biſhops to ſhorten or lengthen the time of Penance, according to the behaviour of the Penitents.

The 6th concerns thoſe who have Sacrific'd to Idols, fearing Torments or the loſs of their Goods, and who deſire to be admitted to do Penance. The Synod orders, That they ſhould be among the number of Hearers till *Eaſter-day*, that afterwards they ſhould be Three Years Supplicants or Proſtrate, and then they ſhould be preſent at the Prayers, which is call'd *Communicating without partaking of the Oblation.* It excepts however the caſe of the danger of Death, in which it Orders, That they ſhould be receiv'd according to the Law made about it.

The 7th impoſes Two Years penance upon thoſe who were preſent at the Feaſts made in Honour of the Idols, but carried thither their own Meat, intending not to eat of that which was there preſented.

The 8th impoſes Seven Years Penance upon thoſe who Sacrific'd ſeveral times; and the 9th impoſes Ten Years Penance upon thoſe who forc'd their Brethren to do it.

The 10th Canon concerns the Celibacy of Deacons. The Council there Ordains, That if they declared at the time of their Ordination, that they would Marry, they ſhall not be depriv'd of their Function if they did Marry; but if they were Ordain'd without making this declaration, and afterwards Marry'd they ſhould be oblig'd to quit their Employment.

The 11th Ordains, That if Maids Contracted happen to be carried away by others than thoſe

to

to whom they were promiſed, they ſhall be reſtored to them again whatever violence they have ſuffered.

The Councils.

The 12th declares, That thoſe may be Ordain'd who have Sacrific'd to Idols before they were Baptized, becauſe they are purified from this Sin by Baptiſm.

The 13th Canon is about Suffragan Biſhops or *Chorepiſcopi*. 'Tis as follows in the Greek Text: *'Tis not lawful for Suffragan Biſhops to Ordain Prieſts or Deacons, nor for the City Presbyters in another Pariſh without the permiſſion of their Biſhop.* 'Tis plain that this Canon is imperfect, and that ſomething muſt be ſupplied to make it ſence: For what mean theſe words, *Nor to the City Presbyters*, &c. Had Prieſts ever Power to Ordain other Prieſts in their own Churches? Had they ever permiſſion to do it out of their own Churches by the Biſhops Letters? Why ſhould not the Suffragans, who were above the Prieſts, have the ſame Power? There muſt be ſomething added: See what *Dionyſius Exiguus* has added in his Verſion. *No more is it lawful for Prieſts to do any thing in the Diocеſs, without the permiſſion of the Biſhop in writing.* This Addition is found in the ancient Code of the *Roman* Church, publiſhed by *Queſnellus*, and in the Verſion of *Iſidore*; and *Juſtellus* has reſtored it in the Greek Text, of the Code of the Univerſal Church.

The 14th condemns the ſuperſtition of ſome Clergymen who would not eat Meat. The Synod Ordains, That if they continued in this Superſtition, and would not eat Herbs boil'd with Meat, they ſhould be depriv'd of their Eccleſiaſtical Function.

The 15th declares, That if Prieſts ſell any thing belonging to the Church, while it has not a Biſhop, it ſhall be in the Power of the Biſhop who is choſen, either to make void the bargain, or to take the price of the thing that is ſold.

The 16th and 17th impoſes long Penances upon thoſe who have committed Crimes contrary to Nature.

The 18th forbids Biſhops, who cannot be receiv'd into their own Biſhopricks, to invade thoſe of others, and allows them only to keep the rank of other Presbyters; of which Honour it Ordains that they ſhall be depriv'd if they ſtir up Sedition againſt the Biſhop of the place.

The 19th ſubjects thoſe Virgins to the ſame puniſhment with Bigamiſts, who violate the Profeſſion that they have made, and forbids them to dwell with Strangers as if they were their Siſters.

The 20th impoſes Seven Years Penance for Adultery.

In the 21ſt the Synod obſerves, That the ancient Canons delay'd the abſolution of thoſe Women till Death, who having committed the Sin of Adultery murder'd their Infants; but to mitigate this Puniſhment, it impoſes upon them only Ten Years Penance.

The 22d delayeth the Abſolution of thoſe till the Point of Death who have committed wilful Murder, and till then it places them in the rank of proſtrate Penitents.

The 23d impoſes Seven Years of Penance for Manſlaughter.

The 24th ſubjects thoſe to a Penance of Five Years who meddle with Divination, and practiſe ſuperſtitious Actions.

The laſt is about a particular Caſe. A Man had defiled the Siſter of her to whom he was contracted, and afterwards married this laſt; her Siſter hang'd her ſelf for madneſs. The Synod Ordains, That all thoſe who were complices to theſe Crimes, ſhall be put under Penance for the ſpace of Ten Years.

Theſe Canons are ſigned by 18 Biſhops of the Dioceſs of *Aſia*, of *Pontus*, and of the Eaſt. *Vitalis* Biſhop of *Antioch* is the firſt among theſe Biſhops. 'Tis certain that he held the See of the Church of *Antioch* from the Year 311. until the Year 319. And after him there is the Name of *Agricolaus* Biſhop of *Cæſaria* in *Paleſtine*: But *Euſebius* makes no mention of this Biſhop, and he could be but a very little time Biſhop of that Church. *Marcellus* of *Ancyra* who is the Third, is famous enough in Hiſtory. Some think that *Baſil* of *Amaſea* ſuffered Martyrdom under *Licinius*, and St. *Jerom* affirms it in his *Chronicon*: Yet *Philoſtorgius* and St. *Athanaſius* reckon him among thoſe Biſhops who were preſent at the Council of *Nice*. The ſame St. *Athanaſius* mentions *Lupus* of *Tarſus*, and *Longinus* of *Neocæſarea*. There is mention made of *Leontius* of *Cæſarea* in *Cappadocia* in the Life of St. *Gregory Nazianzen*, where 'tis ſaid, That 'twas he who Baptized *Gregory* of *Piſa* in the time of the *Nicene* Council. The others are leſs known.

The Council of *Neocæſarea* made Fifteen Canons about the Diſcipline of the Church.

The 1ſt is, That if a Prieſt marries after he has been Ordain'd, he ought to be degraded; and if he commit Fornication or Adultery he ought to be puniſhed more rigorouſly, and put under Penance.

The 2d is, That if a Woman marry Two Brothers, ſhe ought to be excluded from the Communion of the Church, till the end of her Life; but at the Point of Death ſhe ſhall be abſolved, provided ſhe promiſes to break the Marriage. For if the Husband or the Wife die without being parted, the ſurviving Perſon can very hardly be admitted to Penance.

The 3d is, That the time of the Penance of thoſe who Marry often is regulated by the Canons, but it may be ſhortned proportionably to the Converſion of the Penitent, and the fervour of his Penance.

The 4th is, That he who having a deſire to commit Sin with a Woman, and did not accompliſh it, ſeems to have been ſaved by the Grace of God.

The 5th is, That if a Catechumen, who is in the rank of thoſe who pray with the Faithful, fall into Sin, he muſt be placed in the rank of Hearers, and if he continue to ſin, he is to be totally turned out of the Church.

The 6th commands thoſe Women to be Baptized who are ready to Lie-in.

The 7th forbids Prieſts to be preſent at the Marriage of *Bigamiſts*.

The *Councils.*

The 8th declares that he cannot be admitted into Holy Orders, whoſe Wife has been convicted of Adultery; and that if a Clergy-man's Wife commit Adultery, he ought to Divorce her, upon pain of being depriv'd of his Miniſtry, if he do not.

The 9th is, That if a Prieſt who has committed the Sin of the Fleſh before he was Ordain'd, confeſs his Crime, he ought no more to Offer, but he ſhall enjoy all his other Rights; for as to other Sins, 'tis thought, that they are pardoned by the Impoſition of Hands: But if he does not confeſs this Fault, and cannot be Convicted of it, he ſhall be left to his own Conſcience.

The 10th is, That a Deacon who ſhall commit the ſame Crime before his Ordination, ſhall be plac'd in the rank of the other Miniſters.

The 11 forbids to give the Order of Prieſthood to thoſe Perſons who are under Thirty Years of Age, tho' they have well deſerved, becauſe our Lord was Baptized, and begun to Preach at that Age.

The 12th is, That thoſe who have been Baptiz'd in their Sickneſs, can never be Ordained Prieſts, becauſe they ſeem to have embraced the Faith only through neceſſity, unleſs this Favour be afterwards granted them upon the account of their Faith and Zeal; and that there be but few Perſons who can be Ordained.

The 13th forbids the Prieſts in the Country to make the Oblation in the preſence of the Biſhop, or of the Prieſts of Cities, and does not allow them ſo much as to diſtribute the Bread of the Euchariſt, or to give the Cup, but it permits them to do both the one and the other in the abſence of the Biſhop, and the City-Presbyters.

The 14th declares, that Suffragans repreſent the 70 Diſciples, and ſo they are looked upon as the Brethren of the Biſhops, and have the honour of making the Oblation.

The laſt Ordains, That there ſhould be but Seven Deacons in each City, how great ſoever it be. Some of the Biſhops who were at the Council of *Ancyra*, ſubſcribed to this. *Vitalis* of *Antioch* preſided there, as well as at the Council of *Ancyra*. Which ſhows that theſe Two Councils were held after the Year 311. and before the Year 319.

Of the Firſt COUNCIL *of* Alexandria *againſt* Arius.

Of the Firſt of *Alexandria*, againſt *Arius*, 322.

SOme time after, *Arius* began to publiſh his Impiety, *Alexander* Biſhop of *Alexandria*, held a Council of near One hundred Biſhops of *Egypt*, wherein he Excommunicated *Arius* and his Followers. This Council was held in 322.

Of the pretended COUNCIL *of* Bithynia *for* Arius.

Of *Bithynia* for *Arius*, 322.

Euſebius of *Nicomedia*, and the other Biſhops who protected *Arius* againſt *Alexander*, held a Council the next Year in *Bithynia*, wherein they declare *Arius* Orthodox, and worthy of the Communion of the Church. *Sozomen* mentions this Council *B.* III. *Ch.* 15. of his Hiſtory.

Of the Second COUNCIL *of* Alexandria *againſt* Arius, *held in the preſence of* Hoſius.

Of the Second of *Alexandria*, againſt *Arius*, 324.

Hoſius being ſent to *Alexandria* from the Emperour, to compoſe the Differences which troubled the Churches of *Egypt*, held a Council in that City, which the Clergy of *Mareotis*, in a Proteſtation produced by St. *Athanaſius*, call an Oecumenical Council. It is not known what was determined in this Council. 'Tis probable that the Wiſe Biſhop of *Corduba* did what he could to reconcile Men's minds, and not being able to compaſs his Deſign, he would decide nothing. *Socrates* in *B.* 3. *Ch.* 7. of his Hiſtory, teſtifies, That in this Council the Terms of *Subſtance* and *Hypoſtaſis* were treated of, in oppoſition to *Sabellius*: And we learn from the Proteſtation of the Clergy of *Mareotis*, which we juſt now cited, that *Colluthus* a pretended Biſhop was degraded in this Council, and the Ordinations which he made were annull'd. *Philoſtorgius* ſays, That *Alexander* of *Alexandria* coming at this time to *Nicomedia*, and having ſpoken to *Hoſius*, cauſed *the Conſubſtantiality of the Word* to be determined by a Synodal Sentence. But we have no other Author who mentions this Judgment, neither is there any probability that it was given.

Of the COUNCIL *of* Nice.

Of *Nice*, 325.

Conſtantine ſeeing that he had laboured in vain to allay the Diſputes which divided the Church, thought it would be the moſt ready and effectual means to reſtore Peace, to call a numerous Synod compos'd of the Eaſtern and Weſtern Biſhops. This Council was called Oecumenical, *i. e.* a Council of the whole World, or the whole Earth, becauſe it was called together from all Parts of the *Roman* Empire, to which the Title of *the World*, or *the Earth* was given, and which did almoſt include the Catholick Church. This Council was aſſembled by the Order of the Emperour at *Nice* [a] a City of *Bithynia*, about the Month of *July*, in the Year 325 [b], in the Second Year of *Conſtantine's*

[a] *By Order of the Emperour*, &c.] *Euſebius B.* III. of the Life of *Conſtantine*, *Ch.* 6. ſays, That the Council of *Nice* was aſſembled by Order of the Emperour; and the Biſhops of this Council in their Letter to the *Egyptians*, ſay, That they were Summon'd to meet by the Emperour's Letters. *Conſtantine* ſays the ſame thing, all the Ancients are agreed in it.

[b] *In the Year* 325. *Socrates* aſſures us, That this Council was aſſembled at this time, and it could not be aſſembled ſooner nor later.

Reign [c].

Reign [c]. St. *Sylvester* was then Bishop of *Rome*, who sent thither *Victor* and *Vincentius* his Legates. 'Tis commonly held that this Council consisted of 318 Bishops; but those who were present at it, do not precisely determine this number [d], but say only that there were about 300 Bishops. 'Tis not certainly known, who presided in this Council, but it is very probable that it was *Hosius* [e], who held the chief place there in his own Name, because he had already taken cognizance of this Affair, and was much esteemed by the Emperour, who was there present. The Assembly was held in a Hall in his Palace [f]. 'Tis said that the Bishops presented Petitions to him, wherein they accus'd one another, and that he burnt them all without reading them: 'Tis also said, That many Philosophers came to *Nice* to oppose the Christian Religion, and that they were confounded by one simple Bishop: But these two Stories are not very certain. But 'tis certain, that they minded very closely the Cause for which they were assembled, which was the Heresy of *Arius*. St. *Athanasius* Deacon of *Alexandria*, and some others, disputed stoutly against him. When the Day was come that this great Affair should be determined, one of the Bishops made a Harangue to the Emperour, and afterwards they begun to enter upon the Business. *Arius* having explained his Opinions, was condemned with an unanimous Consent. After this *Eusebius of Cæsarea* presented a Confession of Faith, but the Council finding that it did not expressly enough reject the Error of the *Arians*, urged the Bishops who favoured this Heretick to make a clear Profession of the Divinity of the Son of God; and when the Council saw, that all the Terms which were used to dignifie the Divinity of the Son of God were eluded by these Bishops by far-fetched Explications, the Council was forced, for excluding all kind of Ambiguity to say, That the Son of God was *Consubstantial* to his Father. This Word was the subject of a great Dispute among the Bishops, which was allayed by the Prudence of the Emperour, who made them all agree in the Sence of this Word. And thus in the Confession of Faith, or in the Creed made by this Council, Profession is made, *Of believing in one only God, the Creator of all things, visible and invisible and in one only Lord Jesus Christ the Son of God, begotten of the Father, the only Son of the Substance of the Father, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten not made, Consubstantial to his Father, by whom all things were made in Heaven and on Earth, who descended for us Men and for our Salvation, who was incarnate and made Man, who suffered and rose again, and ascended into Heaven; and who shall come to judge the quick and the dead: And in the Holy Spirit.* After this Creed followed an Anathema against those who should say, *That there was a time when the Son of God was not, or that he was not before he was begotten, or that he was created of nothing, and that he was of another Substance and another Essence, or that he was created and subject to Change.* All the the Bishops except *Secundus* of *Ptolemais*, and *Theonas* of *Marmarica*, Signed this Confession of Faith [g]. *Eusebius* of *Cæsarea* refused to Sign it at First, but he did it the next day. After this *Arius*, *Secundus* and *Theonas*, were condemned in the Council [h], and a Book of the First, entituled *Thalia*, was proscribed.

The Council having thus judged the *Arians* with rigor, treated the *Meletians* with more moderation. It permitted *Meletius* to continue in the City, and to retain the name of Bishop, and the honour annexed to that Office; but it absolutely forbad him to ordain any body: It preserved also the Rank, Honour and Office of those whom he had ordained, provided nevertheless that they should be confirmed by a more Sacred Imposition of Hands, which is a kind of Re-ordination [i]; that they should be inferiour to those who had been ordained by *Alexander*, and that they should have no hand

The *Councils.*

[c] *In the Second Year of the Reign of* Constantine.] It begun in the Month of *August*, and the Council was held in the Month of *July*.

[d] *Those who were present at it, do not precisely determine this number.*] *Eusebius* B. III. of the Life of *Constantine*, says, that there were at the Council of *Nice* more than 250 Bishops. *Eustathius* says, that there were to the number of 270. or thereabouts. St. *Athanasius* in his Book of the Decrees of the Council of *Nice*, and in his Epistle to the Monks, says, that they were about 300. yet the same St. *Athanasius* in his Letter to the *Africans*, St. *Hilary* in his Book of Synods, *Ruffinus*, St. *Ambrose*, St. *Epiphanius*, &c. call the Council of *Nice*, a Council of 318 Bishops. *Socrates*, *Sozomen*, and *Marius Mercator*, do not reckon precisely the same number, but they do not much differ from it.

[e] *'Tis not certainly known who presided in this Council, but 'tis probable that it was* Hosius.] St. *Athanasius* in his second Apology, calls *Hosius* the Father and President of all the Councils. The Name of this Bishop is the First in all the Subscriptions. *Alexander* was much esteemed as appears by the Letter of the Council. *Eustathius* of *Antioch* is called the chief Bishop of the Council by *Proclus* and by *Facundus*. But it is more probable that *Hosius* presided there in his own Name, and not in the Pope's: For he no where assumes the Title of Legate of the Holy See, and none of the ancients say, that he presided in this Council in the Pope's Name. *Gelasius Cyzicenus* who first affirmed it, says it without any Proof or Authority.

[f] *The Assembled was held in his Palace.*] *Eusebius* says so expressly, B. III. of the Life of *Constantine*, Ch. 10. *Socrates*, B. I. of his History, *Ch.* 18. and *Theodoret*, B. I. *Ch.* 7. following herein the Testimony of *Eusebius*. 'Tis true, that this place is called by *Eusebius* himself in *Ch.* 7. a Sacred Place, but it is upon the account of the Assembly of the Bishops who were then in it.

[g] *All the Bishops except* Secundus *and* Theonas *Signed this Creed.*] This appears by the Letter of the Synod, and by the Testimony of *Theodoret*, B. I. Ch. 7. and of *Philostorgius*. Some say, that *Eusebius* and *Theognis* would not Sign the Condemnation of *Arius*, and that they were condemned in the Council. This is not true, and if they did alledge this distinction, it was after the Council of *Nice*, and not in the Council.

[h] Arius, Secundus *and* Theonas *were condemned*, &c.] This appears by the Letter of the Council, tho' St. *Jerom* affirms the contrary concerning *Arius*. St. *Athanasius*, who is more to be credited than St. *Jerom* in this matter, says several times that *Arius* was condemned in the Council of *Nice*. *Socrates*, *Sozomen*, and *Theodoret* do also testifie the same thing.

[i] *Which is a kind of Re-ordination.*] It is commonly thought that this Imposition of Hands, which the Fathers of this Council call, μυστικὴν χειροθεσίαν, was only a Ceremony; but *Valesius* has very well proved that it was a new Ordination; and this is the thing which the Word does properly signify.

In

The *Councils.*

in the Election of Biſhops. Nevertheleſs it permits the People and the Clergy to chooſe them Biſhops, if they were found worthy of it, provided that the Biſhop of *Alexandria* approve this Election. Laſt of all, the Council made a Decree concerning the Celebration of *Eaſter*, and ordained that this Feaſt ſhould be Celebrated only on the *Sunday*. *Conſtantine* wrote a general Letter to the whole Church, to acquaint them with the Deciſions of this Council, and the Biſhops wrote a Letter particularly to the Chriſtians of *Egypt*, wherein they inform them exactly of what had been ordained about the Cauſe of the *Arians* and *Meletians*, and about the Celebration of *Eaſter*.

St *Ambroſe* indeed ſeems to intimate that this Council made a Paſchal Cycle; but theſe Words muſt be ſo underſtood, as meaning only, That the Determination of the Council gave occaſion to make uſe of Cycles. St. *Leo* adds in *Ep.* 64. That the Council gave Order to the Biſhop of *Alexandria* to give notice every Year to the Biſhop of *Rome*, of *Eaſter-day*, that he might publiſh it to all the Churches of the World: But if the Council had made this Order, they would have ſignified it in their Letter to the *Egyptians*, where they ſpeak favourably of *Alexander* and his Church.

The Council of *Nice* did not only determine the differences which troubled the Church by its Deciſions, but alſo made Rules concerning the Diſcipline of the Church. Theſe Rules, which are called Canons, are in number Twenty, and there never were more Genuine [k], tho' ſome Modern Authors have added many more.

The Firſt Canon excludes from Sacred Orders, thoſe that made themſelves Eunuchs, but not thoſe who became ſo by Sickneſs, or by the Cruelty of *Barbarians*.

The 2d forbids to advance thoſe Perſons to the Orders of Prieſt or Biſhop, who were lately Baptized; and Ordains, that thoſe who ſhall be convicted of any Crime, ſhall be deprived of their Eccleſiaſtical Functions.

The 3d forbids Biſhops, Prieſts, Deacons, and other Clergy-men, to keep Women in the Houſe with them; yet it excepts Mothers, Siſters, and other Perſons of whom there can be no bad ſuſpicion.

The 4th Ordains, That a Biſhop ſhould be Ordained by all the Biſhops of the Province, if it can be done; but if it be too difficult to aſſemble them all, either becauſe of an urgent neceſſity, or becauſe of their great diſtance, he may be Ordained by Three Biſhops, provided that thoſe who are abſent be willing, and conſent by their Letter that this Ordination ſhould be made; but it adds, That the validity of what is done in the Province depends upon the Metropolitan.

The 5th Ordains, That none of thoſe who ſhall be ſeparated from the Church by the Biſhops in each Province can be received or reſtored to Communion in any other place; and that enquiry be the better made, whether their Biſhop has juſtly excommunicated them; they Ordain, That Two Synods ſhall be held every Year in every Province, one before Lent, and the other in Autumn.

The 6th Canon is famous for the ſeveral Queſtions it has occaſioned, The moſt natural Sence that can be given to it, is this: "We Ordain, That the Ancient Cuſtom ſhall be obſerved, which gives "Power to the Biſhop of *Alexandria*, over all the Provinces of *Egypt*, *Lybia*, and *Pentapolis*, becauſe "the Biſhop of *Rome* has the like Juriſdiction over all the Suburbicary Regions (for this Addition muſt "be ſupplied out of *Ruffinus*:) We would likewiſe have the Rights and Priviledges of the Church "of *Antioch*, and the other Churches preſerved; but theſe Rights ought not to prejudice thoſe of the "Metropolitans. If any one is Ordained without the conſent of the Metropolitan, the Council de"clares, That he is no Biſhop: But if any one is Canonically choſen by the Suffrage of almoſt all "the Biſhops of the Province, and if there are but One or Two of a contrary Opinion, the Suffrages "of the far greater number ought to carry it for the Ordination of thoſe particular Perſons. This Canon being thus explained has no difficulty in it. *It does not oppoſe the Primacy of the Church of* Rome, *but neither does it eſtabliſh it.* It preſerves to Great Sees their ancient Priviledges, that is, the Juriſdiction or Authority which they had over many Provinces, which was afterwards called the Juriſdiction of the Patriarch or Exarch. In this Sence it is, That it compares the Church of *Rome* to the Church of *Alexandria*, by conſidering them all as Patriarchal Churches. It continues alſo to the Church of *Antioch*, and all the other Great Churches, whatſoever Rights they could have; but leſt their Authority ſhould be prejudicial to the ordinary Metropolitans, who were ſubject to their Juriſdiction. The Council confirms what had been Ordain'd in the Fourth Canon, concerning the Authority of Metropolitans, in the Ordination of Biſhops. This explication is eaſie and natural, and we have given many Proofs of it in our Latin Diſſertation, concerning the ancient Diſcipline of the Church.

[Only ſo far, as it may by a Negative Argument, be hence very ſtrongly concluded, That the See of *Rome* then claimed none but Priviledges common to it, and other Metropolitical Sees.]

The 7th is, That ſince by ancient Tradition, the Church of *Elias*, or of *Jeruſalem*, has been honoured, this Prerogative of Honour ſhall be continued to it, but without prejudice to the Rights of its Metropolis.

The 8th declares, That the *Novatians* who return to the Church, may continue in the Clergy after they have receiv'd Impoſition of Hands, and made Profeſſion of following the Diſcipline of the Church.

[k] *There were never more Genuine.*] *Theodoret* and *Ruffinus* mention only theſe 20 Canons; tho' the latter reckons 22 of them, yet he own'd no more, becauſe he divided two of them. The Biſhops of *Africa* found but 20 of them, after they had enquired very diligently all over the Eaſt, for all the Canons made by the Council of *Nice*. *Dionyſius Exiguus*, and all the other Collectors of Canons have acknowledged but theſe 20. The *Arabick* Canons which *Echellenſis* publiſhed under the Name of the Council of *Nice*, cannot belong to this Council.

The

That if a *Novatian* Bishop in a City, where there is a Catholick Bishop, return to the Church, he shall not take the place of the Catholick Bishop, but continue in the Presbytery, unless the Catholick Bishop will allow him the Name of a Bishop: But if he will not, this *Novatian* Bishop shall continue Priest or Suffragan. The Councils.

The 9th or 10th Ordains, That those Priests shall be degraded, who are found either to have Sacrificed, or to have been guilty of other Crimes befor their Ordination.

The 11th imposes a Penance of Ten Years, upon those who voluntarily renounce the Christian Religion, without being forced, either by the loss of their Estate, or danger of their Life.

The 12th imposes Thirteen Years Penance upon those who having shown their Zeal for the Faith did afterwards Apostatize to obtain Offices: Nevertheless it permits this Penance to be shortned in favour of those who testify much Grief and Remorse.

The 13th renews the ancient Law, which Ordains, That dying Persons shall not be deprived of the last and most necessary *Viaticum*, that is, of Absolution; but upon condition, That if the sick Person recovers his health, he shall be placed only in the Rank of those who are present only at the Prayers of the Church. It leaves it at the Discretion of the Bishop, to give or to refuse the Communion to dying Persons who desire it.

The 14th turns back those Catechumens to the place of Hearers, who Apostatized when they were ready to receive Baptism, and enjoyns them to continue in that place for Three Years, before they can be restored to the place wherein they were before.

The 15th forbids the Translations of Bishops and Priests, and Ordains, That those who shall be Translated, shall return to their First Church.

The 16th forbids the receiving of Priests, Deacons or Ministers of another Church, without the consent of their Bishop.

The 17th Ordains, That Clergymen who are Usurers, or who take sordid Gain, shall be deposed.

The 18th forbids Deacons to give the Eucharist to Priests, because it is against the Canons, and contrary to Custom, and they have not the power to Offer nor to give the Body of Jesus Christ, to those who do Offer. It forbids them also to take the Eucharist before the Bishops, and advertises them, that they are but inferiour Ministers to Priests; That they ought to receive the Eucharist after them from the hand of a Bishop or a Priest; That 'tis not lawful for them to sit in the place of Priests, and threatens those who do not obey this Rule, with the deprivation of their Ministry.

The 19th Ordains, That the *Paulianists* shall be re-baptized, who return to the Church; and that if there be found any who had the Name of Clergy-men among these Hereticks, who are worthy of Holy Orders, they shall be deposed. It Ordains the same thing of Deaconesses who are reckoned among the Clergy, tho' they never received Imposition of Hands, that they shall be placed among the Laity.

The last Canon abolishes the Custom of some Churches, wherein they kneeled on *Sunday* and *Whitsunday*, and Ordains for keeping Uniformity, that they shall pray to God standing at this time in all Churches.

We must add to the History of this Council Two remarkable Stories related by *Socrates* and *Sozomen*, which *Socrates* says he learned from an old Man who assisted at this Council. The First is concerning *Acesius* a *Novatian* Bishop, who being asked by the Emperour, whether he approved the Decision of this Council, answer'd him, That he had received from his Ancestors the Faith which they had decreed, and that he always celebrated *Easter* on the Day which they had appointed. The Emperour having afterwards asked him, why then did he separate from the Communion of the Church? He alledged the Indulgence which the Church had given from the time of *Decius*, and said that those who had faln into Crimes ought never to be received into the Communion of the Church, and that they ought to expect pardon from God only, who only could grant it them. The Emperour hearing this Answer, answer'd him pleasantly, *O Acesius take then a Ladder, and mount up to Heaven alone.* The other Story concerns *Paphnutius* a Bishop in *Egypt*, who oppos'd the Canon, which was proposed in the Council for obliging Bishops, Priests and Deacons, to observe Celibacy. This good Man said, that tho' he had lived all his Life-time in Celibacy, yet he did not think, that this Yoke ought to be imposed upon the Clergy. Some question the truth of this Story; I believe they do it rather for fear least this Story might prejudice the present Discipline, than from any solid proof they have for it. But these Persons should consider, that this Canon is purely a matter of Discipline, and that the Discipline of the Church may change according to the Times, and that 'tis not necessary for the Defence of it, to prove that it was always *Uniform in all Places.*

[This would be an excellent Defence for the Discipline of the Church of *Rome* in this particular, if there were some Ages wherein Celibacy could more easily be preserved than it can in others; or if the Constitution of Mankind varied according to the Temporal Interests of any one private Church.]

What we have hitherto said, shews, That the Authentical Monuments of the Council of *Nice* are the Confession of Faith, with the Anathematism subjoined to it, the Letter of the Synod to the *Egyptians*, the Decree concerning *Easter*, and the Twenty Canons. I do not think that there ever were any other Acts of this Council[1], since they were unknown to all the ancient Historians. There

[1] *I do not think that there ever were any other Acts of this Council.*] If there had been any, St. *Athanasius* would have sent them to his Friend, who desired of him the History of the Council of *Nice*, or he would have

The *Councils.*

is a Latin Letter of this Synod to St. *Sylveſter*, extant, but it is ſuppoſititious [m], which has no Authority, and which has all the Marks of Forgery, that any writing can have, as well as the pretended Anſwer of St. *Sylveſter* [n]. Neither is that Council genuine, which is ſaid to have been aſſembled at *Rome* by St. *Sylveſter* for the confirmation of the Council of *Nice*. The Canons of this Council are alſo Forged [o], which contain Rules contrary to the Practice of that time, and which it had been impoſſible to obſerve.

Conſtantine ſent a Letter to the Catholick Church, which is inſtead of a Synodical Letter of the Council, becauſe by this Letter he publiſhes what was decided concerning *Eaſter*. He ſays nothing of the cauſe of the *Arians* and *Meletians*, becauſe that particularly concerned the *Egyptians* to whom the Council gave an account of it. He condemned *Arius* and the *Arians*: He ſent this Heretick into baniſhment with *Secundus* and *Theonas*, who would not ſubſcribe the Decrees of the Synod; and the Council ending happily in the Month of *Auguſt*, in the Year 325. at the beginning of the Second Year of his Reign, he gave the Biſhops a noble Entertainment, and ſent them home loaded with Preſents, after he had exhorted them to Unity.

bid him read them: But he never did it, and he gives him an account of his own, of what was done in the Council. There is a Paſſage cited out of St. *Athanaſius*, to prove that he acknowledged other Acts of this Council. 'Tis taken out of the Book of Synods, where mention is made in the Verſion of it, of the Acts of the Council of *Nice*. But in the Greek it is only τὰ τῶν πατέρων, *which has been written by the Fathers*; and 'tis plain that he ſpeaks in this place of the Confeſſion of Faith. And that which farther ſhews that there never were any Acts of the Council of *Nice*, is, that the Fathers of the Council themſelves, in their Letter to the *Egyptians*, ſay, that their Arch-Biſhop *Alexander*, ſhould inform them particularly of all that paſſed in the Synod. In a word, neither *Ruffinus*, nor *Socrates*, nor *Theodoret*, nor any ancient Hiſtorian, had ever ſeen or known theſe Acts. St. *Jerom* ſays, that he had read the Acts of the Council of *Nice*, but he means only the Creed, the Canons, and the Subſcriptions. The Acts which *Gelaſius Cyzicenus* attributes to *Dalmatius* were made ſince the Council, and taken out of *Euſebius*, *Theodoret*, *Socrates*, *Sozomen*, and other Hiſtorians.

[m] *The Letter of the Council to St.* Sylveſter *is ſuppoſit titious.*] The Stile of it is barbarous and intricate. It begins with this Period which has no ſence: *Gloriam corroborata de divinis myſteriis. Eccleſiaſticæ utilitatis quæ ad robur pertinent Eccleſiæ Catholicæ & Apoſtolicæ ad ſedem tuam Romanam explanata, & de Græco redacta ſcribere conſitemur*; and afterwards, *Nunc itaque ad veſtræ ſedis argumentum accurrimus roborari*, and ſo on. It is all made up of ſuch kind of ſtuff, the date is ridiculous, wherein the Conſuls are called *Sovereigns*, an Epithete never given to them, and the Letter is Dated Five or Six Days after the Opening of the Council.

[n] *The Anſwer of St.* Sylveſter.] The Stile is like that of the former Letter; it ſuppoſes that St. *Sylveſter* added ſomething to the Council of *Nice*, it mentions the Cycle of *Victorinus*, who lived long after St. *Sylveſter*. The Date of the Conſuls alſo is falſe.

[o] *The Canons of this Council are alſo forged.*] The Inſcription of this Council diſcovers its Impoſture: There 'tis ſaid, that the Council was held in the preſence of *conſtantine*, in the City of *Rome*; but *Conſtantine* came not to *Rome* that Year. 'Tis alſo obſerved, that it conſiſted of 275 Biſhops: Who can think that *Sylveſter* aſſembled ſo numerous a Synod, and yet that it ſhould be unknown to all Antiquity? Why is it not mentioned in ſome ancient Author? The Firſt Canon concerning the time of *Eaſter* is Non-ſence. The Second is yet more unintelligible: Theſe are the Words of it; *Ut unuſquiſque Epiſcopus vediens ad Parochiam ſuam, compaginem ſalutationis plebi tuæ innoteſcat.* Thus the Stile of it is as barbarous as is poſſible. The Third Canon forbids the Clergy to appear before Secular Judges for any Cauſe whatſoever. This is contrary to the Diſcipline of that time. The Fourth declares, That thoſe who would enter into Holy Orders, ſhould paſs through all the Degrees, and be One Year Porters, Twenty Years Readers, Ten Years Exorciſts, Five Years Acolyths, as many Years Sub-deacons, and yet as many Deacons, and afterwards Prieſts, and that they cannot be Biſhops till the end of Six Years more; from whence it would follow, that none could be Ordained Biſhops till they were more than 60 Years old; which is ridiculous and contrary to the Practice of the Ancient Church.

Of the pretended COUNCIL *of* Antioch *againſt* Euſtathius.

Of *Antioch* againſt *Euſtathius*, 330.

IN this Council which was held in 330. *Euſebius* of *Nicomedia*, and thoſe of his Faction, depos'd *Euſtathius*, after the manner which we related, when we gave an Account of the Life and Writings of this Biſhop, and they choſe in his room *Paulinus* Biſhop of *Tyre*. 'Tis probable that in this Council they depos'd *Aſclepas* Biſhop of *Gaza*, and condemned *Eutropius* of *Adrianople*. However this be, this Council has not left any Monument in Writing.

Of the SYNOD *of* Cæſarea.

Of *Cæſarea*, 334.

ST. *Athanaſius* was cited to a Council held at *Cæſarea* in *Paleſtine*, in the Year 334. but he did not appear, and there is nothing known of this Synod.

Of the pretended COUNCIL *of* Tyre *againſt St.* Athanaſius.

Of *Tyre*, againſt St. *Athanaſius*, 335.

THE Emperour called a Council in the Year 335. in the City of *Tyre*, to judge the Cauſe of St. *Athanaſius*. He wrote a Letter to the Biſhops of this Synod, wherein he exhorts them to ſettle Peace and Concord in the Church: He recommended it to them to judge juſtly and without Prejudice, and threatned thoſe with baniſhment who would not appear at the Council. He ſent thither Count *Dionyſius*, with Guards to hinder any Diſorder. This Council conſiſted of Sixty Eaſtern Biſhops, or thereabouts. St. *Athanaſius* came thither with Forty Biſhops of *Egypt*; he was forced to appear there as a Criminal. Several Accuſations were propoſed which could not be proved, and ſo they inſiſted upon that of the Chalice, which they alledged he had cauſed to be broken in

Maræotis

Maræotis by his Prieſt *Macarius*. The Council ſent Deputies to the places to inform themſelves of the Truth or Falſhood of this Story. But ſince the Deputies were the greateſt Enemies of St. *Athanaſius*, who could not fail of returning their Information to his Diſadvantage, he thought himſelf obliged to retire, and appeal to the Emperour. Some time after, the Deputies returning with an Information, which they had made as they would themſelves, the Synod pronounced againſt him a Sentence of Condemnation and Depoſition. The Councils.

Of the SYNOD *of* Jeruſalem.

THE Synod of *Tyre* was not yet finiſhed, when the Emperour ſent a Letter to the Biſhops, wherein he ordered them to come preſently to *Jeruſalem*, to make there the Dedication of a Magnificent Church which he had built there. They obeyed the Emperour's Orders, and having perform'd this Ceremony with much Pomp, they made a Synod there, wherein they received *Arius*, &c. I know very well that *Valeſius* affirms, that *Arius* was then dead, and that the Council received only the Followers of *Arius*. But St. *Athanaſius* ſays plainly, in his Book of the Synods of *Ariminum* and *Seleucia*, That *Arius* and his Followers were received in this Council. We have in St. *Athanaſius* the Synodical Letter of this Council, written to the *Egyptians* and *Alexandrians*, wherein they write to them, that they had received *Arius* and his Party, after they were ſatisfied that they held very Orthodox Doctrines. Of *Jeruſalem*, 335.

Of the COUNCIL *of* Conſtantinople *againſt* Marcellus *of* Ancyra.

THE Council of *Jeruſalem* being ended, the Biſhops came to *Conſtantinople*, where they held alſo a Synod, wherein they depoſed *Marcellus* of *Ancyra*, as convicted by his Writings of renewing the Errour of *Paulus Samoſatenus* and *Sabellius*. He had been already accuſed of this Hereſy in the Council of *Jeruſalem*, and he had promiſed that he would retract it, and burn his Book; but refuſing to do it at *Conſtantinople*, he was there condemned and depoſed. Of *Conſtantinople*, againſt *Marcellus* of *Ancyra*, 336.

Of the COUNCIL *of* Conſtantinople *againſt* Paul *Biſhop of that City.*

AFter the Death of *Conſtantine*, *Paul* of *Conſtantinople*, who had been baniſhed, returned to *Conſtantinople*, according to the permiſſion which the *Cæſars* had given to the exiled Biſhops to return from their Baniſhment. But *Euſebius* of *Nicomedia* who had a mind to uſurp the See of this great City, and the Biſhops of his Party being Enemies to *Paul*, becauſe he was a Defender of St. *Athanaſius*, ſtirred up againſt him his Prieſt *Macedonius*, who accuſed him of leading a Life unbecoming the Prieſthood, and they preſently aſſembled a Synod at *Conſtantinople*, wherein they depoſed him, and choſe in his room *Euſebius* of *Nicomedia*. Of *Conſtantinople*, againſt *Paul* Biſhop of that City, 338.

Of the COUNCIL *of* Alexandria, *in behalf of St.* Athanaſius.

ST. *Athanaſius* being returned from *Triers*, whither *Conſtantine* had baniſhed him, re-entred upon the poſſeſſion of the See of *Alexandria*, and notwithſtanding the Condemnation of the Council of *Tyre*, was acknowledged as their Lawful Biſhop; yet being oppoſed a-new by the *Euſebians*, under the Empire of *Conſtantius*, he cauſed a Council of a 100 *Egyptian* Biſhops, or thereabouts, to aſſemble in the Year 340. who wrote in his Favour to all the Biſhops of the World, and cleared him from the Accuſations that were laid againſt him. This Letter is extant in the Second Apology of St. *Athanaſius*. Of *Alexandria*, in behalf of St. *Athanaſius*, 340.

Of the COUNCIL *of* Rome, *under Pope* Julius, *in behalf of St.* Athanaſius.

THE *Euſebians* deſiring to obtain the Favour of Pope *Julius*, ſent Deputies to him about the end of the Year 339. to requeſt of him a Council, to judge the cauſe of St. *Athanaſius*, and declared to him at the ſame time, That if he pleaſed, they would make him judge of their Difference. *Julius* anſwered them, That it was juſt a Council ſhould be aſſembled in what place they pleaſed; That there they might propoſe their Accuſations againſt St. *Athanaſius*, and anſwer what he had to ſay againſt them. The *Euſebians* without waiting for this Synod, where they could not be Judges, any more than St. *Athanaſius*, aſſembled often-times at *Antioch*, where they ordained one *Gregory*, to fill the See of *Alexandria*, and ſent him to ſeize upon it by main Force. St. *Athanaſius* underſtanding what they had done, retired to *Rome*, where he was kindly received by Pope *Julius*, who wrote immediately to all the Eaſtern Biſhops, that they ſhould come to *Rome* on the Day which he appointed there to appear before the Synod, which was to be aſſembled about the end of the Year 341. The *Euſebians* never appeared, and detained the Pope's Legates who brought this Letter, till the Month of *January* in the next Year. However, The Biſhops of *Italy* aſſembled in a Church of *Rome*, and examined the Cauſe of St. *Athanaſius*, and that of *Marcellus* of *Ancyra*. All the Accuſations which had been alledged againſt the former were propoſed, and after he had proved them all to be falſe, he was declared Innocent. *Marcellus* of *Ancyra* perſwaded the Biſhops that his Faith was Orthodox, and declared that his Books were miſ-underſtood, and ſo was acquitted alſo. At laſt, the Council prayed *Julius* to write to the Biſhops of the Eaſt; which he did in the Year 342. Of *Rome*, in behalf of St. *Athanaſius*, 341.

after

The *Councils.*

after the return of his Legates. We have often already ſpoken of this Letter of *Julius*, and therefore it is not neceſſary to ſay any thing more of it here.

Of the COUNCILS *held at* Antioch.

Of *Antioch*, 341, 342.

THE Eaſtern Biſhops having quitted the Deſign they had of appearing before a Council of the Weſt, or of taking the Pope for Judge of their differences with St. *Athanaſius*, aſſembled at *Antioch*, in the beginning of the Year 341. and there held a Synod of Ninety Biſhops or thereabouts. The occaſion of this Synod was the Celebration of the Dedication of the Church of *Antioch*. But as it was the Cuſtom of the Biſhops, when they were aſſembled to make ſome Eccleſiaſtical Rules, ſo theſe thought fit to compoſe New Confeſſions of Faith, and to make Canons concerning the Diſcipline of the Church.

In the Firſt of theſe Confeſſions of Faith, they declare, that they are not followers of *Arius*, and that they have no other Faith but what they received by Tradition; that they reſtore *Arius*, becauſe they found that his Doctrines were Orthodox, but that they do not follow him. After this Proteſtation there followed a Confeſſion of Faith, wherein they do not uſe the Word *Conſubſtantial, but they declare, That they believe in one only Son of God, coexiſtent with his Father who begot him, by whom all things were made; and in the Holy Spirit.* This was the Firſt Confeſſion of Faith that was made after that of the Council of *Nice*; and it was quickly followed by a Second made by the ſame Biſhops in the ſame place, wherein they enlarge much more upon the Attributes of Jeſus Chriſt: They ſay, *That he was born of the Father before all Worlds, That he is God of God, Whole of Whole, a perfect Being*, &c. *That he is the perfect Image and exact Reſemblance of the Divinity, of the Subſtance, of the Will, the Power and Glory of the Father.* They add, That the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, are not Three different Names, but Three Subſtances, and that they are one in Will. They pronounce an *Anathema* againſt thoſe who ſay, *That there was an Age or a Moment before the Generation of the World*, or who ſay, *That he is a Creature formed like other Creatures.* Theſe expreſſions of *being one by Will, of being a Creature like others*, and ſome others like them, which are in this Confeſſion of Faith, render it very much ſuſpected.

For this reaſon perhaps it diſpleaſed ſome Biſhops of the Synod, which obliged *Theophronius* Biſhop of *Tyana* to make a Third Confeſſion, which was approved by all, wherein they profeſs to believe in Jeſus Chriſt, *The only Son of God, God, the Word, the Power and Wiſdom, by which all things were created, who was begotten of the Father before all Worlds, perfect God of perfect God, who exiſts in the Father Hypoſtatically.* This Confeſſion of Faith has nothing that could render it ſuſpected, but only the omiſſion of the Word *Conſubſtantial.* Theſe are the Three Confeſſions of Faith which were made in this Council.

As to what concerns the Diſcipline of the Church, theſe Biſhops ſuppoſing that St. *Athanaſius* had been fairly judged in the Council of *Tyre*, though they had no more to do but ordain a Biſhop in his room. At firſt they caſt their Eyes upon *Euſebius* of *Edeſſa*, a Diſciple of *Euſebius* of *Cæſarea*, and of *Patrophilus* of *Scythopolis*: But this Prudent Man refuſing it, leſt he ſhould be affronted by the People of *Alexandria* who loved St. *Athanaſius*, they choſe *Gregory*, and prayed the Emperour to ſend him with a ſtrong Force to *Alexandria*, to take Poſſeſſion of that Church.

Afterwards they made 25 Canons concerning the Diſcipline of the Church, whoſe Authority has been Diſputed, upon the account of thoſe who made them. St. *Chryſoſtom* and Pope *Innocent* reject them, as being compoſed by *Arians*; yet they were inſerted into the Code of the Univerſal Church, and cited in the Council of *Chalcedon*, where ſome Canons of this Council of *Antioch* are quoted; and ſince that time they have had a place in all the Collections of Eccleſiaſtical Canons. And indeed, they contain the Wiſeſt and the Juſteſt Rules that ever were obſerved in the ancient Church; which has made ſome Authors believe, That part of them at leaſt were made by another Synod; but their Conjectures will not hold, and it is evident, that the 4th 12th and 15th were made by this Synod, ſince they are the ſame which St. *Chryſoſtom* and Pope *Innocent* reject, becauſe they were made by *Arians*. This being evident, ſay I, 'tis very probable, that all the other Canons were made by the ſame Council, eſpecially ſince in all the Collections, they are attributed to one Synod of *Antioch* only, which was held ſoon after the Council of *Nice*.

But we muſt carefully diſtinguiſh this Council of *Antioch*, of which we have juſt now ſpoken, that was held in the Year 341. from another Synod made up of a part of the ſame Biſhops, who aſſembled in the beginning of the Year 342. for this laſt was held after St. *Athanaſius* was acquitted, when the Biſhops of the Eaſt ſent back the Pope's Legates, after they had been detained till *January*, in the Year 342. 'Twas in the name of this Synod that they wrote a Letter to *Julius*, wherein they excuſe themſelves, for not being able to come to the Synod of *Rome* which he had aſſembled, both upon the account of the War with the *Perſians*, and becauſe of the ſhortneſs of the time between the delivery of *Julius*'s Letter to them, and the Day which he had ſignified to them for the meeting of the Synod. They took it ill that *Julius* had written to them all alone, and had addreſſed his Letter only to *Euſebius*; but above all they complained, that he had taken into his Communion, *Athanaſius* and *Marcellus*, who were condemned and depoſed.

Probably 'twas in this laſt Synod that the Fourth Confeſſion of Faith was compoſed, which is produced by St. *Athanaſius*. It comes very near to that of the Council of *Nice*, ſaving only that it omits the Word *Conſubſtantial.* They made it, as St. *Athanaſius* obſerves, to ſend it into the Weſt to the Emperour *Conſtans*.

The

The 1ſt Canon of the Council of *Antioch* confirms the Decree of the Council of *Nice*, concerning the Celebration of *Eaſter*.

The 2d condemns thoſe who would never communicate, and who have an averſion to the receiving of the Euchariſt, and forbids the holding Communion with thoſe that are excommunicated, under the Penalty of being excommunicated themſelves.

The Councils.

The 3d forbids Clergy-men to forſake their Churches to abide in others, and ordains that he who will not return, being recall'd by his own Biſhop, ſhall be depoſed, and that the Biſhop who detains him ſhall be puniſhed by the Synod.

The 4th ordains, That in caſe a Biſhop being depoſed by a Synod, and a Prieſt or a Deacon being depoſed by his Biſhop, ſhall dare to diſcharge the Functions of their Offices before they be reſtored, they can never hope to be reſtored in another Synod; That they ſhall not be permitted to defend themſelves; and that all thoſe ſhall be excommunicated who have communicated with them, and knew the Judgment that was given againſt them.

The 5th is, That if a Prieſt or a Deacon deſpiſing his Biſhop, ſeparate from the Church, and make private Meetings, ſetting up a New Altar, and will not obey his Biſhop, when he ſhall be admoniſh'd and call'd back again two or three times, he can no longer hope to continue in his Office, and if he continue to trouble the Church, the Aid of the Secular Arm may be implored to chaſtiſe this ſeditious Perſon.

The 6th forbids the receiving of an excommunicated Perſon, until he has been reſtored to Communion by his Biſhop.

The 7th ordains, That no Perſon ſhall be received into Communion, who has not Letters of Peace, *i. e.* Letters teſtifying that he is not ſeparated from the Communion of the Church.

The 8th declares, That theſe Letters cannot be given by the Prieſts who are in the Country Villages, or at leaſt that they cannot addreſs them but only to their neighbouring Biſhops; but that the Suffragans may grant them.

The 9th ordains, That the Biſhops of the Province reverence their Metropolitan, and do nothing of conſequence without him, but only take care of the Dioceſs, to ordain Prieſts and Deacons, and to regulate the particular Affairs of their Church; but to do nothing more without the Metropolitan, who ought likewiſe to do no conſiderable thing without taking the Advice of the Biſhops of the Province.

The 10th regulates the Rights of Suffragans. In enjoyns them not to exalt themſelves above their Rank; to take care of the Churches which are ſubject to them, without meddling with the Affairs of others. It permits them in their own Churches to ordain Readers, Sub-Deacons and Exorciſts, but it forbids them to ordain Prieſts and Deacons, tho' they have even received Impoſition of Epiſcopal Hands, that is, tho' they have been ordained Biſhops. Laſtly, it ordains, That the Suffragan ſhould be ordained by the Biſhop of the City.

The 11th ordains, That in caſe a Biſhop, or a Prieſt, or another Clergyman addreſs to the Emperour without the Conſent of the Biſhops of the Province, and chiefly of the Metropolitan, he ought to be excommunicated and depoſed; but if he has any Affairs which oblige him to wait upon the Emperour, he may do it with the conſent of the Metropolitan and and the Biſhops of the Province, which ſhall be expreſſed in the Letters which they give him.

The 12th forbids Clergymen, who have been depoſed by their Biſhop, to addreſs themſelves to the Emperour, to obtain Reſtitution; and takes from them who ſhall do it all hopes of being reſtored.

The 13th forbids Biſhops to paſs from one Province to another to ordain there, unleſs they be called by the Metropolitan of the Province, and nulls every thing which ſhall be done by one Biſhop of a Province.

The 14th ſays, That in caſe the Biſhops of one Province cannot agree about judging of a Biſhop, the Metropolitan may call the Biſhops of the neighbouring Province, to judge and decide this Controverſy.

But it is ordained in the 15th, That if a Biſhop is condemned unanimouſly by all the Biſhops of the Province, he cannot be judged a-new, and that the Sentence of the Synod of the Province ought to remain firm.

The 16th declares, That if a Biſhop who has no Biſhoprick, invade a vacant Church, without the Authority of a Synod, he ought to be driven away from it, tho' the People of the Church whereof he is Biſhop ſhould chooſe him. It adds, That a Synod cannot be compleat and lawful without the preſence of the Metropolitan.

The 17th declares, That if any being ordained Biſhop, refuſe to accept of the Biſhoprick, he is to continue excommunicated, until ſuch time as he accepts it, or that the Synod of the Province has otherwiſe determined about it: But if it be none of his Fault, that he does not go to his Church, but becauſe the People of the Church will not receive him, it is ordained in the 18th Canon, that he ſhall have the Honour and Place of a Biſhop, upon condition that he do not any wiſe trouble the Church wherein he ſhall continue.

The 19th forbids the Ordination of a Biſhop without a Synod, and without the preſence of the Metropolitan. It adds, That 'tis convenient that all the Biſhops of the Province ſhould be preſent at this Synod with him; but if this cannot be done, yet they muſt be Summoned to it, and ſeveral of them muſt give their Suffrages, either in the Synod, or by Letters: That if the Ordination be made otherwiſe, it ſhall not be good; but if ſome particular Perſons out of a Spirit of Contradiction conteſt it after it is thus made, the Suffrages of the major part ſhould carry it.

The 20th ordains, That every Year two Synods ſhall be held in a Province; *viz.* the Firſt, the

The *Councils.*

Third Week after *Eaſter*, and the Second in the Month of *July*, that ſo Prieſts, Deacons, and in ſhort, all thoſe who pretend that their Biſhop has done them any Injury, may have recourſe to the Synod. It forbids alſo to keep theſe Synods without the Metropolitans.

The 21ſt forbids the Tranſlations of Biſhops.

The 22d forbids a Biſhop to meddle within the Dioceſs of another, and to make any Ordination there.

The 23d forbids a Biſhop to ordain his Succeſſor.

The 24th provides for the preſervation of the Church-Lands: It gives the management of them to the Biſhops; but it ordains, that the Prieſts ſhall take cognizance of the Lands of the Church, leſt after the Death of the Biſhop his Heirs ſeize upon them.

The Laſt regulates the uſes to which the Biſhop ſhould apply the Revenue of the Church: It ordains, That he ſhall diſpoſe of them, for the good of the Poor and of Strangers; and that he ſhall be content with neceſſaries, according to the command of the Apoſtle St. *Paul*; That he ſhall not keep the remainder to himſelf; That he ſhall not give it to his Brethren or to his Children, but that he ſhall diſtribute it according to the Advice of the Prieſts and Deacons; That if he does not do it, he ſhall be accountable to the Synod of the Province; and Laſtly, That if the Prieſts and the Biſhop be accuſed of conſpiring together, to appropriate to themſelves the Eccleſiaſtical Revenues, the Synod ſhall examine this Accuſation, and ſhall puniſh them if it be found true.

Of the COUNCIL *of* Antioch.

Of *Antioch*, 345.

THE *Euſebians* aſſembled alſo at *Antioch*, about the end of the Year 345. or the beginning of the next Year, and there made a large Confeſſion of Faith, which they ſent into the Weſt, by *Eudoxus*, *Martyrius*, and *Macedonius*. 'Tis quoted as well as the others by St. *Athanaſius*. There they make profeſſion of believing in Jeſus Chriſt, the only Son of God, begotten of his Father before all Worlds, God of God, Light of Light; and they condemn thoſe that ſay, that he is not God, or that he was made of nothing, and thoſe that ſay, There are Three Gods, and thoſe that confound the Divine Perſons. This Confeſſion is Catholick, tho' the Term *Conſubſtantial* is not found in it.

Of the COUNCIL *of* Milan.

Of *Milan*, 346.

THE Biſhops of the Weſt being aſſembled at this Council to find out ſome means of determining the Differences of the Biſhops which troubled the Peace of the Church, the Deputies of the Eaſtern Biſhops came thither, and propoſed that large Confeſſion of Faith laſt mentioned to them: The Weſtern Biſhops for their part declared, That the *Nicene* Creed muſt be approved, and *Arius* condemned. This Propoſition provoked the Deputies of the Biſhops of the Eaſt who retired in great anger. *Urſacius* and *Valens* were received into Communion in this Council, after they had preſented a *Manifeſto*, wherein they condemn the Hereſies of *Arius* and *Photinus*. The Error of the latter was alſo condemned in this Synod. This Council was held in the Year 346. For, Firſt, It was aſſembled when the Deputies of the Council of *Antioch* came into the Weſt, and brought with them their long Confeſſion of Faith; and St. *Athanaſius* ſays, That they did this Three Years after the Firſt Deputation, which they made about the end of the Year 342. Secondly, *Liberius* ſays, in his Letter to *Conſtantius*, compoſed in the Year 354. That it was then Eight Years ſince the Legates who came from the Eaſt, withdrew from the Council of *Milan* in great diſcontent. Laſtly, St. *Athanaſius* ſays, that *Conſtantius* commanded him to appear at *Milan*, in the Fourth Year of his Abode in the Weſt; and he came in 341. and therefore this Synod was held about the end of the Year 345. or the beginning of the Year 346.

Of the COUNCIL *of* Cologne *againſt* Euphratas.

Of *Cologne*, againſt *Euphratas*, 346.

THere is commonly placed in the Year 346. a Synod which is thought to have been held at *Cologne*, and wherein 'tis ſaid that *Euphrates* Biſhop of this City was depoſed, for denying the Divinity of Jeſus Chriſt. The Acts of this Council are extant in the Second Tome of the Councils, *p.* 615. But I find there is great probability that theſe Acts were forged, and that this Hiſtory is falſe: For this *Euphratas*, who is ſaid to have been depoſed in this Synod, in the Year 346. *i. e.* in the next Year after the Conſulſhip of *Amantius* and *Albinus*, was preſent the Year after at the Council of *Sardica* as a Catholick Biſhop, and was alſo one of the Deputies whom the Council ſent into the Eaſt, as appears by the Teſtimonies of St. *Athanaſius* and *Theodoret*. Is it poſſible that a Biſhop, who was a little before convicted of denying the Divinity of the Son, and then depoſed, ſhould be preſent at the Council of *Sardica* among the Catholick Biſhops, and ſhould be choſen for a Deputy by the whole Council? Some ſay, that this Council was held after that of *Sardica*; but this Hypotheſis which is contrary to the Date of the Acts, may alſo be eaſily deſtroyed: For *Maximinus* of *Triers* who is thought to have preſided at this Council, as the Acts teſtify, died ſoon after the Council of *Sardica*, ſince it is certain, by the Teſtimony of St. *Athanaſius*, in his Epiſtle to thoſe that lead a Monaſtick Life, That *Paulinus* the Succeſſor of *Maximinus*, was Biſhop of *Triers* when *Urſacius* and *Valens* retracted, *i. e.* in the Year 349. But from the Year 347 to 349. *Euphratas* was always out of *France*, and conſequently it is impoſſible that he ſhould be Depoſed by *Maximinus* of *Triers*.

There is alſo another Argument which proves the Acts of the Council of *Cologne* to be forged. *Servatus* Biſhop of *Tongres*, ſays, that he reproved *Euphratas* in the preſence of St. *Athanaſius*. Now this

this Bishop could not have seen St. *Athanasius*, but upon Two Occasions. First, when this Saint was at *Triers*; and Secondly, when *Servatus* was sent into the East by *Magnentius*: But he could not reprove *Euphratas* in the presence of St. *Athanasius*, neither when this Father was at *Triers*, since *Euphratas* could not be accus'd of this Error before the Council of *Sardica*, nor when he was sent Deputy into the East; for then *Maximinus* of *Triers*, who is said to have presided at the Council of *Cologne*, was dead, as we have just now shown. The Councils.

The Subscriptions of these Acts do also plainly discover their Forgery: For there you may read the Names of *Desiderius* of *Langres*, and of *Simplicianus* of *Autun*, who lived in the Fifth Age of the Church; there is also the Name of *Discolus* Bishop of *Rheims*, who is not to be found in the Catalogue of the Bishops of that Church. Lastly, *Severinus* who is said to have been Ordained in the room of *Euphratas*, was still alive in the Year 402. according to the Testimony of *Sulpitius Severus*. 'Tis true the Names of *Desiderius* and *Discolus* are amongst the Names of the Bishops of *France*, in the Subscriptions of the Letter of the Council of *Sardica*; but 'tis probable that he that forged these Acts, took from thence these Names, and added to them the Names of the Bishopricks. However it be, these Acts were unknown to all the ancient Historians, who make no mention of this History, nor of the Council of *Cologne*. The First who cited them is the Author of the Acts of *Servatus* of *Tongres*, which the Learned now own to be suppositious. After him *Servatus Lupus* mentions them in the Life of *Maximius*: *Hogerius* Abbot of *Lobbes*, and some Modern Authors mention them; but their Authority is of little weight in so ancient a Matter as this.

Of the COUNCIL *of* Sardica.

THE Emperours *Constantius* and *Constans* desiring to restore Peace to the Church, called a Synod of the Eastern and Western Bishops at *Sardica*, in the Year 347 [a]. Thither came 100 Bishops from the West, and 73 Bishops from the East [b]. But those of the East having declared to those of the West, that they would not be present at the Council, unless St. *Athanasius*, *Marcellus*, and the other Bishops that were condemned, were excluded from Ecclesiastical Communion, and the Western Bishops refusing to accept of this Condition, the Council was divided, and the Eastern Bishops withdrew. Those of the West, of whom *Hosius* was the Head and President [c], did notwithstanding hold a Synod in their absence, to treat of the Faith, and of the Accusations charged upon St. *Athanasius*, and the other Catholick Bishops; and to make Canons concerning the Dicipline of the Church. In Matters of Faith, they all Agreed, that they must not make any new Creed, but must hold to that of the Council of of *Nice*: Yet some particular Persons would have made a new Creed, in imitation of the Bishops of the East, but all the Council disapproved their Design. The Creed then drawn up is preserved by *Theodoret*, *Ch.* 8. of the 2d *B.* of his History. Afterwards the Council took into their consideration, the personal Accusations against St. *Athanasius* and *Marcellus* of *Ancyra*. The First justified himself and was acquitted; the Second having alledged that *Eusebius* and his Adversaries took for Affirmations what he propos'd as Objections, was also restored. *Asclepas* Bishop of *Gaza* was restored; *Theodorus* of *Heraclea*, *Narcissus* of *Neronius*, *Stephen* of *Antioch*, *George* of *Laodicea*, *Menophantus* of *Ephesus*, *Ursacius* of *Singidunum*, *Valens* of *Mursa*, and *Patrophilus* of *Scythopolis*, were Excommunicated and Deposed. Of *Sardica*, 347.

Lastly, The Council produced Twenty Canons, and wrote Three Letters. The First which was addressed to all the Bishops, is to the Church of *Alexandria* by St. *Athanasius*, and by St. *Hilary* in his Fragments; the Second is to *Julius*, which is in St. *Hilary* in the same place, and the Third produced by St. *Athanasius*. There was also a long Letter to the Emperours, which was in St. *Hilary*'s Book, but is not now in his Fragments, nor any where else.

On the other side, the Eastern Bishops who withdrew from *Sardica*, assembled at *Philippopolis*, and wrote a Letter from thence, which they dated from *Sardica*, addressed to all the Bishops of the World. There they cry out upon St. *Athanasius*, *Marcellus* of *Ancyra*, and *Asclepas*, and make them

[a] *The Emperours* Constantius *and* Constans *called a Council at* Sardica *in the Year* 347.] *Socrates B.* II. *Ch.* 20. and *Sozomen B.* III. *Ch.* 11. testify that it was called in this Year. St. *Athanasius* confirms this Epocha, because he says, that it was held a Year after the Council of *Milan*. It appears by the express Testimonies of St. *Athanasius*, that this Council was called by the Emperours. *Hosius* says the same thing in his Letter to the Emperour, and the Historians, *Socrates*, *Sozomen*, *Theodoret* and *Sulpitius*. *Severus* follow this Opinion. *Socrates* indeed says, the Bishops of the East complain'd, that *Julius* had allowed too little time for coming to the Synod; but he confounds what they say about the Council of *Rome*, with what concerns the Council of *Sardica*.

[b] *Thither came* 100 *Bishops from the West, and* 73 *from the East.*] St. *Athanasius* in his Letter to those that lead a Monastick Life, says, that this Council consisted of 170 Bishops or thereabouts. Now it appears by the Subscriptions of the Letter of the Bishops of the East, that these Bishops from the East were 73. St. *Athanasius* indeed says, That the Letter of the Council of *Sardica* containing his Absolution, was signed by 300 Bishops, but this is to be understood not only of those who were present at the Council, but also of those who subscribed after the Council was over, to its Synodical Letter.

[c] *Of whom* Hosius *was Head and President.*] The Name of this Bishop is the First in the Subscriptions which are in St. *Athanasius*, who says, That he was the Head and President of all the Councils where he was present. *Theodoret* says expressly, That he presided in this Council, *B.* II. *Ch.* 15. of his History, as well as *Sozomen*, *B.* 3. *Ch.* 11. and the Council of *Chalcedon* in their Discourse to *Marcianus*, Tome IV. of the Councils, *p.* 825. *Petrus de Marca* has affirmed, That he presided in this Council, in the Name of the Pope, but his Opinion is not founded on any solid Argument. The Pope's Legates signed after him, and declared, That they only represented his Person: *Julius Roma per Archidamum & Philozenum Presbyteros.*

pass

The *Councils.*

paſs for wicked Rogues. They declare, That they do not join with the Biſhops of the Weſt, becauſe they had received into their Communion thoſe Biſhops who were depoſed in the Eaſt, and upon the account of this pretended violation of their Authority, they excommunicate *Hoſius*, *Protogenes*, *Gaudentius*, *Maximinus* and *Julius*. They complain that the whole World was turned upſide down, and the whole Church diſturbed for the ſake of One or Two wicked Fellows. They accuſe the Biſhops of the Weſt of Arrogance, and reprove them for endeavouring to eſtabliſh a new Law, to give themſelves the liberty of examining a-new what had been determined in the Eaſt. They obſerve that the ancient Diſcipline of the Church is contrary to this Practice, and that the Judgments given in the Eaſt ought to be confirmed in the Weſt, as thoſe of the Weſt were received in the Eaſt. They prove this Rule by ſeveral Examples. Laſtly, they add to this Letter a Confeſſion of Faith, wherein they make profeſſion of Believing *in the Son of God, begotten of the Father before all Worlds, God of God, Light of Light, who created all things*; and they condemn thoſe who ſay, *That the Son was made of nothing, or that he is of another Subſtance than the Divine Subſtance, and that he is not of God, or that there was a time when he was not the Son of God*; as alſo, they anathematize thoſe who ſay, *That there are Three Gods, or that Jeſus Chriſt is not God, or that there is not one Chriſt only the Son of God, or that he is the ſame Perſon with the Father or the Holy Spirit.* This Letter which is preſerved in the Fragments of St. *Hilary*, is addreſſed to *Gregory* of *Alexandria*, to *Amphion* of *Nicomedia*, and to ſeveral other Biſhops, and among the reſt to *Donatus* of *Carthage*. For which reaſon the *Donatiſts* urge it in the Conference of *Carthage*, and the Catholick Biſhops being ignorant of this Hiſtory, ſay, That the Council of *Sardica* was made up of *Arian* Biſhops. Some ſay, That *Paul* of *Conſtantinople* was reſtored in the Council of *Sardica*, others who follow *Epiphanius*, ſay, That *Photinus* was condemned there. They are both miſtaken, for *Paul* was dead, and *Photinus* was not condemned in this Synod.

I have only now to give an Abridgment of the ſubject Matter of the Canons of the Council of *Sardica*. Theſe Canons were not compoſed as thoſe of other Councils in the form of Laws; but they are propoſitions made by *Hoſius* and ſome other Biſhops, which are approved by all the Synod.

In the 1ſt *Hoſius* ſays, *That they ought wholly to aboliſh a wicked Cuſtom and pernicious Abuſe, by hindering Biſhops to paſs from one See to another.* And having declared that Avarice and Ambition are the only cauſes of theſe Tranſlations, becauſe there is no Example of a Biſhop who ever quitted a great Biſhoprick to take a little one. He propoſes for a ſevere puniſhment of this Fault, that thoſe who are guilty of it ſhall be excluded from Lay-Communion. And all the Fathers of the Council anſwered, *We agree to it.*

In the 2d Canon *Hoſius* adds, That the ſame Sentence ought to be pronounced againſt thoſe who excuſe themſelves, becauſe they were deſired by the Faithful of their Second Church; and the Synod ordains that it ſhall be ſo.

The three following Canons concern Eccleſiaſtical Deciſions. It had been ordained in the Council of *Antioch*, That the Deciſion of the Council of the Province could not be invalidated, and that if the Biſhops of the Province could not agree, they ſhould call in thoſe of the Neighbouring Province.

The Council of *Sardica* falls foul upon theſe Two Deciſions: For in the Third Canon *Hoſius* propoſes, Firſt, that it ſhould be forbidden to appeal to Judges of a neighbouring Province; and Secondly, he ſays, That for the Honour of the Memory of St. *Peter*, he judged it convenient, with the leave of the Council, to Ordain, That if a Biſhop condemned in his own Country thought himſelf innocent, thoſe who had judged him ſhould write of it to the Biſhop of *Rome*, to enquire whether the Cauſe of the Biſhop accuſed ſhould be examined a-new: That if he, and the Judges whom he ſhould name were of this Opinion, they muſt proceed to a new Deciſion upon the place; but if he did not think fit that the Cauſe ſhould be examined a-new, then the Sentence already paſt muſt ſtand good.

Gaudentius adds in the Fourth Canon, That a Biſhop depoſed by a Synod of the Province, who deſires this new Deciſion, muſt not be expell'd his See, till the Biſhop of *Rome* has determined, whether the Cauſe ought to be determined a-new.

Laſtly, In the 5th Canon, according to the Greek, and the 7th according to the Edition of *Dionyſius Exiguus*, *Hoſius* ſays, That when the Biſhop of *Rome* thinks fit that the Cauſe of a Biſhop ſhould be examined a Second time, he ought to write to the Biſhops next adjoyning to his Province, That they examine the whole Matter with Care and Exactneſs; That he muſt alſo be impowred to ſend Legates in his own Name to this New Synod, unleſs he think it more convenient to leave the judging of the Cauſe to the neighbouring Biſhops of the Province only, without ſending thither his Legates. The Biſhops of the Council approve theſe Propoſitions of *Hoſius* and *Gaudentius*. Theſe three Canons have occaſioned great Diſputes, which would quickly vaniſh, if Men would confine themſelves to the Words of the Council of *Sardica*, which ſufficiently diſcover; Firſt, That the Diſcipline which theſe Fathers eſtabliſh is New; Secondly, That they do not give the Biſhop of *Rome* power to judge the Cauſe of a Biſhop, in his own Tribunal at *Rome*; but they only give him Authority to enquire whether it were well or ill determined; and in caſe that he find it was determined wrong to order a New Deciſion of it in the Country, and by the neighbouring Biſhops of the Province where it was determined, whither he might ſend Legates in his own Name to be preſent, if he thought it convenient. This is the Natural Sence of the three Canons of this Council, which I have explained more at large, in my Second Diſſertation of the Diſcipline of the Church.

The 5th Canon, according to the Edition of *Dionyſius Exiguus* declares, That if there remains but one Biſhop in a Province, and he will not ordain other Biſhops, the Biſhops ought to come to him and joyn with him in ordaining; but if he perſiſt in his unwillingneſs and will not meet them

them for ordaining Biſhops, the neighbouring Biſhops alone may then ordain them without his Conſent. This is the Propoſition of *Hoſius*, to which the Council agreed.

The 6th is, That a Biſhop ought not to be ordained in a Borrough or little City, where a Prieſt is ſufficient, leſt the Dignity of a Biſhop be leſſened.

The following Canons are about the Journeys of Biſhops to Court. *Hoſius* for hindering them to go thither continually, and importune the Emperour by their frequent Petitions, thought fit to ordain,

Firſt, That none of the Biſhops ſhall go to Court, unleſs he be required by the Emperour's Letters.

Secondly, That thoſe who ſhall have Requeſts or Petitions to make for the Poor of their Churches, ſhall only ſend thither a Deacon.

Thirdly, That this Deacon, before he goes to Court, ſhall addreſs himſelf to his Metropolitan, to whom he ſhall make known the occaſion of his Petitions, and of whom he ſhall obtain Letters of Requeſt and Recommendation.

Fourthly, That thoſe who ſhall go to *Rome*, ſhall addreſs themſelves to the Biſhop of that City, who having examined their Petitions, ſhall write of them to Court if he finds them Juſt.

Fifthly, *Gaudentius* adds, That for putting theſe Rules in Execution, the Biſhops which lie upon the Road, ſhall ask the Biſhops whom they ſhall ſee going to Court, and if they find that they have not obſerved the Canons above-mentioned, they ſhall not receive them into their Communion. But becauſe theſe Rules were New, *Hoſius* moderates this Penalty, and ſays, That they muſt firſt make them known to theſe Biſhops, and perſwade them to ſend a Deacon to Court from the place where they ſhall be, and then return to their own Dioceſs. Theſe Propoſitions are approved by the Council, and contained in the Canons 8, 9, 10, 11, 12.

In the 13th *Hoſius* ſays, That he thought it neceſſary to ordain, That Biſhopricks ſhall only be given to thoſe who have diſcharged the Offices of Reader and Deacon, or Prieſt, for a conſiderable time. The Biſhops of the Council approve this Propoſition.

In the 14th *Hoſius* ſays, That it ought to be ordained, that a Biſhop ſhould not continue longer than three Weeks in the Dioceſs of another, and out of his own. All the Biſhops are of this Opinion: But *Hoſius* moderates this Law in the following Canon, in favour of thoſe who have an Eſtate out of their Dioceſs, and who are obliged to continue there more than three Weeks for their Affairs, but he would have them forbidden after this time is ſpent, to go to the great Church of the City, and orders them to be preſent only at the Offering of a Prieſt.

In the 16th *Hoſius* propoſes the renewing of that Law, which forbids a Biſhop to give the Communion to him who is excommunicated by his own Biſhop: And the Biſhops of the Council ſay, That this Rule will preſerve Peace and Concord.

The 17th allows Prieſts and Deacons, who are condemned by their own Biſhop to appeal to the Judgment of the Biſhops of the Province.

In the 18th the Biſhop *Januarius* deſires, that a Biſhop may be forbidden to ſollicite the Clergy of another Biſhop, that he may ordain them in his own Dioceſs. The Council anſwers, That theſe Conteſts occaſion Diſcord among Biſhops, and is of Opinion, that it ought not to be done.

Hoſius adds in the 19th Canon, That the Ordination of a Clergy-man of another Dioceſs ought to be void, and that the Biſhop who ſhall do it, ought to be puniſhed.

In the 20th the Biſhop *Aëtius* having remonſtrated, that many Prieſts and Deacons, Strangers, continued a long time at *Theſſalonica*, the Synod ordains, That the Rules made with reſpect to Biſhops may oblige theſe Perſons.

The 21ſt Canon according to the Edition of *Dionyſius Exiguus*, which we have followed, declares, That according to the Remonſtrance of the Biſhop *Olympus*, the Council is of Opinion, that a Biſhop forced away from his own Dioceſs, for the Defence of the Diſcipline of the Church, or of the Faith and Truth, may continue in the Biſhoprick of another, till he can return to his own, for it would be great Inhumanity not to receive him who is perſecuted, and that on the contrary, much Civility and Kindneſs ought to be ſhewn to him.

There are in the Greek two other Canons which concern a particular Buſineſs. The Biſhop *Gaudentius* ſays to the Biſhop *Aëtius*, That ſince he had had no trouble in his Dioceſs, from the time that he was Biſhop of it, he thought that he ought to receive thoſe who were ordained by *Muſæus* and *Eutychianus*. *Hoſius* judged that he ought not to admit thoſe who being ordained would not continue in the Churches to which they are named. He adds, That *Eutychianus* and *Muſæus* ought not to be look'd upon as Biſhops, but if they deſired Lay-Communion, it ſhould not be refuſed them.

Theſe Canons end with theſe Words in the Edition of *Dionyſius Exiguus*. *The whole Council hath ſaid; The Catholick Church ſpread over all the Earth, ſhall obſerve what has been now ordained.*

However, The Canons of the Council of *Sardica* were never received by the Catholick Church, as general Laws. They were never put into the Code of the Canons of the Univerſal Church, approv'd by the Council of *Chalcedon*. The Eaſt never received them, neither would the Biſhops of *Africa* own them. The Popes only uſed them, and cited them under the Name of the Council of *Nice*, to give them the greater Weight and Authority.

Of the Firſt COUNCIL *of* Sirmium.

THE Firſt Council of *Sirmium* was made up of Weſtern Biſhops; it was held in the Year 349. Two Years after that of *Milan*. *Photinus* who had been already excommunicated, was there condemned, but he could not be forced away from his See, and therefore the Weſtern Biſhops only

Of the Firſt of *Sirmium*, gave 349.

The *Councils.*

gave notice to the Eaſtern of the Judgment they had given againſt this Heretick. This is related in the Fragments of St. *Hilary*.

Of the Second COUNCIL *of* Sirmium.

Of the Second of *Sirmium*, 351.

THE Second Council of *Sirmium* was made up of Eaſtern Biſhops, aſſembled by the Emperour *Conſtantius*, in the Year 351. *Baſil* of *Ancyra* entred the Liſts there againſt *Photinus*, and convicted him of Hereſy. He was afterwards Depoſed by the Biſhops, and ſent into baniſhment by the Authority of the Emperour. In this Council was made the Firſt Creed of *Sirmium*, wherein the Biſhops make profeſſion of believing *in Jeſus Chriſt the only Son of God, born of his Father before all Worlds, God of God, Light of Light, by Whom all Things were made.* There they anathematize thoſe that ſaid, *He was created of nothing, or of another Subſtance, or that he was not of God, or that he was made in Time; Thoſe that ſaid there are Two Gods*, or thoſe who on the contrary averr'd, *That the Father, or at leaſt one part of him, was born of* Mary, *and alſo thoſe who make no diſtinction of the Three Divine Perſons*, or who ſaid, *That the Divinity was changed into Fleſh, and that it was ſubject to Sufferings and Changes.* This is the Sum of that long Creed quoted in Greek by St. *Athanaſius*, and in Latin by St. *Hilary*, who has conſidered and explained it as a very Orthodox Confeſſion of Faith.

Of the COUNCIL *of* Arles.

Of *Arles*, 353.

CONſtantius had a long time deſired to get *Athanaſius* condemned by the Weſtern Biſhops. To compaſs this Deſign, he aſſembled a Synod in the Year 353. in the City of *Arles*. The Pope ſent for Legates *Vincentius* of *Capua*, and another Biſhop of *Campania* called *Marcellus*; and ordered them to deſire the Meeting of a Council in the City of *Aquileia*. Theſe Legates being arrived at the Council of *Arles*, deſired that they would begin with handling the Doctrine, and with condemning the Errour of *Arius*, before they ſpoke of the Cauſe of St. *Athanaſius*: But *Urſacius* and *Valens* who had no other Deſign but to procure the Condemnation of St. *Athanaſius*, would not admit this Propoſition; and forced the Biſhops of the Council, and even the Pope's Legates to ſubſcribe the condemnation of this Saint. There was none but only *Paulinus* Biſhop of *Triers* that continued ſtedfaſt, and for this Reaſon he was baniſhed immediately.

Of the COUNCIL *of* Milan.

Of *Milan*, 355.

LIberius being informed of the Fall of his Legates, ſendeth *Lucifer* Biſhop of *Calaris*, to wait upon the Emperour, and deſire of him a new Synod. The Emperour granted him one, and caus'd it to meet at *Milan*, in the Year 355. but it did not anſwer the Pope's Expectation. The Emperour cauſed the Biſhops of the Eaſt and the Weſt to be Summoned to it; but yet it was compos'd only of the Weſtern Biſhops. There came almoſt 300 to it. Thither they brought *Euſebius* of *Vercelles*, and *Lucifer* of *Calaris*, who was the Pope's Legate, together with *Pancratius* the Prieſt, and *Hilary* the Deacon. Theſe were invited to the Synod, and were urged to ſubſcribe the Condemnation of St. *Athanaſius*: They anſwer'd, That they muſt Firſt handle Matters of Faith; That they ſaw in the Aſſembly ſome Hereticks, or ſuch as were ſuſpected of Hereſy; That in the Firſt place they muſt make profeſſion of the Faith contained in the *Nicene* Creed. *Dionyſius* of *Milan* took Pen and Paper, to write down and ſign the Creed: But preſently *Urſacius* and *Valens* took them by force out of his hands. Thereupon there aroſe a great Tumult, the People were put in a Commotion, and the Biſhops withdrew to the Palace, where they were preſſed to ſign a Letter written in the Emperour's Name againſt St. *Athanaſius*. There were but few Biſhops who cou'd reſiſt the Emperour's ſollicitations, and thoſe who were ſo ſtedfaſt as to do it, *viz.* *Euſebius* of *Verſeilles*, *Dionyſius* of *Milan*, and ſome others, were ſent into baniſhment. *Baluzius* in his new Collection of Councils, has cauſed the new Acts of this Council to be printed, taken out of the Life of *Euſebius* of *Vercelles*, publiſhed by *Ughellus* in the Firſt Tome of his *Italia Sacra*; but there is no probability that they are Authentical.

Of the COUNCIL *of* Biterræ, *or* Beziers.

Of *Biterræ*, or *Beziers*, 356.

THE *French* Church had not yet been toſſed with the Storms which troubled the Peace of all the Churches in the World. *Saturninus* Biſhop of *Arles*, a factious Man, was the Firſt who brought thither the fire of Diviſion. He aſſembled in the Year 356. a Council at *Beziers*, and us'd all his Endeavours to make it receive the followers of *Arius*; but St. *Hilary* oppoſed him ſtoutly, and having deſired him to treat of Doctrinal Matters, offered to convict *Urſacius*, *Valens*, and *Saturninus* of Hereſy. Inſtead of harkning to him they wrote to Court againſt him, and he was ſent into baniſhment, together with *Rhodanius* Biſhop of *Tholouſe*. After he was forced away, the Biſhops of this Council being devoted to the Intereſts of *Saturninus*, did whatever he deſired; but the other Biſhops of *France* would never communicate with him, nor with *Urſacius* and *Valens*, and would not ſuffer other Biſhops to be Ordain'd in the room of thoſe that were baniſhed.

Of

Of the Third COUNCIL *of* Sirmium.

THE Second Creed of *Sirmium* was made in that City, in the Year 357. by *Potamius* Bishop of *Lubon*, a City of *Spain*, in the presence of *Valens*, *Ursacius*, *Germinius*, and some other Bishops. This Creed is *Arian*. In it they reject the Word *Consubstantial*, and they declare, That the Father is greater than the Son, and that the Son had a beginning. Of the Third of *Sirmium*, 357.

Of the COUNCIL *of* Antioch.

THE Eastern *Arians* seeing that those of the West had plainly made Profession of their Error, did also publickly declare themselves in a Council assembled at *Antioch*, in the Year 357. *Eudoxius* Bishop of that City, a Patron of *Aëtius*, *Acacius* Bishop of *Cæsarea* in *Palæstine*, *Uranius* Bishop of *Tyre*, and some others, did there condemn the Words *Consubstantial*, and *like in Substance*, and wrote to *Ursacius*, *Valens*, and *Germinius*, to thank them, because by their means the Bishops of the West had embraced their Doctrine. Of *Antioch*, 358.

Of the COUNCIL *of* Ancyra.

THE greatest part of the Eastern Bishops opposed this Design of *Eudoxius*, and could not endure that he should make so publick a Profession of the Impious Doctrine of *Aëtius*. *George* Bishop of *Laodicea* wrote a Circular Letter upon this Subject, wherein he exhorted his Brethren to join together for defending the Faith of the Church. *Basil* of *Ancyra* presented this Letter to many Bishops who were assembled in his City for Dedicating his Church, about the Feast of *Easter*, in the Year 358. These Bishops wrote a Synodical Epistle related by St. *Epiphanius*, wherein they First confirmed the Creeds of the Eastern Bishops made at *Antioch*, at *Sardica*, and at *Sirmium*, and then condemned the Heresy of *Aëtius*, and professed to believe the Son of God to be like his Father. There follow after their Creed 18 Anathematisms, wherein they condemn these following Impious Dogmes, *viz.* That the Son of God is not like to his Father, That he is unlike in Substance, That he is a Creature, That he is another God than God the Father, *&c.* At the end of these Anathematisms there is one against those who say, That the Father and the Son are Consubstantial. St. *Hilary* who explains the others, makes no mention of this Last, because the Deputies of this Synod durst not bring it to *Sirmium*. Of *Ancyra*, 358.

Of the Fourth COUNCIL *of* Sirmium.

SOON after the Council of *Ancyra*, there was a Council held at *Sirmium*, wherein the Bishops of *Italy* and the West were present. Therein was made a Collection of the Creeds of *Antioch*, of the First of *Sirmium*, of that of *Sardica*, and that of *Ancyra*, which *Eustathius* Bishop of *Sebastea*, and *Eleusius* Bishop of *Cyzicum*, presented to be signed by all the Bishops, who made no Scruple to do it. Of the Fourth of *Sirmium*, 358.

Of the Fifth COUNCIL *of* Sirmium.

Constantius having appointed two great Synods, one in the East at *Seleucia*, and the other in the West at *Ariminum*, some Eastern Bishops before they went to *Seleucia*, met together at *Sirmium*, where they made a new Confession of Faith, which was dictated by *Marcus* of *Arethusa*, after a long Conference with the other Bishops, and was signed by those that were present. Therein they make profession of believing the Son of God to be in all things like to his Father; but they reject the name of *Substance*, as a Term that ought not to be used in speaking of the Trinity, because it is not found in Scripture, and is not intelligible by the People. Nevertheless *Basil* of *Ancyra* added in his Subscription, That the Son of God was in all things like to his Father, not only by the consent of Will, but also in Substance and Essence. This Creed has the Names of the Consuls at the beginning, which displeased many. Of the Fifth of *Sirmium*, 359.

Of the COUNCIL *of* Ariminum.

WHile these things were a doing in the East, the Western Bishops assembled from all Parts to *Ariminum*. The Emperour had sent his Letters Mandatory for them, and provided for them publick Carriage, and Money for performing their Journey; but the Bishops of *France* and *Britain* thought it below them to accept of these Offers, and chose rather to travel at their own Expence. There came about 400 to the Synod, which began about the Month of *July*, in the Year 359. *Ursacius* and *Valens* proposed there the Creed which was made a little before at *Sirmium*; but the Council confin'd themselves to that of *Nice*, and would not receive any other. This is declared by a solemn Decree which was sign'd by all the Bishops, and to it they subjoined Anathematisms against the Error of *Arius*, which are related at the end of St. *Hilary*'s Fragments. *Ursacius*, *Valens*, *Germinius* and *Demophilus* refusing to acquiesce in this Definition, were condemn'd by the unanimous consent of all the Bishops. Matters being thus determined in the Council to the advantage of the Faith of the Church, the Bishops sent Deputies to *Constantius*, with a Letter, wherein they give him an account of what Of *Ariminum*, 359.

The *Councils.*

what they had done: But on the other ſide *Urſacius*, *Valens*, and their followers, ſent alſo Deputies to the Emperour, and having much greater Intereſt in the Emperour, they prepoſſeſs'd him, and hindred him from giving audience to the Deputies of the Synod. And ſo he did nothing but write back to them, that he had not time to hear the Twenty Deputies which the Synod had ſent to him, becauſe he was obliged to go againſt the *Perſians*; and that he had given them Order to wait till his Return to *Adrianople*, becauſe he would examine Matters of Religion, with a Mind calm and diſengaged from all other Buſineſs. The Council anſwered him, That they would never depart from what they had done, and they earneſtly prayed him to permit the Biſhops to return to their Churches before the rigour of the Winter. In the mean time, the Deputies of the Council aſſembled at *Nice*, a City of *Thrace*, and declared all that was done at *Ariminum*, null and void. *Urſacius*, *Valens*, and *Germinius*, approved a Confeſſion perfectly, like that of *Sirmium*, wherein they declare that the Son of God is like his Father in all things, and reject the Terms of *Subſtance* and *Hypoſtaſis*. *Urſacius* and *Valens* recited this Confeſſion of Faith at *Ariminum*, and the Emperour ſent his Commands to the Governour, that he ſhould not ſuffer any Biſhop to go away till he had Signed it, and gave order to ſend thoſe into baniſhment who ſhould continue Obſtinate, provided they were no more than Fifteen. At firſt they all teſtified much Conſtancy, but by little and little they ſuffered themſelves to be overcome through Emulation, and the greateſt part of them Sign'd the Confeſſion of Faith: There were but Twenty that held out to the laſt, but in the end they were overcome alſo, and Signed as well as the others. Nevertheleſs ſome of them, as *Phegadius* Biſhop of *Tongres*, added Profeſſions of Faith to their Subſcriptions, wherein they expreſly condemn the Hereſy of *Arius*. When all the Biſhops had Signed the Confeſſion of Faith, they wrote to the Emperour, that they had fully ſatisfied his Commands, by agreeing with thoſe of the Eaſt, and rejecting the Word *Subſtance*; and therefore they prayed him earneſtly to give Order to the Governour to ſuffer them to go to their Churches. The Emperour gave them leave: And thus ended this Council, whoſe beginning was Glorious, and end Deplorable.

Of the COUNCIL *of* Selucia.

Of *Seleucia*, 359.

WHile theſe things were doing in the Weſt, the Eaſtern Biſhops aſſembled at *Selucia*, and there raiſed Diſputes, which they maintained with extream Heats. There came to this Synod 160 Biſhops of two different Parties, altogether oppoſite to one another. One of them were pure *Arians* who maintained, That the Son of God was not at all like in Subſtance to his Father. There were about 40 of this Party. The others called *Semi-Arians*, made profeſſion of believing the Son of God to be like in Subſtance, and rejected the Errours of *Arius* and *Aëtius*; thoſe of this Party were 105. The other Biſhops were probably Catholicks, Defenders of the Conſubſtantiality. There was an Officer from the Emperour's Court, called *Leonas*, preſent at the Council, for hindering any Tumult. The Firſt Aſſembly was held on the 23d of *September*, in the Year 359. *Leonas* required the Biſhops to propoſe what they were to treat of. The *Semi-Arians*, whereof the chief were *George* of *Laodicea*, *Eleuſius* of *Cyzicum*, *Sophronius* of *Pompeiopolis*, *Silvanus* of *Tarſus*, *Macedonius* of *Conſtantinople*, *Baſil* of *Ancyra*, *Euſtathius* of *Sebaſtea*, and St. *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem*, maintain'd, That Perſonal Cauſes ſhould be firſt examined, before they handled Matters of Faith. On the contrary, the *Arians*, whereof the Heads were *Acacius* of *Cæſarea*, *George* of *Alexandria*, *Uranius* of *Tyre*, *Eudoxius* of *Antioch*, maintained, That they ſhould firſt begin with matters of Faith; and they carried it againſt the others. They propoſed, that the *Nicene* Creed ſhould be rejected, and a new one ſhould be made: But the Biſhops of the other Party ſaid, That they received the Council of *Nice*, and found nothing to be blam'd in it, but only the Word *Conſubſtantial*. Hereupon there aroſe a great Diſpute which laſted till Night. To put an end to it, *Sylvanus* of *Tarſus* ſaid with a loud Voice, That it was needleſs to make a New Creed, that they had nothing to do, but Sign that which was made at *Antioch*, by a Synod held there for the Dedication of the Church. The *Acacians* ſeeing that this Propoſition was approv'd, withdrew, and the next Day the other Biſhops being ſhut up in the Church, cauſed the Creed of *Antioch* to be Signed by all the Biſhops. On the third Day, *Leonas* re-aſſembled the Biſhops of both Parties. The *Acacians* deſired that the Biſhops who were divided from them and depos'd, ſhould withdraw; they complained that they were not ſuffer'd to ſpeak freely in the Firſt Aſſembly; and they propoſed a Confeſſion of Faith, wherein they declare, That they did not refuſe to approve the Creed made at *Antioch*, but that they were obliged to reject more expreſly the Terms, *Conſubſtantial* and *like in Subſtance*, which troubled the Church; That they did alſo condemn thoſe who ſaid, that the Son of God was not like the Father, and that they made profeſſion of believing with the Apoſtle, that he was the Image and Reſemblance of the Father. They add, That the Creed of *Sirmium* was perfectly like theirs. This Confeſſion of Faith is related by St. *Epiphanius* with the Subſcriptions of 39 Biſhops of this Party. St. *Hilary* obſerves, That the greateſt part of thoſe who Signed it being *Anomæans*, were forced to explain the Profeſſion which they then made, by ſaying, That the Son was like his Father as he was his Father, but he was not like him as he was God. The Fourth Meeting was ſpent in Diſputes which came to no end. Wherefore *Leonas* ſeeing that there was no means left to reconcile them, declared that he would put an end to the Council, and that he would not be preſent the next Day at the Aſſembly of the Biſhops. The *Acacians* took occaſion from thence to appear no more. The other Biſhops, after a Citation of them, depos'd *Acacius*, *George* of *Alexandria*, *Uranius* of *Tyre*, and Six other Biſhops of their Party, and excommunicated Nine of them. They reſtored *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem*, and ordained one named *Anianus* Biſhop of *Antioch*, in the room of *Eudoxius*; but this *Anianus* was immediately ſent into baniſhment.

The

The Succeſs of what was done both by the one and the other Party in this Council, depended upon the Will of the Emperour; the buſineſs was, who ſhould firſt engage him. The Deputies of the *Acacians* came firſt to *Conſtantinople*; and they were quickly followed thither by thoſe of the *Semi-Arians*, whereof the chief were *Euſtathius* of *Sebaſtia*, *Baſil* of *Ancyra*, *Sylvanus* of *Tarſus*, and *Eleuſius* of *Cyzicum*; they were aſſiſted by St. *Baſil*, who was as yet but a Deacon. The Emperour would have the Cauſe of the Faith diſcuſs'd in his own preſence. 'Tis ſaid that *Aetius* entred upon a Conference with *Baſil* of *Ancyra*, and was convicted of Hereſy. However this be, *Theodoret* ſays, that *Euſtathius* of *Sebaſtea* preſented to the Emperour a Confeſſion of Faith, wherein it was ſaid, That the Son of God was not like his Father, and accus'd *Eudoxius* of maintaining it; that the Emperour having given it to this Biſhop he denied it, and ſaid that it was *Aetius's*, and that *Aetius*, having acknowledged it for his, was driven out of the Palace. While theſe things are doing, the *Nicene* Creed, which was ſign'd at *Ariminum*, was brought to *Conſtantinople*, and the Emperour having propos'd it, it was Sign'd by all the Biſhops of both Parties. [That made in *Nico* a City of Thrace.] The *Councils.*

Of the COUNCIL *of* Conſtantinople.

THE *Acacians* having ſtay'd at *Conſtantinople*, aſſembled there a Council of 50 Biſhops, in the beginning of the Year 360. Thither they invited the Biſhops of *Bithynia* who were of their Party, and they approv'd and publiſh'd in this Synod the Creed of the Council of *Ariminum*, changing only a few things in it. Afterwards they condemn'd *Aetius*, and Excommunicated three Biſhops who would not Conſent to his Condemnation. But as they condemn'd this Heretick only out of Policy, that they might obtain the favour of the Emperour who could endure him no longer; ſo they revenged themſelves afterwards upon all the Biſhops which oppos'd them in the Synod of *Seleucia*, and depos'd the Heads of the *Semi-Arian* Party, who were *Macedonius* of *Conſtantinople*, *Baſil* of *Ancyra*, *Eleuſius* of *Cyzicum*, *Euſtathius* of *Sebaſtea*, *Heortaſius* of *Sardis*, and *Dracontius* of *Pergamus*. In the Second Seſſion, they added to theſe *Silvanus* of *Tarſus*, *Sophronius* of *Pompeiopolis*, *Elpidius* of *Satala*, and *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem*. They alledg'd many Pretences for depoſing of them, and ordain'd in their room Perſons of *Aetius's* Party. *Eudoxius* poſſeſs'd himſelf of the See of *Conſtantinople*. *Of Conſtantinople*, 360.

Of the SYNOD *of* Melitine.

THere is mention made in the Council of *Conſtantinople*, whereof we have juſt now ſpoken, of a Synod held at *Melitine* about the Year 357. This Synod was compos'd of Biſhops of *Acacius's* Party, ſince they alledge his Authority in the Council of *Conſtantinople*, and condemn *Elpidius* for having received a Prieſt who had been depos'd in this Synod. St. *Baſil* in Letter 74 teſtifies, That *Euſtathius* of *Sebaſtea* was depos'd in this Council. St. *Cyril* was preſent there, if we may believe the Biſhops of the Council of *Conſtantinople*. This is all that we could learn of this Synod, of which we have very little in Antiquity. *Of Meli-tine*, 357.

Of the SYNOD *of* Antioch.

THE Church of *Antioch* continuing vacant by the departure of *Eudoxius*, *Meletius* was ordain'd Biſhop of it by a Synod which *Conſtantius* call'd in 361. 'Tis ſaid that ſome time after being invited to preach before the Emperour upon theſe words of the *Proverbs*, *God hath Created me in the beginning of his ways*, he declared openly for the Faith of the Church; whereupon the *Eudoxians* call'd a Second Synod at *Antioch*, and depos'd him, under pretence that he had receiv'd into his Communion ſome Clergy-men who were depos'd by *Eudoxius*, and ordain'd *Euzoius*, in his room. Afterwards they made a Confeſſion of Faith, wherein they diſcover plainly their impious Doctrine, making no ſcruple to declare, That the Son of God was not at all like his Father in Subſtance, and that he was created of nothing. This was the laſt Synod held under *Conſtantius*, and the laſt of the Creeds made by his Order. *Of Antioch*, 361.

Of the COUNCIL *of* Alexandria.

ST. *Athanaſius* being returned to *Alexandria* after the Death of *Conſtantius*, held a Council there to enquire what way they ſhould take with the *Arians* who were willing to be reconciled to the Church. In this Council the State of the Church of *Antioch* was conſidered, and the Biſhops deputed, *Aſterius* Biſhop of *Amaſea*, and *Euſebius* of *Vercelles*, to make Peace in that Church. The Queſtion of the three Hypoſtaſes was debated in this Council; and it was determin'd that it did not concern the Faith, and that thoſe who ſay there are three Hypoſtaſes in the Trinity, are of the ſame Opinion with thoſe who ſay there is but one, becauſe they underſtand the ſame word differently. In it they alſo ſpeak of the Myſtery of the Incarnation, and determine, That the Word did not only take a Body but alſo a Soul, and a Mind. We have loſt the Synodical Letter, but the Letter which St. *Athanaſius* wrote to the Church of *Antioch* by the Order of the Council, is ſtill extant. He enjoyns them to receive the Chriſtians who aſſembled in the ancient Church of *Antioch*, without exacting of them any other Condition, ſave only, that they condemn the Hereſy of *Arius*; and be oblig'd to receive the *Of Alexandria*, 362.

The *Councils.*

Faith of the *Nicene* Council, and that they reject their Error who believed the Holy Spirit to be a Creature. He adverties them, that no New Creed was made in the Council of *Sardica*; he gives them an Account of what was determined in the Council of *Alexandria*, concerning the Hypoſtaſis, and the Incarnation: He exhorts them to labour for Peace, and to ſhun ſuch Queſtions as tended only to foment Diviſions. This Letter was Sign'd by the Deputies of *Lucifer*, of *Paulinus* and *Apollinarius*, and by *Paulinus* himſelf who approv'd it when it was brought to *Antioch*.

Of the COUNCIL *of* Paris.

Of *Paris*, 362.

THE Weſtern Biſhops who had been abuſed in the Synod of *Ariminum*, being conſcious of their Fault, endeavour'd to repair it by aſſembling many Synods to annul what had been done there, and to maintain the *Nicene* Faith. *France* was none of the laſt that teſtified her Zeal upon this occaſion. St. *Hilary* aſſembled there many Councils for Re-eſtabliſhing the Faith of the Council of *Nice*. We have yet in the Fragments of St. *Hilary*, a Letter of a Council held at *Paris*, wherein the Biſhops that were there preſent acknowledge, That they had done ill to conſent in the Synod of *Arminium*, that they ſhould ſpeak no more of the Word, *Subſtance*. They profeſs to believe, that the Three Perſons of the Trinity are of the ſame Nature, and of the ſame Subſtance, and they condemn *Auxentius*, *Urſacius*, *Valens* and *Saturnius*. This Council was in the Year 362.

Of the COUNCIL *of* Italy.

Of *Italy*, 362.

'TWas not only in *France* that the Synod of *Ariminum* was rejected: The Biſhops of *Italy* alſo nulled and voided all that had been done in this Synod, and Anathematiz'd *Urſacius* and *Valens* as the Heads of the *Arians*. We have in the Fragments of St. *Hilary* a Letter written upon this ſubject in the name of the Biſhops of *Italy* to the Biſhops of *Illyricum*.

Of the COUNCIL *of the* Egyptian *Biſhops, held at* Antioch.

Of the *Egyptian* Biſhops held at *Antioch*, 363.

THE Emperour *Jovian*, a moſt pious Prince, being at *Antioch* in the Year 363, deſir'd of St. *Athanaſius* and the *Egyptian* Biſhops, who were come to wait upon him in that City, that they would explain to him the Faith of the Church. Theſe Biſhops being aſſembled, propos'd to him no other Creed but that of the Council of *Nice*, and rejected the Error of the *Macedonians* who denied the Divinity of the Holy Spirit. It is commonly thought that this Council was aſſembled at *Alexandria*: But it appears by the Letter which it preſented to the Emperour, related by *Theodoret* Ch. 3. of the 4th. B. of his Hiſtory, That it was compos'd of ſome *Egyptian* Biſhops, repreſenting all the other Biſhops of their Province, who had deputed them: Which plainly ſhews, That this Council was held out of *Egypt*, in the place where the Emperour was, that is, in *Antioch*, where 'tis certain St. *Athanaſius* came to wait upon *Jovian*.

Of the COUNCIL *of* Antioch *under* Meletius.

Of *Antioch*, under *Meletius*, 363.

THE *Acacians* ſeeing that the Emperour *Jovian* favoured the Catholicks, joyned themſelves with *Meletius* Biſhop of *Antioch*, and held a Council in that City, wherein they declared, That they would embrace the Faith of the Council of *Nice*, and receive the Term, *Conſubſtantial*: But at the ſame time they add, That this Term muſt be underſtood in the ſence, which ſignifies, That the Son of God was begotten of the Subſtance of his Father, and that he is like in Subſtance to his Father; That we muſt not believe that there was any Paſſion in this ineffable Generation; That we muſt not make uſe of the Word, *Subſtance*, according to the natural ſence of this Term; That it was not us'd but to deſtroy the Error of *Arius*, who ſaid, That the word was made out of nothing, an Error which was revived by the *Anomæans*. Theſe Biſhops having made this Declaration in their Letter to the Emperour, approve the whole and entire Creed of the Council of *Nice*.

Of the COUNCIL *of* Lampſacus.

Of *Lampſacus*. 365.

HYpatianus the Deputy of the Biſhops of the *Helleſpont*, deſired a Council of the Emperours *Valens* and *Valentinian*. They appointed one at *Lampſacus*, where the Biſhops aſſembled in the Year 365. After they had deliberated for the ſpace of Two Months what they ſhould do, they null'd all that had been done at *Conſtantinople* by the Intriguing of *Eudoxius* and *Acaſius*. They declared that the Son of God was like in Subſtance to his Father, and adher'd to that Profeſſion of Faith which was made in the Synod of *Antioch*, while the Dedication of the Church of that City was celebrated. They Ordain afterwards, That the Biſhops depos'd by the *Anomæans*, ſhould re-enter into their Churches, from which they had been unjuſtly forced away, and they appointed them for Judges the Orthodox Biſhops of their Province, and ſome of thoſe that were neareſt to it. They ſent Deputies to *Valens* who was then at *Heraclea*; but they were not well receiv'd, becauſe *Eudoxius* had prepoſſeſſed the Emperour, who Ordain'd, That the Churches ſhould be given thoſe of his Party. He oblig'd alſo *Eleuſius* of *Cyzicum*, in a Synod held in the Year 366, to agree with *Eudoxius*; but this Biſhop repented of it, and publickly teſtified the ſorrow he had for being overcome by the Sollicitations of the Emperour.

Of

Of the COUNCIL *of* Singedunum, *Compos'd of* Arian *Biſhops.*

Of *Singedunum*, of *Arian* Biſhops, 366.

Germinius Biſhop of *Sirmium* made in 366. a Confeſſion of Faith, wherein he makes profeſſion of believing *in Jeſus Chriſt the only Son of God, our Lord and our God, the true Son of God, of the true Father, God, begotten before all Worlds, like in all things to his Father, in Divinity, in Majeſty, in Greatneſs, in Power and in Wiſdom.* This Confeſſion of Faith diſpleas'd *Urſacius*, *Valens* and the other *Arian* Biſhops, who deſired of him an Account of his Faith. The only Anſwer that he made to them was, that he would not ſeparate from them: Wherefore they aſſembled at *Singedunum* a City of *Mœſia*, and from thence wrote to him to diſſuade him from maintaining that the Son of God was in all things like his Father. This Letter is preſerved in the Fragments of St. *Hilary*. 'Tis Dated *December* 16th. in the Year 366. *Germinius* anſwer'd them, [*That he made Profeſſion of believing the Son of God to be in all things like to his Father, except the Innaſcibility, God of God, Light of Light, Begotten before all Ages, who is not made of nothing, but begotten of God his Father.* In ſhort he ſays, That he does not depart from the Creed drawn up by *Marcus* of *Arethuſa*, which had been formerly ſign'd by *Urſacius* and *Valens*.

Of the SYNODS *held by the* Semi-Arians.

The *Synods* of 365. & 366.

THE Biſhops who are cal'd *Semi-Arians*, aſſembled many Councils after the Synod of *Lampſacus*: They held one at *Smyrna* compoſed of the Biſhops of *Aſia*, one in the Province of *Pamphylia*, another in *Iſauria*, and one in *Lycia*. Theſe Councils wrote Letters not now extant, that were carried to Pope *Liberius* by *Euſtathius* the Deputy of theſe Biſhops, who ſent him into the Weſt to make a Reconciliation with thoſe who made Profeſſion of adhering to the *Nicene* Creed. *Euſtathius* diſcharged his Deputation, approv'd the *Nicene* Creed, and obtained Letters of Commendation from *Libertius*. He brought theſe Letters to a Synod which was held in *Sicily*, wherein the Faith of the Conſubſtantiallity was approved; and returning afterwards into the Eaſt, he receiv'd the Letters of a Synod of *Illyricum* held in the Year 367, which declared the Trinity to be Conſubſtantial, and particularly eſtabliſhed the Divinity of the Holy Spirit. The Letter of this Council is related by *Theodoret* B. IV. of his Hiſtory. About the end of this Letter the Biſhops of this Council exhort thoſe of the Eaſt to chooſe for filling up the vacant Biſhopricks, either the Children of Biſhops which were dead, if they found them capable, or the ancient Prieſts, and not to Ordain for Prieſts or Deacons ſuch Perſons as came out of the Palace or the Army, but to take them out of the inferiour Clergy. The Deciſion of this Synod was confirm'd by an Edict of the Emperour, addreſs'd to the *Aſiaticks*, wherein he declares that the Term *Conſubſtantial*, ſignifies not only that the Son is like to his Father, but that he is of the ſame Nature and the ſame Subſtance.

Of the SYNOD *of* Tyana.

Of *Tyana*, 368.

Euſtathius being returned from the Eaſt with Letters of Commendation from the Weſtern Biſhops, came to a Synod aſſembled at *Tyana* in the Year 368, compoſed of the Biſhops who had declared in *Jovian*'s time, That it was neceſſary to maintain the Faith of the Conſubſtantiality. *Euſtathius* having read there the Letter of *Liberius* and the other Weſtern Biſhops, was there admitted to Communion, and the *Anomœans* were reconciled to the *Semi-Arians*. A Synod was appointed at *Tarſus*; but the Emperour *Valens* hindred its Meeting there, and cauſed one to be held in *Caria*, wherein the Term *Conſubſtantial* was rejected.

Of the COUNCIL *of* Gangra.

Of *Gangra*, 370.

THE preciſe time of this Council is not known. Some have thought that it was held between the Council of *Antioch* and that of *Nice*. Others following the Teſtimony of *Socrates* and *Sozomen*, place it after the Council of *Seleucia*. This Opinion is confirmed, becauſe that *Euſebius* who firſt ſign'd the Canons of this Council, was probably the Biſhop of *Cæſarea* in *Cappadoſia*, the Predeceſſor of St. *Baſil*, who held the See of this Church from the Year 362, to the Year 371. This Council condemns the Errors of one *Euſtathius* who is different from the Biſhop of *Sebaſtea*, who under pretence of leading a more perfect and auſtere Life, eſtabliſhed ſuch Practices as were contrary to the Laws of the Church. In the Letter of the Synod, he and his followers are Accus'd, Firſt, Of condemning Marriage, and parting Wives from their Husbands; Secondly, Of forſaking the Publick Aſſemblies of the Church to keep private Meetings; Thirdly, Of reſerving the Oblations for themſelves only; Fourthly, Of parting Servants from their Maſters, and Children from their Fathers, under pretence of making them lead a more auſtere Life; Fifthly, of permitting Women to be habited like Men; Sixthly, Of deſpiſing the Faſts of the Church, and obſerving others, according to their own fancy, even on *Sundays*; Seventhly, Of believing that it was forbidden in all Times to eat Meat; Eighthly, Of rejecting the Oblations of married Prieſts; Ninthly, Of deſpiſing Holy Places, and the Tombs of the Martyrs; Tenthly, Of believing that none can be Sav'd without parting with all their Goods. Theſe Errors are condemned in Twenty Canons, which have been plac'd in the Code of the Canons of the Univerſal Church.

The 1ſt. condemns thoſe who diſallow Marriage, and believe that a Married Perſon cannot be Sav'd.

The

The *Councils.*

The 2d. thunders an Anathema againſt thoſe who condemn ſuch as eat Fleſh, excepting only the Blood of thoſe things that have been offered to Idols, and things ſtrangled.

The 3d. is againſt thoſe who teach their Slaves to deſpiſe their Maſters, inſtead of ſerving them with reſpect.

The 4th. is againſt thoſe who ſay, we muſt not take the Communion from the hand of a married Prieſt.

The 5th. againſt thoſe who deſpiſe the Houſe of God, and the Aſſemblies there kept.

The 6th. condemns thoſe who would have another than the Publick Church, who deſpiſe it, and would have the Eccleſiaſtical Functions performed without a Prieſt approved by the Biſhop.

The 7th. and 8th. are againſt thoſe who receive the Eccleſiaſtical Offerings out of the Church, without the conſent of the Biſhop, or of thoſe whom he has entruſted.

The 9th. is againſt thoſe who keep their Virginity, not becauſe of its Excellency, but becauſe they think Marriage to be an abominable thing.

The 10th. againſt thoſe who inſult over Married Perſons.

The 11th. againſt thoſe who deſpiſe the *Agapæ*, that's to ſay, the Feaſts of Charity.

The 12th. againſt thoſe who fanſie themſelves to be more Holy than others, becauſe they wear a ſingular Habit, and condemn thoſe that wear decent Apparel.

The 13th. pronounces an Anathema againſt thoſe Women who leave off their own Habit, and wear Men's Apparel.

The 14th. againſt thoſe who forſake their Husbands out of Deteſtation of Marriage.

The 15th. againſt thoſe who abandon their Children, who do not Feed them, nor Educate them in Piety, but neglect them under pretence of Devotion.

The 16th. againſt thoſe Children, who under pretence of Piety forſake their Parents, and ſhow them no more that reſpect which they owe them next to God.

The 17th. againſt thoſe Women who cut their Hair, to deſtroy the Sign of that Submiſſion which they owe to their Husbands.

The 18th. pronounces an Anathema upon thoſe who Faſt on *Sundays*, under pretence of leading a more auſtere Life.

The 19th. is againſt thoſe who break the Faſts of the Church without Neceſſity, and in Contempt.

The 20th pronounces an Anathema againſt thoſe who abhor the Aſſemblies and the Sacrifices which are made in honour of the Martyrs, and deſpiſe their Memories.

At laſt, the Fathers of this Council conclude with theſe excellent Words: "We ordain theſe things "not to conclude thoſe who would, according to the Advices of Holy Scripture, exerciſe themſelves in "the Church by theſe practices of Continence and Piety, but againſt thoſe who uſe theſe kinds of "Auſterities for a Pretence to ſatisfy their Ambition, who deſpiſe thoſe who lead an ordinary Life, "and who introduce Innovations contrary to Scripture and the Eccleſiaſtical Laws. We admire Vir"ginity when it is accompanied with Humility; we praiſe Abſtinence which is joyn'd with Piety and "Prudence. We reſpect that Retirement which is made with Humility; but we alſo honour Mar"riage. We do not blame Riches when they are in the hands of Perſons that are Juſt and Benefi"cent; we eſteem thoſe who cloath themſelves Modeſtly, without Pride and Affectation, and we "abhor uncivil and voluptuous Apparel: We have a Reverence for Churches, and we approve the "Aſſemblies which are there made as Holy and Uſeful: We do not confine Piety to Houſes. We "honour all places built to the Name of God; we approve the Aſſemblies which are kept in the "Church for the publick Good: We praiſe the Largeſſes which the Faithful give to the Church to be "diſtributed among the Poor. In a word, We wiſh and deſire that theſe things may be obſerv'd in the "Church, which we have learn'd from the Scripture and the Tradition of the Apoſtles.

Of the COUNCIL *of* Laodicea.

Of *Laodicea*, between 360 & 370.

IT has been commonly believed, That this Council was more ancient than that of *Nice*, but the Regulations which are contain'd in its Canons, do ſufficiently diſcover, that it was held at a time wherein the Church flouriſhed, and had been a long time delivered from the Pagan Perſecutions; which ſhows that this Council could not have been aſſembled before the middle of the Fourth Century. 'Tis very probable that it was celebrated between 360 and 370. We know nothing of its Hiſtory; but we have 60 Canons of this Aſſembly, which regulate many conſiderable Points of Eccleſiaſtical Diſcipline, and have been received by the whole Church, and put into the Code of the Canons of the Univerſal Church.

The 1ſt. of theſe Canons declares, That by a kind of Condeſcention, the Communion ought to be given to thoſe who are married a Second time, after they have for ſome time given themſelves to Faſting and Prayer.

The 2d. is, That the Communion out to be given to thoſe Sinners who have done Penance for their Crimes.

The 3d. is, That thoſe ought not to be promoted to a Biſhoprick who were lately baptiz'd.

The 4th. That Clergy-men ought not to be Uſurers.

The 5th. That Ordination ſhould not be made in the preſence of thoſe who are in the Rank of Hearers.

The 6th. That Hereticks ſhould not be ſuffered to enter into the Houſe of the Lord.

The 7th. That in order to the receiving of Hereticks, ſuch as the *Novatians*, the *Photinians*, the *Quarto Decimani*, they ought firſt to abjure and anathematize all Hereſies, and chiefly that whereof they made Profeſſion; and then after they are inſtructed in our Doctrine, they ought to be anointed with Chriſm; and laſtly, made partakers of the Holy Myſteries.

The

The 8th. That they muſt be wholly baptiz'd a new who come from the Sect of the *Montaniſts.*

The 9th. That the Faithful ought to be forbidden to go to the Cœmiteries or Churches of Hereticks to pray there with them, and that thoſe who do it ought to be excommunicated, and do Penance for their Fault. The *Councils.*

The 10. That Catholicks ſhould not give their Daughters in marriage to Hereticks.

The 11th. That Prieſteſſes ſhould not be ordained in the Church.

The 12th. That the choice of Biſhops ſhould be approv'd by the Metropolitan, and by the Biſhops of the Province.

The 13th. That the choice of a Biſhop ſhould not be wholly left to the People.

The 14th. That the Holy Myſteries ought not to be ſent at *Eaſter* as a Benediction.

The 15th. That none but the Canon-Chanters who ſit in high Chairs, and read in Books, ſhall ſing in the Church.

The 16th. That the Goſpel ſhould be read together with the other Books of Scripture, on *Saturday.*

The 17th. That many Pſalms ſhould not be read together, but between every Pſalm a Leſſon.

The 18th. That the ſame Prayers ſhould be read at *Mattins* as at *Veſpers.*

The 19th. That after the Biſhop's Sermon, the Prayers of the Catechumens ſhall be read apart by themſelves, and when theſe are gone forth, then ſhall be the Prayer of the Penitents; and Laſtly, after theſe have withdrawn having received Impoſition of Hands, the Prayer of the Faithful ſhall be made at three times ſucceſſively: That the Firſt Prayer ſhall be made in ſilence, but the Second and Third Prayers ſhall be pronounced with a loud Voice, and after that the Peace ſhall be given; that when the Prieſts ſhall give it to the Biſhop, The Laity ſhall give it to themſelves, and afterwards the Oblation ſhall go on till it be finiſhed; and that none but thoſe who are Holy ſhall be ſuffered to approach the Altar to receive the Communion.

The 20th. forbids Deacons to ſit in the preſence of a Prieſt without his leave, and it ordains likewiſe, That the other Miniſters and all the inferiour Clergy ſhall ſhow the ſame reſpect to Deacons.

The 21ſt. forbids Miniſters to do the Offices of Deacons, and to touch the Holy Veſſels.

The 22d. and 23d. forbids Miniſters and Readers to carry the Stole.

The 24th. forbids all the Eccleſiaſticks to go to a Publick Houſe.

The 25th. declares, That Miniſters muſt not give the Holy Bread nor bleſs the Cup.

The 26th. That thoſe who were never ordained by Biſhops, muſt not meddle with exorciſing in the Church, or in Houſes.

The 27th. That thoſe Eccleſiaſticks who are invited to the Love-Feaſts, muſt not carry any Meat away with them to their own Houſes.

The 28th. That theſe Feaſts muſt not be made in Churches.

The 29th That Chriſtians muſt not obſerve the Ceremonies of the Jews, nor Feaſt on *Saturday*; but they muſt labour on this Day, and abſtain from labour on *Sundays.*

The 30th. That an Eccleſiaſtick or Monk, muſt not waſh in the Baths with Women.

The 31ſt. That Men ought not to give their Children in marriage to Hereticks.

The 32d, That the Bleſſing of Hereticks ought not to be received.

The 33d. That the Faithful ought not to pray with them.

The 34th. That a Chriſtian ought not to forſake the Martyrs of Jeſus Chriſt to go and honour falſe Martyrs which have been Hereticks.

The 35th. That Chriſtians ought not to forſake the Church to invoke Angles, and keep Meetings in private.

The 36. That thoſe ought to be caſt out of the Church who practice Magick, Judicial Aſtrology, and Witchcraft, *&c.*

The 37. That the Faithful ought not to celebrate the Feaſts of Jews or Hereticks.

The 38th. That they ought not to uſe the unleavened Bread of the Jews, nor follow their Ceremonies.

The 39th. That they ought not to celebrate the Feaſts of Pagans.

The 40th. That the Eaſtern Biſhops ought to be preſent at a Synod to reform others there, or to be reform'd themſelves.

The 41ſt. and 42d. That a Clergy-man muſt not go out of his Dioceſs, without Canonical Letters, without the permiſſion of his Biſhop.

The 43d. That the Porters ſhould not leave the Gates of the Church for a moment under pretence of Praying.

The 44th. That Women ought not to come near the Altar.

The 45th. That none ought to be baptized in the Second Week of Lent.

The 46th. That he who is to be baptized, ought to be inſtructed in the Faith, and that he ought to give notice on *Holy-Thurſday* to the Prieſts or the Biſhop, that he will preſent himſelf to Baptiſm.

The 47th. That thoſe who were baptized during their Sickneſs, ought to be inſtructed when they recover their health.

The 48th. That thoſe who are baptized, after Baptiſm, ſhould be anointed with Heavenly Chriſm.

The 49th. That no Offerings ſhould be made during Lent but on *Saturdays* and *Sundays.*

The 50th. That they ſhould not break their Faſt in the laſt Week of Lent; but Faſt throughout the whole Lent, eating nothing but dry Meats.

The 51ſt. That the Feaſts of the Martyrs ought not to be obſerved in Lent, but on *Saturdays* and *Sundays.*

The 52d. That Marriages ſhould not be celebrated in Lent.

The Counc. ils.

The 53d. That Chriſtians ought not to behave themſelves diſorderly at Marriage-Feaſts, nor Dance there but take their Repaſt Modeſtly.

The 54th. That Clergy-men ought not to be preſent at the Shows or Balls, that are made during Marriage-Feaſts, but ariſe and be gone before the Mask begins.

The 55th. That neither Clergy-men nor Lay-men, ought to make Feaſts at Taverns, by paying every one their Club.

The 56. That Prieſts ought not to enter, nor go up into the Pulpit, before the Biſhop be come into the Church, unleſs he be ſick or abſent.

The 57th. That Biſhops muſt not be plac'd in Towns, nor Villages, but Viſitors, who ought to do nothing without the Advice of the Biſhop who is in the City, and that the Prieſts ought to obſerve the ſame thing.

The 58th. That neither Biſhops nor Prieſts ought to make the Oblation in their own Houſes.

The 59th. That private Pſalms ought not to be ſung in Churches, nor any Books read there which are not Canonical, but only the Canonical Books of the Old and New Teſtament.

The 60th and Laſt Canon contains an Enumeration of the Canonical Books of the Old and New Teſtament. It places in the number of the Canonical Books of the Old Teſtament thoſe which the Jews acknowledged; and in this number it places *Eſther*, *Job* and *Ruth*, but not *Tobit*, *Judith*, *Eccleſiaſticus*, *Wiſdom*, nor the Books of the *Maccabees*. The Canonical Books of the New Teſtament are the Four Goſpels, the *Acts*, and the Seven Canonical Epiſtles, and the Fourteen Epiſtles of St. *Paul*, but the *Revelation* is not in this Catalogue.

Of the COUNCIL *of* Rome *under* Damaſus.

Of *Rome*, under *Damaſus*, 370.

IN the Year 370, Pope *Damaſus* aſſembled a Council at *Rome*, in whoſe Name a Synodical Letter was written againſt the *Arians*, produced in Greek by *Theodoret*, *B.* VI. of his Hiſtory, *Ch.* 23. and by *Sozomen*, *B.* II. *Ch.* 22. and publiſhed in Latin by *Holſtenius*. It is addreſs'd to the Biſhops of *Illyricum*, and not to the Biſhops of the Eaſt, ſince theſe laſt are mentioned in the Third Perſon. This Synod confirms the Faith of the Council of *Nice*; and declares that *Auxentius* Biſhop of *Milan* was condemned by the Biſhops of *France*. It excommunicates thoſe who do not believe that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are one and the ſame Divinity, and one and the ſame Subſtance. It obſerves, That the Council of *Ariminum*, could not prejudice the Deciſions of the Council of *Nice*, becauſe thoſe who made the Creed of *Ariminum*, proteſted afterwards againſt what they had done, and alſo becauſe neither the Biſhop of *Rome*, whoſe Judgment was chiefly to be waited for, nor *Vincentius* of *Capua*, nor many other Biſhops, did ever conſent to the Deciſion of the Council of *Ariminum*. Laſtly, they ſay, That they hope that the Biſhops who hold not the Doctrine eſtabliſhed by the *Nicene* Creed, ſhould quickly be deprived of their Biſhopricks, and they exhort the Biſhops of *Illyricum* conſtantly to defend the true Faith.

Of the COUNCIL *Of* Rome *againſt* Urſicinus.

Of *Rome*, againſt *Urſicinus*, 372.

THIS Council was held in the Year 372. againſt *Urſicinus* the *Anti*-Pope. In it the Aſſociates of this pretended Biſhop are condemned, and among others *Florentius* of *Puteoli*, and the Biſhop of *Parma*.

Of the COUNCIL *of* Valence.

Of *Valence*, 374.

IN the Year 374, *Phœbadius* or *Fegadius* Biſhop of *Agen*, and 20 Biſhops more aſſembled at *Valence* to ſettle ſome Commotions of this Church, and having regulated this Affair, they made Four Canons for the Reformation of Diſcipline.

In the Firſt they forbid thoſe to be Ordained for the future who have been twice Married, or thoſe who have eſpous'd a Widow, whither they did it before or ſince their Baptiſm: But they do not meddle with the Ordinations of *Bigamiſts* made before their Deciſion, leſt they ſhould diſturb the Church.

In the 2d. Canon they Ordain, That Penance ſhall not immediately be allowed to thoſe Virgins, who Married after they had made a Vow of Virginity, and that they ſhall not be receiv'd until they have made full ſatisfaction.

The 3d. Canon delays Abſolution of thoſe till death, who having been baptized, did partake in the Profane Sacrifice of Devils, and exhorts them in the mean time to do Penance for their Fault, and to wait for the Remiſſion of it from the Mercy of God.

In the laſt place they declare, That all thoſe Deacons, Prieſts, and Biſhops muſt be depoſed, who confeſs themſelves guilty of ſome great Crime, whether they did really commit it, or only accuſe themſelves falſly of it. There is a Letter prefixed to theſe Canons, wherein they addreſs to the Biſhops of the Five Provinces, and of *Gaul*, after which there follows another Letter written to the Church of *Frejus*, wherein the Synod acquaints it, That tho' the Biſhop *Concordius* had ſpoken in behalf of one *Acceptus*, who probably had accuſed himſelf of ſome Crime whereof he was not guilty, yet the Synod did not think fit to make an Exception in his favour from the general Rule which they had made. To give a Reaſon of this Rule they add, That tho' they knew that many Perſons accuſe themſelves of thoſe Crimes which they have not committed, from the dread they have of the Prieſthood, yet Men being more inclined to judge ill than well, they thought fit that all thoſe who had

ſaid

ſaid ill of themſelves ſhould be removed from the Prieſthood, whether it were true or falſe, for fear of giving occaſion of Diſputes, by thoſe Accuſations which might be urged againſt the Miniſters of Jeſus Chriſt of ſuch Crimes, whereof they might be convicted by their own Teſtimony. This Synod conſiſted of 21 Biſhops. *Phœbadius* of *Agen* is the firſt; in it there is found alſo the Name of *Rhodanius* of *Tholouſe*, of *Juſtus* of *Lyons*, of *Britto* of *Triers*, of *Florentius* of *Vienna*, and of *Concordius* of *Arles*. 'Tis obſerved in ſome Manuſcripts, That it conſiſted of 30 Biſhops, but perhaps this number ought to be corrected, by making it 21. The Councils.

Of the COUNCIL *of* Antioch *for reſtoring* Peace *in that Church.*

THE Church of *Antioch* for a long time had been rent in Pieces with Diviſions. After the Depoſition of the Great *Euſtathius*, ſome rigid Catholicks had always maintain'd themſelves without a Biſhop, till *Lucifer* Ordain'd one *Paulinus*; but the greateſt part of the Catholicks acknowledged *Meletius* for their lawful Biſhop. The Eaſt favoured this laſt, *Egypt* and the Weſt adher'd to *Paulinus*. St. *Baſil* us'd all his Endeavours in vain to reconcile them, for he could not compaſs it; but Nine Months after his Death, as is obſerv'd by St. *Gregory Nyſſen* in the Life of St. *Macrina*, in the Year 378, a Council was held at *Antioch*, wherein the Two Parties were reconciled, upon condition that no Biſhop ſhould be Ordain'd in his room who ſhould die firſt, but the Survivor ſhould continue ſole Biſhop. *Theodoret* ſays, That *Paulinus* would not accept this Condition, but the Biſhops of *Italy* affirm the contrary in the Letter of the Council of *Aquileia*, and in the Fifth Letter of the Council of *Italy*. There was receiv'd in this Synod a Confeſſion of Faith ſent from the Weſt, which is call'd the *Tome of the Weſt*, as it is declar'd in the Fifth Canon of the Council of *Conſtantinople*. 'Tis probable, That this *Tome* is either the Synodical Letter of *Damaſus*, or the Anathematiſms which follow it. *Baronius* ſays, That Deputies were named in this Council, and he grounds this Conjecture upon a Paſſage of St. *Gregory Nyſſen*, who ſays, That he was deputed by a Council; but it cannot be known at preſent, whether he ſpeaks of this Council or of another. Of *Antioch*, 378.

In ſhort, *Valeſius* attributes to this Council the Letter 69 of St. *Baſil*, written by ſeveral Biſhops, to the Biſhops of *Italy* and *France*, wherein mention is made of a Writing of the Biſhops of the Weſt: but this Conjecture cannot be maintain'd, ſince there are among the Biſhops, in whoſe Name this Letter was written, the Names of St. *Baſil* Biſhop of *Cæſarea*, and *Theodotus* of *Nicopolis*, who were dead when the Synod, which we now ſpeak of, was held; beſides that there is no mention in it of the Reconciliation of *Meletius* and *Paulinus*, which was not till after the death of St. *Baſil*.

Of the COUNCILS *of* Conſtantinople.

FOR the better underſtanding the Hiſtory of the Council of *Conſtantinople*, which is called the Second General Council, we muſt diſtinguiſh Three Aſſemblies of Biſhops held at *Conſtantinople* at Three ſeveral times. Of the Firſt of *Conſtantinople*, 381.

The Firſt was held in the Month of *May* in the Year 381. It was compos'd of all the Biſhops of the Eaſtern Empire, except *Egypt*. *Meletius* of *Antioch* preſided in the Aſſembly, and confirmed St. *Gregory Nazianzen* in the See of the Church of *Conſtantinople*. There is ſome probability that in this Synod the Canon was made, wherein the Election of *Maximus* is condemned, who endeavoured to invade the See of the Church of *Conſtantinople*, and alſo the Canon wherein the ſecond place of Honour is granted to the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*. However this be, *Meletius* died before the end of this Synod, his Body was carried back to *Antioch*, and the Eaſtern Biſhops choſe in his room, *Flavianus*, contrary to the Promiſe that was made while *Meletius* was alive, That no Perſon ſhould ſucceed in the room of the Biſhop that died firſt.

Of the Second COUNCIL *of* Conſtantinople.

WHEN *Flavian* was Ordain'd, the Eaſtern Biſhops returned to *Conſtantinople*, at the beginning of the Year 382. They were never after ſo favourable to *Gregory Nazianzen*, becauſe he reprehended the Ordination of *Flavianus*, as a thing contrary to the Agreement that was made; and therefore this Saint had no ſooner propoſed to withdraw, but almoſt all the Biſhops conſented to it. After his retirement, the Council Ordained *Nectarius* Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*. 'Tis to this Synod that the Canon and Creed of the General Council of *Conſtantinople* are attributed. In it was read the Letter of the Weſtern Biſhops aſſembled at *Aquileia*, wherein they deſire that a General Council of the Eaſt and Weſt may be held at *Alexandria*. The Eaſtern Biſhops anſwer'd, That they could not go farther off, and they only ſent Three Deputies into the Weſt, to acquaint them with their deſires of Peace, and to inform them of the truth of their Doctrine. Of the Second of *Conſtantinople*, 382.

The Weſtern Biſhops being diſſatisfied with this, and with what was Ordain'd in the Council of *Conſtantinople*, complained to the Emperour, Firſt, That they had Ordained *Flavianus* in the Room of *Meletius*, contrary to the Promiſe made while he was alive; Secondly, That they had Ordain'd *Nectarius* Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* without any regard to *Maximus* who had been Ordain'd by the Patriarch. Thirdly, That they had avoided the calling of a General Council, that they might hold one at *Conſtantinople*. At laſt, they pray that a General Council may meet at *Rome* to determine all Differences: For ſay they, 'tis fit that the Eaſtern Biſhops ſhould not deſpiſe the Judgment of the Biſhop of *Rome*, and the Biſhops of *Italy*, ſince they have waited for the Judgment of *Aſcolius* of *Theſſalonica*.

We

The Councils. *We do not*, add they, *aſſume to our ſelves the Prerogative of this Examination, but we expect to have a part in the Judgment, becauſe the Judgment ought to be common to all thoſe who are of one and the ſame Communion.*

Of the Third COUNCIL *of* Conſtantinople.

Of the Third of *Conſtantinople*, 383.

THIS Letter from thoſe of the Weſt, was deliver'd in the Year 383, to a Synod aſſembled at *Conſtantinople*, whereof *Nectarius* was Preſident. The Biſhops of this Council made anſwer, That they wiſhed they could be preſent at *Rome* to treat there of the Affairs of the Church; but not being able to do it leſt they ſhould leave their Churches in a forlorn condition, they thought it would be ſufficient to give them an account of all that they had ordain'd. They ſay therefore, That they have approved the Creed of the Council of *Nice*, That they admit one and the ſame Divine Majeſty in Three Perſons, That as to the Incarnation they have a very Orthodox Doctrine, being perſuaded that Jeſus Chriſt took a Body, Soul and Spirit, and that he is a perfect Man. They prove that this is their Doctrine by the *Tome of the Weſt*, which they approved at the Synod of *Antioch*. As to the manner of Governing the Churches, they declare, That according to the Canons of the Council of *Nice*, they believed that the Biſhops of each Province, ought to ordain the Biſhops of their own Province, and call in to their aſſiſtance their Neighbours alſo, if they thought fit: That according to this Law *Nectarius* was ordained Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* in the General Synod, with the Conſent of the People and Clergy of *Conſtantinople*, and in the preſence of the Emperour; that after the ſame manner *Flavianus* was ordain'd by all the Biſhops of the Province and of the Dioceſs of the Eaſt, and that St. *Cyril* was ſome time ago ordain'd Biſhop of *Jeruſalem* by the Biſhops of the Province. They exhort the Weſtern Church to approve of what they had done, and to admoniſh them to preferr the Edification of the Church, before the Inclinations they might have to any particular Perſons, that ſo they might re-eſtabliſh a perfect Union among all the Members of the Church. This is what is contained in the Letter of this Synod related by *Theodoret*. This Council is not different from that mention'd by *Socrates Ch.* 10. of *B.* V. of his Hiſtory, and by *Sozomen*, *Ch.* 12. of *B.* VII. In which were preſent the Chief Biſhops of all the Sects, ready to defend their own Opinions: But *Nectarius* confounded them all, by asking them if they would referr themſelves to the ancient Catholick Authors, who lived before the beginning of theſe Diſputes: For ſome being willing to accept of theſe Terms, and others refuſing to do it, the Emperour who ſaw them divided, deſired of every one their Confeſſion of Faith, and when they had preſented them to him, he tore all thoſe in which there was not Profeſſion made of believing the Conſubſtantial Trinity, and made an Edict againſt all Hereſies.

The Creed of the Council of *Conſtantinople* is not very different from that of *Nice*. The Fathers of this Council have only added ſome more expreſs Terms, to denote the Divinity of the Holy Spirit, by calling him, *The quickning Lord who proceedeth from the Father, who is to be worſhipped and glorified together with the Father and the Son, who ſpake by the Prophets.* They make *Profeſſion* alſo, *of believing one only Holy and Apoſtolick Church, of confeſſing one Baptiſm only for the Remiſſion of ſins, of looking for the Reſurrection of the dead, and the Life of the World to come.* This Creed was not at firſt received by all Churches, and there were ſome that would add nothing to the *Nicene* Creed. For this cauſe it was perhaps, that no other Creed but that of *Nice* was read in the Council of *Epheſus*, and there it was alſo forbidden to make uſe of any other: But this of *Conſtantinople* was authentically approved in the Council of *Chalcedon*, where it was read after that of *Nice*.

It was a long time before the Canons of this Council was approv'd by the Weſtern Biſhops: Not only St. *Leo* rejected them in his Epiſtle 53, now the 80, but alſo *Gelaſius* in his Epiſtle to *Dardanus*, and St. *Gregory* in his Epiſtle 25 of *B.* VI. rejects them, as not being received in the Weſt; but however, they have been received in the Eaſt, and are put in the Code of the Cannons of the Univerſal Church. 'Tis not eaſy to tell how many Canons were made in the Three Councils of *Conſtantinople*, whereof we have juſt now ſpoken, nor to which of the Three they are to be attributed, and whether they are all made in one and the ſame Synod. The Verſion of *Dionyſius Exiguus* contains but Three of them; but the Second contains that which is the Third in the Greek, and the Laſt is reckon'd for the Fourth which concerns the Ordination of *Maximus*. But the Code of the Canons of the Univerſal Church, adds to theſe a Fifth, which concerns *the Tome* of the Weſtern Biſhops, a Sixth about the Form of Eccleſiaſtical Deciſions, and a Seventh concerning the manner of receiving Hereticks. *Photius*, *Zonaras*, *Balſamon*, and the other Greeks, acknowledged theſe laſt Canons, and attribute them to the Council of *Conſtantinople*, ſo that there can be no Queſtion, but they were made by one of thoſe three Councils of which we have ſpoken, but it is more probable, that they were made by the Laſt. Firſt, Becauſe *Dionyſius Exiguus* has not put them in his Collection of Canons; Secondly, Becauſe *Socrates* and *Sozomen* mention only the Four firſt when they ſpeak of the firſt and Second Council of *Conſtantinople*; Thirdly, Becauſe 'tis plain that theſe Canons are an Addition, or Supplement to the Three other Canons; Fourthly, becauſe it appears that the Fifth Canon was made by ſome Biſhops, who had a Confeſſion of Faith of the Biſhops of the Weſt, which they call *a Tome*, and which they approv'd. Now the Biſhops of the Third Council of *Conſtantinople* ſpeak of this Confeſſion in their Letter to the Biſhops of the Weſt, and give it the Name of *a Tome*; which ſhows that the Fifth Canon and this Letter were from the ſame hand. Laſtly, *Nicholas* the I. in his Letter to the Emperour *Michael*, cites the Sixth Canon of this Council, as belonging to the Council of *Conſtantinople*; but he obſerves that it is not to be found in his Code of the Canons. Theſe Reaſons ſhew, That the Four firſt Canons of the Council of *Conſtantinople*; belong to the Firſt and Second Synods, but

but rather to the Firſt than the Second, becauſe of the Fourth which is againſt the Ordination of *Maximus*, and that the three following belong to the Third Synod held in 383. The *Councils.*

The 1ſt. of theſe Canons confirms the Creed of the Council of *Nice*, and pronounces an Anathema againſt all the Hereſies that are contrary to it, eſpecially againſt the *Eunomians*, the *Anomœans*, the *Arians*, the *Eudoxians*, againſt the *Semi-Arians* who were Enemies to the Holy Spirit, againſt the *Marcellians*, the *Photinians* and *Apollinariſts*.

The 2d. Canon conſiſts of Four Parts: In the Firſt the Biſhops of one Dioceſs are forbidden (taken the name of Dioceſs for many Provinces) to go out of their own Dioceſs; and 'tis ordained according to the Canons, That the Biſhop of *Alexandria* ſhall govern *Egypt* only; That the Biſhops of the Eaſt ſhall govern the Eaſt, ſaving always to the Church of *Antioch* its Privileges and Prerogatives, which are mention'd in the Sixth Canon of the Council of *Nice*; That the Biſhops of the Dioceſs of *Aſia* ſhall regulate what concerns their own Dioceſs; That thoſe of *Thrace* ſhall govern only the Churches of *Thrace*, and thoſe of *Pontus* the Churches of *Pontus*.

The Second Part forbids every Biſhop in particular to go out of the Bounds of his own Country to Ordain, or to meddle with the Affairs of the Churches in another Dioceſs.

The Third ordains, That the Synod of every Province ſhall regulate what concerns its own Province, as had been ordain'd by the Council of *Nice*.

The Laſt Part declares, That the Churches which are among the *Barbarians*, that's to ſay, thoſe that are without the *Roman* Empire, ſhall be governed according to their ancient Cuſtoms, becauſe in theſe Countries there is no diſtinction of Dioceſſes or Provinces.

The 3d. Canon grants to the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* the firſt Place of Honour next to the Biſhop of *Rome*: Some have pretended that this Canon is to be extended to Juriſdiction; but this Explication is contrary to the Terms in which it is conceiv'd, and was never approv'd by Practice, tho' the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* taking occaſion of this Prerogative of Honour, endeavoured afterwards to uſurp the Dioceſſes of *Thrace*, of *Aſia*, and of *Pontus*, which at laſt were ſubjected to him by the Determination of the Council of *Chalcedon*. The Reader may ſee this more largely explained in the firſt Diſſertation about the ancient Diſcipline of the Church.

The 4th. Canon declares, That *Maximus* was never Biſhop, that his Ordinations are null, and that all that he did ought to be made void.

The 5th. Canon, which is the firſt of thoſe of the Third Council, approves the *Tome* of the Biſhops of the Weſt, and of thoſe of *Antioch* who acknowledge one and the ſame Divinity in the Three Perſons of the Trinity. There is alſo mention made of this *Tome* in the Council's Letter, and 'tis probable that this was the Synodical Letter of *Damaſus*, ſent to the Council of *Antioch* held in the Year 378.

The 6th. Canon regulates the Form of Eccleſiaſtical Deciſions, and ordains, Firſt, That all ſorts of Perſons ſhall not be admitted to accuſe Biſhops of Crimes which concern Religion; That no Hereticks, Schiſmaticks, Perſons excommunicated, condemned, and in a word, all thoſe that are ſeparated from the Communion of Biſhops ſhall not be allowed to do it. Secondly, That the Accuſation of a Biſhop ſhall be carried to the Biſhops of his own Province. Thirdly, That if the Biſhops of the Province cannot judge of the Crimes whereof a Biſhop is accus'd, recourſe muſt be had to the Synod of the Dioceſs. Fourthly, That thoſe who accuſe a Biſhop, ought in writing to ſubject themſelves to the ſame Penalty, to which they expoſe him that is accus'd, if they be convicted of Calumny. Laſtly, That if any one ſlighting theſe Laws, ſhall addreſs himſelf either to the Emperour or Secular Judges, or ſhall deſire a General Council, without acquieſcing in the Judgment of the Biſhops of the Dioceſs, he ought to be heard no longer, ſince he has violated the Canons, and overthrown the Diſcipline of the Church.

The laſt Canon is concerning the manner of receiving Hereticks, who offer themſelves to return into the Boſom of the Church. It ordains, That the *Arians*, *Macedonians*, *Sabbatians*, *Novatians*, *Quartodecimani*, *Tetratites* and *Apollinariſts*, ſhall be receiv'd after they have made Profeſſion of Faith, and Anathematiz'd their Errours, *By the Unction of the Holy Spirit, and the Chriſm wherewith they ſhall be anointed on the Forehead, the Eyes, the Hands, the Mouth, the Ears at the pronouncing of theſe Words: This is the Seal of the Holy Spirit.* As to the *Eunomians*, the *Montaniſts*, the *Sabellians*, and all the other Hereticks, the Council ordains, That they ſhall be received like Pagans; that's to ſay, That at firſt they ſhall receive Impoſition of Hands to give them the Name of Chriſtian; That afterwards they ſhall be plac'd in the rank of Catechumens; That they ſhall be exorcis'd by blowing three times upon their Faces, and into their Ears; That they ſhall be catechiz'd, and that for a long time they ſhall be permitted to hear only the Holy Scripture in the Church; and at laſt they ſhall be baptized.

Of the COUNCIL *of* Aquileia.

THE Council of *Aquileia* was aſſembled in the Month of *September* of the Year 381. It ſhould have been compos'd of the Biſhops of the Eaſt and Weſt; but St. *Ambroſe* having declared that it was needleſs to weary the Eaſtern Biſhops with ſuch a Journey, none but the Weſtern Biſhops were obliged to come thither, and thoſe of the Eaſt were only left at their Liberty to come there if they thought fit. There were about thirty Biſhops preſent at the Council, together with the Deputies of the Biſhops of *France* and *Africa*. *Valerian* was Preſident. In it two Biſhops of *Dacia* and *Mœſia*, nam'd *Palladius* and *Secundianus*, were accus'd of *Arianiſm*; there was read to them before the Council, a Letter of *Arius*, but they would neither approve, nor condemn it, and anſwered Of *Aquileia*, 381.

The Councils.

only, That they ſhould ſee in two Days time, that they were both Catholicks. This Day being come they appeared before the Council; but they would not acknowledge it for a Judge, deſiring a General Council compos'd of the Eaſtern and Weſtern Biſhops; nevertheleſs they examined them, convicted them of the Hereſy of *Arius*, and condemned them. The Acts of this Council, the Letter which they wrote to the Biſhops of *France* and *Spain*, to thank them for the Deputies they had ſent, and the Letter addreſs'd to the Emperours, wherein there is an account of what they had done, and prays them to hinder the Hereticks from entering into the Church, are ſtill extant. It complains afterwards of the Crimes of an *Arian* Biſhop named *Valens*; and Laſtly, it ſupplicates the Emperours to hinder the Aſſemblies of the *Photinians*. All theſe Monuments are extant in St. *Ambroſe*.

The Biſhops of this Council wrote a Letter to the Emperour, praying him to drive away *Urſicinus*, which was publiſh'd by *Sirmondus*, and is in the Second Volume of the Councils, *p.* 998.

They wrote alſo a Letter which is found in the ſame place, in which they give the Emperour an Account of the State of the Eaſtern Empire, they thank him for reſtoring to the Catholicks the Eaſtern Churches; but they complain that many things were chang'd there, and that thoſe were not kindly us'd, who had always been in the Communion of the Weſtern Churches, as *Timotheus* of *Alexandria* and *Paulinus* of *Antioch*. They pray that a General Council may be aſſembled at *Alexandria*, to examine thoſe who ought to be admitted into Communion, and thoſe to whom Communion muſt be denied. This Letter was delivered to the Emperour, at the time of the Second Council of *Conſtantinople*, and was read in this Council.

At laſt, when the Biſhops underſtood what had been done in the Eaſt without conſulting them concerning the Ordination of *Flavianus* and *Nectarius*, they complained of it by another Letter, whereof we have already ſpoken, preſerved in the ſame Volume of the Councils, *p.* 345. They teſtifie alſo by a Fourth Letter which precedes theſe, how much they could have wiſhed that the Council which they deſired had been held, and how neceſſary it would have been. Theſe Letters do not properly belong to the Council of *Aquileia*, but were written ſome time after in the name of thoſe Biſhops which were there aſſembled, and for executing what they had Order'd. For which Reaſon, it was thought neceſſary to mention them here.

Of the COUNCIL *of* Saragoſa.

Of *Saragoſa*, 381.

WHile the Biſhops of *Italy* were thus labouring to procure the Peace of the Church of *Rome*, thoſe of *Spain* were no leſs buſied in allaying the Commotions which were rais'd upon occaſion of *Priſcillian* and his Diſciples. The Council of *Saragoſa* was aſſembled upon this account about the Year 381, where having condemned *Priſcillian* and his followers, they made ſome Canons againſt their Practices.

The 1ſt. forbids Women to meddle with Teaching and Expounding Articles of Faith.

The 2d. pronounces an *Anathema* againſt thoſe who faſted on *Sundays* from a ſuperſtitious or falſe Principle; and againſt thoſe who entred not into the Churches during *Lent*, but hid themſelves in their Houſes or in the Fields.

The 3d. anathematizes thoſe who having receiv'd the Euchariſt did not eat it in the Church.

The 4th. forbids any to be abſent from the Church from the 15th. of *December* until the *Epiphany*.

The 5th. forbids Biſhops under pain of Excommunication to receive thoſe who are excommunicated by their own Biſhops.

The 6th. declares, That thoſe of the Clergy muſt be caſt out of the Church, who abandon the Miniſtry out of vanity to turn Monks.

The 7th. declares, That it is not lawful for any to take to himſelf the Title and Name of Doctor, but only thoſe to whom it is granted.

The 8th. forbids Virgins to be veiled, that are devoted to Jeſus Chriſt, except they be Forty Years old.

'Tis eaſy to perceive that all theſe Canons are made againſt the *Priſcillianiſts*, who affected a ſingular Way of living.

Of the COUNCIL *of* Sida *in* Pamphylia.

Of *Sida* in *Pamphylia*, 383.

ST. *Amphilocius* aſſembled in 383, a Council of 25 Biſhops at *Sida*, a City of *Pamphylia*, againſt the Hereſy of the *Maſſalians* or the *Euchaitæ*. This Council condemned the Errors of theſe Hereticks, and wrote a Synodical Letter to *Flavianus* Biſhop of *Antioch*: It is not now extant. *Photius* had read it, and he tells us of it in Volume 52 of his *Bibliotheca*.

The ſame *Photius* ſpeaks in this place of a Synod held againſt theſe Hereticks at *Antioch* by *Flavianus*. There were preſent in it Three Biſhops and 30 Prieſts and Deacons of the Church of *Antioch*. There *Adelphius* a Ring-leader of the Hereſy of the *Maſſalians* was condemned, and they would not receive him tho' he ſhould have abjur'd his Hereſy, becauſe they were perſuaded that he would not do it ſincerely. Theſe Hereticks making no ſcruple of renouncing their Doctrine with their mouth. *Flavianus* ſent an account to the *Oſroenians* of what paſs'd in this Synod.

Of

Of the COUNCIL *of* Bourdeaux.

THIS Council was aſſembled by the Order of the Emperour *Maximus*, and condemned *Inſtantius* a follower of *Priſcillian*, and had condemned *Priſcillian* himſelf if he had not appeal'd to the Emperour. See what we have ſaid upon this Subject *p.* 191. 'Tis ſaid, That afterwards there was a Council held at *Triers* where St *Martin* was preſent. But this Aſſembly of Biſhops who came to Court to deſire the condemnation of the *Priſcillianiſts*, deſerves not the Name of a Council. See *Sulpitius Severus*'s Account of it in his Dialogues of the Life of St. *Martin*. The ſame *Sulpitius Severus*, at the end of his Second Dialogue, mentions a Council held at *Niſmes* in St. *Martin*'s time, but he acquaints us with nothing that paſs'd in it.

Of the COUNCIL *of* Capua.

THE Council of *Capua* was aſſembled by the Emperour *Valentinian* in the Year 390, to determine the Difference which was between *Flavianus* and *Evagrius*, the Succeſſor of *Paulinus* in the See of *Antioch*. In it *Theophilus* of *Alexandria* and the Biſhops of *Egypt* were named for Judges of this Cauſe. But *Flavianus* would not acknowledge them for Judges, and told the Emperour boldly, who had order'd him to come to *Conſtantinople*, that he might ſend him to *Alexandria*. *Sir, if they accuſe my Manners or my Faith, I am ready to ſubmit my ſelf to the Judgment of my Accuſers themſelves; but if they would have my Primacy and See, I will have no Diſpute with any body about it, neither will I reſiſt thoſe who aſpire to this Dignity; And therefore give the See of* Antioch *to whom you pleaſe.* This reſolute Anſwer, made the Emperour wonder, who ſent him back to *Antioch* to govern his Church. But tho' the Synod of *Capua* had not been aſſembled but for this Affair, yet in it they treated of other things. *Bonoſus* a Biſhop was informed againſt there, becauſe he had the boldneſs to affirm that the Virgin *Mary* had Children by *Joſeph* after the Birth of Jeſus Chriſt. The Council refer:'d this Cauſe to *Anyſius* Biſhop of *Theſſalonica*, and the other Biſhops of *Macedonia*. They forbid him to enter into his Church. This Biſhop being diſgraced by this Judgement, conſulted St. *Ambroſe*, whether it were lawful for him to enter into it. This Saint anſwered him, That he ought to do nothing contrary to the Judgment given by the Biſhops of *Macedonia*: And they deſiring to ratify their Judgment by the Opinion of the Biſhop of *Rome*, wrote an account of it to *Siricius*, who anſwered them, *That the Council of* Capua *having referred this Cauſe, it did not belong to him to Judge of it, but to them to determine it.* We learn all this from the Letter of *Siricius*, which was formerly attributed to St. *Ambroſe*.

This Synod treated alſo of Re-baptization, of Re-ordinations, and Tranſlations of Biſhops, as it is obſerv'd in the 48th. Canon of the Code of the Canons of the Church of *Africa*, which is conceiv'd in theſe Words, *We have declared what was Ordained in the Council of* Capua, *That it was not lawful to uſe Re-baptization, Re-ordination, and the Tranſlation of Biſhops.* This is all we know of this Council.

Of the COUNCILS *of* Rome, *and of* Milan, *againſt* Jovinian.

Siricius condemned *Jovinian* and his followers in a Synod of his Clergy, and his Condemnation was confirmed by a Synod of *Milan*. We have the Letters of theſe Two Synods. In the Firſt it is determined, That tho' we ought not to deſpiſe nor condemn Marriage, yet Virgins are more to be honoured. The Second contains the Proofs of this truth, and in it is ſhown, That the Bleſſed Virgin loſt not her Virginity by bringing forth Jeſus Chriſt into the World.

Of the COUNCIL *of the* Novatians *held at* Sangarus.

Socrates mentions in the 21ſt. *Ch.* of the 5th. *B.* of his Hiſtory, a Council of the *Novatians* held at *Sangarus* about the end of this Century, wherein it was declared a thing indifferent to celebrate the Feaſt of *Eaſter* on *Sunday* or another day, againſt what was Ordained in another Synod held before that at *Pazus*.

Of the Firſt COUNCIL *of* Carthage.

THO' this Council was celebrated in the Year 348, yet we have hitherto delayed to ſpeak of it that we might give an *Idea* of all the *African* Councils of the Fourth Age together. This was a general Council of the *African* Biſhops, and *Gratus* Biſhop of *Carthage* who was preſent at the Council of *Sardica*, preſided in it. He ſpoke firſt to his Brethren, and ſaid, "That we muſt firſt give thanks to "God who hath put an end to the Schiſm, and inſpired the Emperour *Conſtantine*, (it muſt be read "*Conſtans*) to ſend *Paulus*, and *Marcarius* into *Africa* to procure Peace there, and for the Liber- "ty which the *African* Biſhops have enjoyed of meeting together in Provincial Councils, and aſ- "ſembling from all the Provinces of *Africa*; that afterwards we muſt examine the Heads, about "which it will be neceſſary to make ſome Decrees, according to the Divine Laws, and the Inſtructi- "ons of Holy Scripture; but then we muſt have ſuch a regard to this time of Peace, that we neither "weaken the Obligation of the Laws, nor yet prejudice the preſent Unity by too much ſeverity.

The 1ſt. Head which he propoſed was about Rebaptization. He ask'd, whether that Man ought

to

to be re-baptiz'd who at his Baptiſm made Profeſſion of believing the Trinity. The Biſhops anſwer'd: *God forbid, We declare that this Re-baptization is unlawful, contrary to the Orthodox Faith and the Eccleſiaſtical Diſcipline.*

The Councils.

The 2d. Head was to remedy the abuſe which the *Donatiſts* were guilty of in giving the Name of Martyrs to Fanaticks, who laid violent Hands on themſelves, or threw themſelves head-long from Precipies. *Gratus* was of Opinion, That they ſhould be forbidden for the future to honour theſe falſe Martyrs, and that thoſe Lay-men ſhould be put under Penance, who medled with Depoſing of Clergy-men. The Biſhops approved his Opinion, and ſaid, That the ſame was Ordained in the Provincial Councils.

In the 3d. they forbid thoſe Perſons who profeſs Virginity, to cohabit or have any familiarity with any Perſons of the other Sex, under the pain of Excommunication for the Laity, and of Depoſition for the Clergy. The Reaſon which they give for this Law is excellent: *We muſt*, ſay they, *ſhun the occaſions of Sin, remove all kind of Suſpicion, and avoid the Snares which the ſubtilty of the Devil uſes to deſtroy ſimple Souls which are not upon their guard, under pretence of Charity and Love to our Neighbour.*

The 4th. contains the ſame Prohibition to Widows.

In the 5th. the Biſhop *Privatus* remonſtrates, That a Biſhop ought not to be permitted to receive a Clergy-man belonging to another Biſhop, unleſs he has the Permiſſion of his own Biſhop; neither ought he to Ordain a Lay-man of another Dioceſs without the conſent of his own Biſhop. He alledges the Authority of the Council of *Sardica* to prove that this Order ought to be obſerv'd.

In the next, another Biſhop nam'd *Nicaſius* remonſtrates, that it does not become clergy-men to take upon them the charge of Secular Affairs. *Gratus* confirm'd this Remonſtrance by the Authority of Scripture, and the Biſhops approved it.

In the 7th. another Biſhop propos'd, That a Prieſt or a Layman of another Dioceſs ſhould not be receiv'd into Communion, unleſs he had a Letter from his own Biſhop.

In the 8th. 'tis Ordain'd after the Propoſition made by *Evagrius*, and according to the Opinion of *Gratus*, That thoſe ſhall not be Ordained, who have been Guardians, or managed ſeveral other ſorts of buſineſs, till their Accounts be made up and ended.

The 9th. forbids them to chooſe Clergy-men to be Treaſurers or Collectors of the Publick Taxes.

The 10th. forbids Biſhops to invade the bounds of the neighbouring Dioceſſes.

The 11th. regulates the numbers of Judges neceſſary to ſit upon a Clergy-man. A Deacon who is accus'd ought to be judg'd by three neighbouring Biſhops, a Prieſt by ſix, and a Biſhop ought not be judg'd by leſs than twelve.

In the 12th. *Antigonus* Biſhop of *Madaura*, complains, that after he had made and ſign'd an Agreement with *Optantius*, (who probably was his Rival in the Biſhoprick) by which they agreed to divide the People between them, yet this *Optantius* continued ſtill contrary to this Agreement, to win the Affections of all the People. The Biſhops decree that the Agreement ſhould ſtand good.

In the 13th. *Abundantius* Biſhop of *Ardrumetum* ſays, That in the Council of his Province, Prieſts were forbidden to take Intereſt. *Gratus* repreſented that it was not neceſſary to make any Canon about this, that they needed only put the Law in Execution which was written in the Goſpel; and that if Uſury was to be condemned in Lay-men, it was much more damnable in Clergy-men. All the Biſhops approv'd his Judgment.

The Laſt Canon enjoyns Clergy-men and Laymen to obſerve theſe Canons, and thoſe which had been made by other Councils, under the pain of Excommunication for Lay-men, and Depoſition for Clergy-men.

Of the Second COUNCIL *of* Carthage.

Of the Second of *Carthage*, 390.

FRom the Inſcription of this Council corrected by a Manuſcript of the *Vatican* we learn, that it was aſſembled under the third Conſulſhip of *Valentinian* and *Neoterius*, that's to ſay in the Year 390, on the 14th. of *June*, at *Carthage* in the Church of St. *Perpetua*; That *Genethlius* Biſhop of *Carthage*, preſided there, and that Biſhops came thither from different Provinces. *Genethlius* opens the Council by giving thanks to God for the coming of the Biſhops to *Carthage* according to the Letters which he had written to them. He ſays, That tho' all the Biſhops were not preſent at this Council, yet it was to be believ'd that thoſe who were abſent were united in Spirit with it. He recommends afterwards the Biſhops to defend the Faith of the Trinity.

The 2d. Canon renews the Law eſtabliſhed in the preceding Council concerning the Celibacy of Biſhops, Prieſts and Deacons.

The 3d. forbids Prieſts to bleſs the Chriſm, to conſecrate Virgins, and to reconcile Penitents at a *Publick Maſs*. This is one of the moſt ancient Monuments where the name of *Maſs* occurs to ſignify the Publick Prayers which the Church made at offering the Euchariſt.

The 4th. Canon permits Prieſts to reconcile Penitents who are Sick and in Danger, with the Biſhop's leave.

The 5th. forbids the making New Biſhopricks without the leave of the Biſhop of the place.

The 6th. forbids the admitting any Perſons of bad Reputation as Accuſers of Biſhops.

The 7th. confirms the Rule made in many Councils, which forbids a Biſhop to receive a Perſon excommunicated by his own Biſhop.

The 8th. declares, That if a Prieſt excommunicated by his own Biſhop, undertake to offer up Sacrifices

criſices in private, and to ſet up Altar againſt Altar, thereby making a Schiſm, he ought to be anathematiz'd, becauſe there is but one Church, one Faith, and one Baptiſm. The *Councils.*

The 9th. forbids Prieſts to celebrate *Maſs* in all kinds of places: It is call'd in this place, *Agenda.*

The 10th. ordains, That a Biſhop accus'd, who would juſtify himſelf, if he cannot call together more, ought at leaſt to defend his Cauſe before Twelve Biſhops, a Prieſt before Six, and a Deacon before Three, one of which ought to be their own Biſhop.

The 11th. forbids Biſhops to intermeddle in the Dioceſſes of others.

The 12th. declares, That Biſhops ſhall not be ordained without the Conſent of the Primate, that's to ſay, the Metropolitan, and that in a caſe of neceſſity three Biſhops are ſufficient to ordain a Biſhop, provided they have the Conſent of the Metropolitan.

The 13th. is the Concluſion of this Council, which ordains, That all the Biſhops ſhall obſerve the Canons which ſhall be ſign'd by all the Biſhops preſent. Some Criticks have doubted of the Truth of this Council, becauſe the Names of *Aurelius* and *Alypius* are found in it, who were not Biſhops when it was aſſembled: But theſe Names are not found in the Edition corrected by the *Vatican* Manuſcript, but in their places there are the Names of *Genethilus* and *Felix.*

Of the COUNCILS *of* Cabarſuſſa *and* Bagaïs.

THeſe two Councils are two Aſſemblies of *Donatiſt* Biſhops of contrary Parties: In the Firſt of which *Primianus* head of one Party, Biſhop of *Carthage*, was depos'd, and *Maximian* in the Second. St. *Auſtin* quotes the Synodical Epiſtles of theſe two Councils; that of the Firſt in the Commentary upon *Pſal.* 36. and that of the Second in divers places of his Books againſt *Creſconius* and *Petilian.* This Father ſays, That the Firſt Council was held in the Year 393, and conſiſted of a 100 Biſhops; and yet there are but 43 in the Subſcriptions of the Council: The Second which was celebrated the next Year, conſiſted of 310 Biſhops. Of *Cabarſuſſa* and *Bagaïs*, 393, 394.

Of the COUNCIL *of* Hippo.

THis Council was held at *Hippo* under the Third Conſulſhip of *Theodoſius* and *Abundantius*, that's to ſay, in the Year 393, on the 5th. of *October.* Its Canons were inſerted into the Council of *Carthage*, in 397. Of *Hippo*, 393.

Of the COUNCIL *of* Carthage, *in the Year* 394.

THis Council is mentioned in the Code of the Canons of the *African* Church, where it is obſerv'd, that it was held under the Third Conſulſhip of *Arcadius*, and the Second of *Honorius* on the 24th, of *June*, and that Deputies are nam'd in this Council to attend at the Council of *Ardrumetum.* Of *Carthage*, 394.

Of the COUNCILS *of* Carthage, *in the Year.* 397.

UNder the Conſulſhip of *Cæſarius* and *Atticus*, who were Conſuls in the Year 397, according to the vulgar *Æra*, the Biſhops deputed from the Provinces of *Africa*, came to *Carthage*; but they were not all preſent there at the ſame time: Some came on the 26th. of *Auguſt*, a Day appointed for the Council, others came not till ſome time after. Nevertheleſs, *Aurelius* Biſhop of *Carthage*, having conferr'd with the Biſhops who came firſt, and received Letters from the Biſhops of the Provinces, who had not yet ſent their Deputies, caus'd the Canons which the Biſhops, with whom he had conferred, thought fit to make, and thoſe which were propos'd by Letters from the Biſhops of *Byzacena*, to be read to thoſe that were preſent. Theſe Canons were received in the Council, which confirmed thoſe which had been made in the Council of *Hippo.* Of *Carthage*, 397.

The 1ſt. Canon orders all the Churches of *Africa*, to inform themſelves every Year by the Biſhop of *Carthage*, on what Day *Eaſter* ſhould be celebrated.

The 2d. ordains, That every Year a Council ſhall meet, to which every one of the Provinces of *Africa* was to ſend three Deputies, excepting only the Province of *Tripolis*, which could ſend but one, becauſe of the ſmall number of Biſhops in that Province.

The 3d. requires, That the Canons ſhould be read to thoſe who were to be ordain'd, that they might not be ignorant of them.

The 4th. forbids the Ordination of Deacons, and Conſecration of Virgins before the Age of 25 Years, and forbids Readers to Salute the People, that's to ſay to addreſs any Speech to them, when they read the Goſpel in the Church.

The 5th. ordains, That the Sacramens ſhould not be given to the Catechumens during the Solemnity of *Eaſter*, but only the Salt which was uſually given them; becauſe if the Faithful do not change the Sacraments during theſe Feaſts, the Catechumens ought much leſs to do it. 'Tis hard to ſay, what this Sacrament is, which the Council forbids to give to the Catechumens during the Feaſt of *Eaſter.* It cannot be the Euchariſt, for that was forbidden to be given them at all times. But the 37th. Canon of the Greek Code of the Canons of the *African* Church explains it, by obſerving that the Catechumens were forbidden to offer Honey and Milk on any other Day, but *Eaſter*-Day.

The 6th. forbids the giving of the Euchariſt to the Dead.

The 7th. regulates the delays of Accuſations brought againſt a Biſhop: It orders that their Cauſes

The *Councils.*

ſhall be carried to the Tribunal of the Metropolitan; but that a Biſhop cannot be excluded from Communion, for not appearing till one Month after he ſhall be cited by the Metropolitan's Letters; and that if he bring a lawful Excuſe for his abſence, one Month more of delay ſhall yet be given him; but if he appear not in that time, he ſhall be excluded from Communion till he be acquitted. And if he be not preſent at laſt at the Univerſal Synod which is held every Year, he is to be look'd upon as ſelf condemn'd; he ought not ſo much as to communicate with his People, while he is excluded from the Communion of other Biſhops; that his Accuſer ought not to be excommunicated, unleſs he fail to appear on the Day when the Cauſe is to be heard, and that no Perſon of a bad Reputation ought to be admitted to accuſe a Biſhop, unleſs the Buſineſs be about perſonal Cauſes which are not Eccleſiaſtical.

The 8th. regulates the number of Biſhops which are requiſite to judge Prieſts and Deacons. It requires five for judging a Prieſt, and two for judging of a Deacon. It ordains, That the delays ſhall be obſerv'd which are contain'd in the forementioned Canon; and as to others of the Faithful, it declares, That the Biſhop of the place may take cognizance of them, and judge them alone.

The 9th. ordains, That if a Clergy-man being accus'd before the Eccleſiaſtical Tribunal, remove the Cauſe to the Civil Magiſtrates, tho' he even gain the Cauſe, he ſhall loſe his Place, if it be a Criminal Cauſe; and if it be a Civil Cauſe, he ſhall loſe what he had gain'd.

The 10th. declares, That if a Perſon who has appeal'd from one Eccleſiaſtical Tribunal to other Eccleſiaſtical Judges of greater Authority, be by them acquitted, the Sentence given by the former Judges ought not to prejudice the latter, unleſs they be convicted of being byaſs'd by Paſſion, or corrupted by Favour. It adds, That it is never lawful to appeal from thoſe Judges that are choſen, even tho' they were not a ſufficient number.

The 11th. forbids the Children of Biſhops and Clergy-men, to act in profane Shows, or to be preſent at them, becauſe it is unworthy of Chriſtians to be preſent in a place where Blaſphemies are ſpoken.

The 12th. forbids Clergy-men to give their Daughters in marriage to Pagans, or Heriticks and Schiſmaticks.

The 13th. forbids Clergy-men to make Donations while they are alive, or by their laſt Will, to ſuch Perſons as are not Catholicks, tho they ſhould be of their Kindred.

The 14th. forbids them to emancipate their Children unleſs they be adviſ'd by their Kindred, or the Children be come to ſuch an Age, that the Sins which they commit can no longer be imputed to their Parents.

The 15th. forbids them to be Farmers or Procters, or to get their Livelyhood by diſhoneſt Traffick:

The 16th. forbids them to receive more than they had lent.

The 17th. forbids them to co-habit with Strange Women, and permits them only to live with their Mothers, their Grand-Mothers, their Aunts, their Siſters, their Neeces, and thoſe of their Domeſticks who dwelt in the Houſe with them before their Ordination.

The 18th. Ordains, That none ſhall be Ordain'd Prieſts, Biſhops, and Deacons, unleſs they have converted all thoſe who liv'd in the Houſe with them.

The 19th. declares, That Readers are to be obliged, when they come to Age, to Marry, or to make the Vow of Chaſtity.

The 20th. forbids Biſhops to undertake any thing in the Dioceſſes of their Neighbours.

The 21ſt. forbids them to detain the Clergy of their fellow-Biſhops.

The 22d. Ordains, That no Clergy-man ſhall be Ordained who has not been examined by the Biſhops, and approved by the Suffrages of the People.

The 23d. That in the Prayers the Name of the Father ſhall not be put in the place of the Name of the Son, That at the Altar the Prayers ſhall always be addreſſed to the Father; That thoſe who have compoſed private Prayers ſhall not make uſe of them, until they have conferred about them with Clergy-men of good Learning.

The 24th, That nothing but Bread and Wine mingled with Water ſhall be offered for the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Jeſus Chriſt.

The 25th. That Clergy-men and thoſe who make Profeſſion of Chaſtity, ſhall not go to ſee Widows or Virgins without the permiſſion of the Biſhop or ſome Prieſts, that they ſhall not be with them alone, but with other Eccleſiaſticks, or ſuch Perſons as the Biſhops or the Prieſts ſhall appoint them: That Biſhops and Prieſts alſo ſhall not viſit them alone, but in company with other Eccleſiaſticks or Chriſtians of known Probity.

The 26th. forbids the Metropolitan to aſſume the Title of Prince of the Prieſts, or the Sovereign Prieſt, and declares, That no other Name ought to be given him but that of Biſhop of the Firſt See.

The 27th. forbids Eccleſiaſticks to eat or drink at an Inn unleſs it be in a Journey.

The 28th. forbids Biſhops to undertake a Voyage beyond Sea without the conſent of the Metropolitan, from whom they ſhould receive Letters recommendatory.

The 29th. declares, That the Sacraments of the Altar ought not to be celebrated by any Perſons but by ſuch as are faſting, except on Holy *Thurſday*: So that if the Memory of one that is dead is to be celebrated in the Afternoon, the Prayers muſt only be read without adminiſtring the Sacrament.

The 30th. forbids Clergy-men and Biſhops to make Feaſts in the Churches, and Orders, That the People ſhall be hindred from doing it, as much as is poſſible.

The 31ſt. leaves Biſhops the liberty to regulate the time of Penance.

The 32d. forbids Prieſts to reconcile Penitents without asking leave of the Biſhop, unleſs urgent neceſſity enforce the doing of it in his abſence. It adds, That Penitents whoſe Crimes are very publick and

and known by all the Church, ſhould receive Impoſition of Hands in an high Place near the Biſhop's Throne.

The 33d. Ordains, That when Virgins happen to loſe their Relations who took care of them, the Biſhop, or in his abſence, the Prieſt, ought to place them in a Nunnery, or commit them to the care of Women of known Probity. *The Councils.*

The 34th. That Sick Perſons ſhall be baptized, who cannot anſwer any longer, when thoſe who are by them teſtify that they deſired it.

The 35th. That the Grace of Reconciliation ſhall not be denied to Sorcerers, Comædians, and other Infamous Perſons, nor even to Apoſtates, when they are converted.

The 36th. hinders Prieſts from conſecrating Virgins without the Biſhop's permiſſion, and abſolutely forbids them to make the holy Chriſm.

The 37th. forbids Clergy-men to dwell in ſtrange Cities, unleſs the Biſhop or the Prieſts of both Places be ſatisfied, that they have juſt and lawful Reaſons to do ſo.

Almoſt all the Canons which we have now mentioned were made by the Council of *Hippo*, except ſome which were added by the Biſhops of *Byzacena*. Theſe laſt are the 35th. and ſo on to the 47th. in the Code of the *African* Canons: There is one beſides of the Council of *Hippo*, which is the 47th. in the 3d. Council of *Carthage*. This contains a Catalogue of the Canonical Books of the Old and New Teſtament, in the number of which are the Five Books of *Solomon*, the Books of *Tobit*, of *Judith*, of *Eſther*, the *Maccabees*, the Three Epiſtles of St. *John*, that of St. *Jude*, and the *Revelations*. 'Tis added in the Council of the Biſhops of *Byzacena*, That it ſhall be lawful to read publickly the Paſſions of the Martyrs.

What concerns the Canonical Books was alſo repeated in a Council held in 418, under Pope *Boniface*, wherein it was propoſed, That the Churches of *Italy* ſhould be conſulted about this Canon.

There were Two or Three Canons beſides of this Council which were explained in the Synod of *Carthage*, that we now ſpeak of, whereof the Firſt declares, That a Biſhop ſhall not be Ordained but by Three Biſhops; the Second, That thoſe who have no Teſtimonials, and do not remember that they were baptized, ſhall be baptized a-new; and the laſt declares, That the *Donatiſts* ſhall be receiv'd only to the Rank of Lay-men.

The other Canons were made in this Council of *Carthage*. The Firſt, as appears by the Code of the Canons of the *African* Councils, is the 48th. wherein *Honoratus* and *Urbanus* Legates from the Province of *Mauritania*, ſay, That they have for a long time expected thoſe of *Numidia*, and declare, That they approve the *Nicene* Creed, and the Canon which forbids any to celebrate the Holy Sacrifice unleſs he be faſting. They ſay that *Siricius* and *Simplicianus* ought to be conſulted about the caſe of Infants baptized by the *Donatiſts*, whether they may be Ordain'd in the Church or no.

In the 37th. the ſame Legates ſay, That Re-baptizations, Re-ordinations, and Tranſlations of Biſhops being forbidden in the full Synod of *Capua*, they beg leave to addreſs themſelves to the Governour of their Province, to drive away *Creſconius*, who had removed from *Rhegium* to *Tuburnia*, and would not depart from thence tho' he had been many times admoniſhed. The Council granted them this leave.

In the 39th. the ſame Perſons deſire, that it may be Ordain'd, that the Ordinations of Lay-men cannot be made but by 12 Biſhops: But *Aurelius* having remonſtrated that this was impoſſible in ſome Provinces, it was Ordain'd, That Three of them at leaſt ſhould meet. But he adds in the next Canon, That if there be any difference, ſome other Biſhops ſhall be called in to examine what is ſaid againſt the Perſon who is to be Ordain'd.

The 41ſt. declares, That the Biſhop of *Carthage* ſhall publiſh *Eaſter*-day immediately after the Synod, which ſhall be aſſembled every Year at *Carthage*.

The 42d. forbids the erecting a Church into a Biſhoprick which was put under the Juriſdiction of a Biſhop without his conſent.

The 43d. is againſt thoſe who ſatisfy themſelves with governing their Dioceſs without attending at Synods.

The 44th. declares, That Clergy-men ought not to be taken from their own Biſhops to make them Biſhops, without their conſent.

In the 45th. *Aurelius* Biſhop of *Carthage* remonſtrates, That commonly leave is deſired by him from the Biſhop of the place to Ordain one of his Clergy-men; but he deſires to know what is to be done if he refuſes it.

Numidius obſerves upon this Propoſal, that it was always lawful for the Biſhop of *Carthage*, to take thoſe who were deſir'd of him, and Ordain them tho' they were of another Dioceſs. *Epigonius* declares in the name of the Biſhops, That it is his Right: But *Poſthumianus* remonſtrates, That it may happen that a Biſhop ſhall have but one Prieſt, and it is not juſt to take him away from him. *Aurelius* anſwers, That a Biſhop may eaſily ordain many Prieſts, but that it is more difficult to find fit Perſons to be Biſhops; and therefore tho' a Biſhop ſhould have but one Prieſt, he ought to give him that he may be made a Biſhop. *Poſthumianus* replies, That therefore it is juſt, that another Church which has many Clergy-men, ſhould furniſh that which has given the one Prieſt to be a Biſhop; and *Aurelius* anſwers him, That the Biſhop who has many Prieſts, ſhall be perſuaded to give ſome of them to him who has given his own Prieſt to be a Biſhop.

The 46th. Canon, which ſhould be the laſt, declares, That the Biſhops which have been ordain'd in a Church, where there was never any before, with the conſent of the Biſhop of the Place, ſhall continue in their Biſhopricks; but that they ſhall only govern the People whereof they have been ordain'd Biſhops.

After

The *Councils.*

After this Canon follows the Approbation and Subſcription of the Biſhops, which is found in Canon Fifty.

Of the COUNCIL *of* Carthage *held in the Year* 398, *call'd the Fourth.*

Of *Carthage*, 398.

THere are 104 Canons which contain the Ordination and Manners of Biſhops, Prieſts, and other Eccleſiaſticks, which are attributed to a Council of *Carthage* call'd the Fourth. The Preface declares, That it was held under the Conſulſhip of *Honorius* and *Eutychianus*, that's to ſay, in the Year 398, and that *Aurelius* Biſhop of *Carthage* preſided in it. But there is ſome difficulty about the truth of theſe Canons; they are neither in the Code of the *African* Church, nor in the Collection of Canons entitled, *The Council of* Africk, nor in the Collection of *Ferrandus*, nor in that of *Dionyſius Exiguus*, and there is not ſo much as one of them cited in theſe places. In a Manuſcript of Cardinal *Barberini*, theſe Canons are entituled *Ancient Statutes of the Eaſtern Church*; but this cannot be the true Title, becauſe the Ceremonies of the Ordination of the leſſer Orders, as they are deſcribed in the Canons of this Council, are agreeable to the Practice of the Weſtern Church, who gave them by delivering the Holy Veſſels, and is not agreeable to the Practice of the Eaſtern Church which never made uſe of this Ceremony, but conferr'd them by Impoſition of Hands. In other Manuſcripts they are entituled, *Ancient Statutes of the Church.* They agree well enough to the Church of *Africa*, as appears by the Firſt Canon, where it is Ordain'd, That a Biſhop ſhall be interrogated, about the Errors common in *Africa*, whether he believes the Conſubſtantial Trinity; if he believes the Reſurrection of this Fleſh; if he believes that 'tis the ſame God who is the Author of the Old and New Teſtament, of the Law and the Goſpel; if he held that the Devil is not wicked by Nature, but become ſo by his own Will; if he did not condemn Second Marriages; if he did not find Fault with thoſe who eat Meat; if he believed that Baptiſm pardoned all Sins, Original Sin, as well as the other actual Sins: Laſtly, if he held that a Perſon may be ſaved out of the Church. Theſe are the Errors of the *Manichees*, *Donatiſts*, and *Pelagians* which were common in *Africk*. As to the Article which concerns Original Sin, it is ſomething ſurprizing that it ſhould be found ſo expreſly ſet down in a Synod held in 398, ſince *Pelagius* did not publiſh his Error in *Africa* till 411, and was not condemned till 412. But it may be this Error was already known, tho' *Celeſtius* was not yet come into *Africa*; and there is no doubt but the Church of *Africk* from that time maintained Original Sin. Howſoever this be, this diſcovers that theſe Canons belong to the Weſtern Church, and even to the Church of *Africa*. I ſee no reaſon ſtrong enough to convince me that this Preface is ſuppoſititious. The other Canons agree well enough with the Diſcipline of the *African* Church. The Reaſon why they are not found in the Ancient Collections, may be, becauſe they made a Body of Canons a-part by themſelves for Eccleſiaſticks. They are cited under the name of the Council of *Carthage*, by *Iſidore*, by *Hincmar*, by *Burchardus*, by *Ivo Carnutenſis*, and by *Gratian.*

The 1ſt. of theſe Canons ordains, That he who is to be promoted to the Epiſcopal Dignity ſhall be examined as to his manner of Life, his Learning and his Faith. As to his manners, it commands that Enquiry be made, if he be Prudent, Teachable, Moderate, Charitable, Humble, Affable and Merciful: As to his Learning, if he be Enlightned and Inſtructed out of the Law of God, if he be Skilful in the Underſtanding of the Scriptures, and Vers'd in the Knowledge of the Dogmes of the Church: As to his Faith, the Canon requires that he be examin'd whether he believes the Conſubſtantial Trinity; whether he believes that the Son of God aſſum'd real Fleſh and a Soul, and that there are two Natures and one Perſon only in Jeſus Chriſt; and whether he affirms, That he was really dead, and ſhall riſe again to judge the Quick and Dead. It adds, That he who is to be ordained muſt alſo be ask'd, If he believes that the ſame God is the Author of the Old and New Teſtament; If he believes that the Devil was not wicked by Nature, but became ſo by his own Free-will; If he believes that the ſame Fleſh which we now carry about with us ſhall be rais'd again; If he be perſuaded of a future Judgment, of future Puniſhments and Glory; If he does not condemn Marriage and ſecond Marriages; If he does not blame the uſe of Meats; If he communicates with Penitents that are reconcil'd; and if he holds that Baptiſm blots out Actual and Original Sin. Theſe are the things about which the Fathers of this Council would have him to be examin'd who is to be ordain'd; and they add, that if he be found well inſtructed in all theſe Points, he may be ordain'd Biſhop with the Conſent of the Clergy and the Laity, in the Aſſembly of the Biſhops of the Province, by the Authority, and in the Preſence of the Metropolitan. That after he has received the Holy Orders of Biſhop, he ought not to govern himſelf according to his Paſſion or Fancy, but according to the Canons of Councils. They add, That Care ſhould be taken, that none be ordain'd but ſuch as are arriv'd at the Age which the Holy Fathers require for the Ordination of a Biſhop.

The 2d. ordains, That when a Biſhop is ordain'd, two Biſhops ought to lay the Book of the Goſpels upon his Head and Neck, and hold it there, and that while one of the Biſhops who are preſent, pronounces the Bleſſing upon him, all the other Biſhops who are preſent, muſt touch his Head with their Hands.

The 3d. That at the Ordination of a Prieſt all the other Prieſts ſhould lay their Hands upon his Head, while the Biſhop Conſecrates him, and lay Hands upon him.

The 4th. That none but the Biſhop ſhall lay Hands upon a Deacon, when he is ordain'd becauſe he is not ordain'd for the Prieſthood, but for the Miniſtry.

The 5th. That the Sub-Deacon who does not receive Impoſition of Hands at his Ordination, ought to receive the Pattin and Chalice empty from the Hand of the Biſhop; and the Flaggons with Water, and the Baſon and Towel, from the Hand of the Arch-Deacon.

The

The 6th. That the *Acolyth* at his Ordination ought to learn from the Biſhops after what manner he ſhould behave himſelf in his Miniſtry; That he receive from the Archdeacon a Candleſtick with a Wax-Candle, to inſtruct him, that he is deſign'd for lighting the Wax-Candles in the Church; and that he alſo receive an empty Flagon to give Wine for the Euchariſt of the Blood of Jeſus Chriſt. The Councils.

The 7th. That the Exorciſt receive at his Ordination from the Hand of the Biſhop a Book wherein are written Exorciſms, and that the Biſhop ſpeak to him theſe Words; *Receive theſe, and get them by heart, and have thou the Power of laying hands upon the Poſſeſs'd and Catechumens.*

The 8th concerns the Ordination of a Reader, which was made in *Africk*, by giving him the Book of the Goſpels, and ſaying to him, *Be Thou a Reader of the Word of God.*

The 9th. concerns the Ordination of a Porter, to whom the Biſhop gave the Keys, ſaying unto him, *Behave your ſelf as one that muſt give an account to God of thoſe things which are lock'd up under theſe Keys.*

The 10th. Commands, That Virgins who would be conſecrated by the Biſhop, ſhould preſent themſelves in Habits agreeable to their Profeſſion and Vocation, like to thoſe which they are to uſe for the future.

The 11th. declares, That Widows and Nuns who are employ'd about the Baptiſm of Women ought to be capable of inſtructing others, and giving an account of their own Faith.

The 12th. That thoſe who are contracted, and preſent themſelves to receive the Benediction of Marriage, ought to be accompanied with their Kindred, and to abſtain from the uſe of Marriage the Night after the Benediction.

The 13th. That the Biſhop ought to have a Lodging near the Church.

The 14th That his Houſhold-Stuff ſhould be of little worth, his Table and Diet mean, and that he ought to acquire Authority by his Faith and his Merit, and not by external Pomp.

The 15th. That he ought not to read the Books of Pagans, nor thoſe of Hereticks, but in caſe of neceſſity, and when occaſion requires it.

The 16th and 17th. That he muſt not take upon him the Care of Widows, of Orphans and Strangers, but that he diſcharge this Care upon his Arch-Prieſt, or Arch-Deacon.

The 18th. That a Biſhop ought not to be Executor of a Laſt Will and Teſtament.

The 19th. That he ought not to plead a Cauſe.

The 20th. That he ought not to trouble himſelf with Domeſtick Affairs, but apply himſelf wholly to Reading, Prayer, and Preaching of the Word of God.

The 21ſt. That he ought not to diſpenſe with his going to the Synod, unleſs there be great neceſſity, and that if he does not go, he muſt ſend a Deputy to approve every thing that ſhall be ordain'd by the Synod, without prejudice to the Truths of Faith.

The 22d. That a Biſhop ſhall not ordain Eccleſiaſticks without the Conſent of his Clergy, and that he ſhall deſire the Teſtimony and Approbation of the Laity.

The 23d. That he ſhall hear no Cauſe but in the preſence of his Clergy, and that the Sentences which he ſhall give in the abſence of his Clergy ſhall be null and void.

The 24th. That he ſhall be excommunicated who goes out of the Church in Sermon time.

The 25th. That if the fear of God does not reconcile the Biſhops, they ought to be reconciled together by the Synod.

The 26th. enjoyns Biſhops to exhort the People of their Dioceſſes to live in Peace.

The 27th. forbids the Tranſlations of Biſhops which are made through Ambition; and as for thoſe which are made for the Good of the Church, it ſays, they ought to be made upon the Requeſt of the Clergy and People by Order of the Synod: neither does it permit Clergy-men to remove unto another Church, without the leave of their Biſhops.

The 28th declares, That a Synod may examine a-new the Condemnation of a Biſhop.

The 29th. That a Biſhop who accuſes a Clergy-man or Lay-man, ought to exhibit his Information againſt him to the Synod.

The 30th. forbids Eccleſiaſtical Judges to judge in the abſence of the Party accus'd.

The 31ſt. declares, That Biſhops ought to uſe the Goods of the Church, not as their own proper Goods, but as ſuch of which they have only the uſe.

The 32d. declares all Sale or exchange of Eccleſiaſtical Goods to be null and void, which is made without the Conſent of the Clergy.

The 33d declares, That the Biſhops and Prieſts who are forced to go into their Neighbour's Churches ſhall be received, and that they ſhall be invited to Preach and to Celebrate the Euchariſt there.

The 34th. That a Biſhop being ſeated, ſhall not ſuffer a Prieſt to continue ſtanding before him.

The 35th, That a Biſhop ſhall ſit on a Seat rais'd on high in the Church, or in the Aſſembly of his Prieſts; but in his Houſe he ſhall converſe with them as his Collegues and Brethren.

The 36th. That the Prieſts who govern the Churches, ſhall ſend for the Holy Chriſm before *Eaſter.*

The 37th. That the Deacon ſhould look upon himſelf as the Miniſter of the Prieſt, as well as of the Biſhop.

The 38th. That he may give the Euchariſt to the People in the preſence of the Prieſt, if neceſſity enforce it, and the Prieſt be willing.

The 39th. That he ſhall not ſit down but with the Prieſt's leave.

The 40th. That in a meeting of Prieſts, he muſt not ſpeak but when he is ask'd.

The 41ſt. That he ſhall not make uſe of a Surplice but at the time of Oblation.

The 42d. That a Miniſter who diſcharges faithfully his Miniſtry ought to be preferred to a higher Dignity.

The *Councils.*

The 43d. That Chriſtians who ſuffer for Religion, ought to be honoured, and their neceſſities provided for.

The 44th. forbids Clergy-men to ſuffer the Hair of their Heads or Beards to grow.

The 45th. exhorts them to make known their Vocation by their Modeſty in their Apparel and Countenance, and forbids them to diſtinguiſh themſelves by their Habit or their Shooes.

The 46th. forbids them to co-habit with Strange Women.

The 47th. and 48th. forbids them to walk in publick Places, and appear at Fairs.

The 49th. deprives them of their Rewards who are not preſent at *Vigils.*

The 50th. declares, That thoſe Miniſters ſhould be depriv'd of their Miniſtery who do not do their Duty, or do it negligently.

The 51ſt. 52d. and 53d. require all Miniſters, how able ſoever they be, to earn their living by an honeſt Trade, yet without failing in their Duty.

The 54th. forbids the Advancement of thoſe Miniſters higher, who envy the Prerogative of others.

The 55th. commands Biſhops to excommunicate thoſe who accuſe their Brethren unjuſtly, and forbids the admitting of them into the Clergy, even tho' they ſhould amend.

The 56th. ordains thoſe Miniſters to be degraded who are Traytors or Flatterers.

The 57th. obliges Slandering Miniſters to make Satisfaction.

The 58th. declares, That his Teſtimony is not to be received without Examination, who often goes to Law.

The 59th. That the Biſhop ought to reconcile thoſe Miniſters that are at difference, and that he who will not obey him ſhall be puniſhed by the Synod.

The 60th. declares, That a Miniſter ought to be remov'd from his Miniſtry, who ſpeaks laſcivious words.

The 61ſt. That thoſe Miniſters ought to be reprimanded who Swear by the Creatures, and if they continue to do it, they muſt be excommunicated.

The 62d. That the ſame ſeverity muſt be us'd to a Miniſter who ſings at Meals.

The 63d. is againſt thoſe Eccleſiaſticks who break a Faſt without inevitable neceſſity.

The 64th. declares, That he ought not to be accounted a Catholick who Faſts on *Sundays.*

The 65th. That the Feaſt of *Eaſter* ought to be celebrated on the ſame day.

The 66th. That an Eccleſiaſtick who believes that his Biſhop has condemned him unjuſtly, may have recourſe to the Judgment of the Synod.

The 67th. That ſeditious Perſons, Uſurers and revengful Perſons, ought not to be Ordain'd.

The 68th. That thoſe muſt not be ordain'd who are in the Rank of Penitents, and that if a Biſhop has ordain'd any of them through miſtake they ought to be depoſed, but if he knew their condition, he ſhall be deprived of the Power of Ordination.

The 69th. makes a Biſhop liable to the ſame Penalty, who ſhall ordain a Widow, or a Woman divorced.

The 70th. enjoins Eccleſiaſticks to ſhun the Society and Feaſts of Hereticks and Schiſmaticks.

The 71ſt. Ordains, That the Name of a Church ſhall not be given to the Aſſemblies of Hereticks.

The 72d. That none ſhall Pray or ſing with them.

The 73d. That thoſe ſhall be excommunicated who ſhall Communicate or Pray with them.

The 74th. That the Biſhop ſhall impoſe Penance upon him that deſires it, without reſpect to the Quality of the Perſon.

The 75th. That negligent Penitents ſhall be later received.

The 76th. declares, That if a Perſon having deſired Penance, perceive himſelf to be ſeiz'd with a Diſeaſe, and loſe his Underſtanding before the Prieſt can come to him, Penance ſhall be granted him upon the Teſtimony of thoſe who affirm that he deſired it, and if it be thought that he will quickly die, he ſhall be immediately reconciled, and the Euchariſt ſhall be put into his Mouth; but yet if he recover his health, he ſhall be put under Penance.

The 77th. That Penitents who fall ſick ſhall receive the *Viaticum*, that's to ſay, the Euchariſt.

The 78th. That thoſe who are thus receiv'd, ought not to think themſelves abſolv'd, if they recover their health, without Impoſition of Hands.

The 79th. That if Penitents die in a Journey or at Sea, before the Communion can be given them, yet they ſhall ſtill be commemorated in the Prayers and Oblations.

The 80th. That Impoſition of Hands ſhall be given to Penitents during all the times of Faſting.

The 81ſt. That Chriſtian Burial ſhall be given to Penitents.

The 82d. That Penitents ought to uſe Kneeling even at thoſe times when the Faithful are exempt from it.

The 83d. The Poor and Aged muſt be honoured.

The 84th. That the Biſhop ought not to hinder any Perſon to enter into the Church, whether he be a Heretick, Jew or Pagan, until the Maſs of the Catechumens begins.

The 85th. That the Catechumens who would be baptized, ought to give in their Names, and after that be prepar'd for Baptiſm by abſtaining from Wine and Meat, and by Impoſition of Hands.

The 86th. That Novices, or thoſe who are newly baptiz'd, ought for ſome time to abſtain from Feaſts and Shows, and to live in Continence.

The 87th contains the Sentence of Excommunication againſt a Catholick, who carries his Cauſe juſt or unjuſt before a Judge of another Religion.

The 88th. excommunicates him who forſakes the Aſſembly of the Church to be preſent at Shows.

The

The 89th. caſts thoſe out of the Church who practice Sooth-ſaying or Enchantments, and who are addicted to *Jewiſh* Superſtitions.

The 90th. declares, That the Exorciſts ought every day to lay Hands on the Poſſeſs'd.

The 91ſt. charges the Poſſeſs'd to take care that the Churches be ſwept.

The 92d. declares, That the Exorciſts ſhall feed the Poſſeſs'd who continue in the Churches.

The 93d. That Oblations ſhall not be received from the Brethren that are ſeparated from the Church.

The 94th. That their Preſents ſhall be rejected who oppreſs the Poor.

The 95th. blames thoſe who refuſe to give, in Memory of the dead, wherewithal to feed the Poor.

The 96th. ſays, That in judging a Cauſe, the Faith and Conduct of the Accuſer and Accuſed muſt be inquired into.

The 97th. That the Superiour of Nuns ought to be approved by the Biſhop.

The 98th. That a Lay-man ought not to teach in the preſence of Prieſts, unleſs they command him.

The 99th. That a Woman how Skilful and Holy ſoever ſhe be, ought not to take upon her to teach in an Aſſembly,

The 100th. That ſhe ought not to take upon her to baptize.

The 101ſt. That the young Widows which are weak ought to be maintain'd at the Expence of the Church to which they belong.

The 102d. declares, That it is the fault of the Biſhop or the Curate of the Pariſh, if the Widows and Nuns, are forced through neceſſity, to have too much familiarity with the inferiour Miniſters.

The 103d. That the Widows who are maintained at the Expence of the Church, ought to be very diligent and conſtant in the Service of God, that they may edify the Church by their Prayers and Works.

The 104th. excommunicates Widows who marry again, after they have made Profeſſion of Celibacy.

Baluzius has added yet one Canon more to theſe, which is againſt thoſe who cauſe Schiſms and Diviſions in the Church of Jeſus Chriſt, which is the Pillar and Foundation of the Faith of Chriſtians. There were many Biſhops at this Council, and they all ſubſcribed, but there are none now extant, beſides the Subſcriptions of *Aurelius* of *Carthage*, of *Donatianus* of *Talabreca*, or *Telepta*, and of St. *Auſtin*.

The *Councils*.

Of the COUNCIL *of* Carthage *in the Year* 399.

IT was a ſettled Cuſtom in *Africk*, that National Councils ſhould be held at *Carthage* very often. There was one in 399, in the Month of *April*, which is mentioned in the Code of the Canons of the *African* Church, which informs us, That this Council ſent *Epigonius* and *Vincentius* Deputies to the Emperour, to obtain a Law to forbid the taking of thoſe out of Churches who had fled thither, whatſoever Crimes they had been guilty of.

Of *Carthage*, 399.

Of the COUNCIL *of* Carthage *in the Year* 401, *commonly call'd the Fifth.*

'TIS commonly thought this Council was in the Year 398, but it appears by the Code of the Canons of the *African* Church, that the greateſt part of the Canons attributed to this Council were made in Two Aſſembiles held in the Year 401, in the Months of *June* and *September*; and therefore we follow this Code in the Abridgment of the Canons of this Council.

Of the Fifth of *Carthage*, 401.

Aurelius remonſtrates, That it was neceſſary for relieving the Churches of *Africk*, which were under great Neceſſity and Grief, to depute ſome Biſhops into the Weſt, and particularly to St. *Anaſtaſius* Biſhop of the Apoſtolical See, and to *Venerius* Biſhop of *Milan*. He repreſents that the Church of *Africk* was ſo abuſed and had ſuffered ſo great a Deſolation, That it had no Deacon who was ſufficiently learned, and much leſs a Prieſt; that therefore one might hear every day the Complaints of an infinite number of languiſhing People, and that if the Biſhops did not relieve them they muſt be accountable to God for the loſs of their Souls.

The 1ſt. Canon of this Council, which is the 57th. in the Greek Code of the *African* Church, confirms what had been ordain'd in a former Synod, That it ſhould be lawful to Ordain thoſe, who having been baptized in their Infancy among the *Donatiſts*, were afterwards reconciled to the Church; and it leaves it to the Prudence of the Biſhops to conſider, whether or no they might not receive a whole *Donatiſt* Church with its Biſhop, who ſhould deſire to be re-united to the Catholicks.

In the 2d. *Aurelius* ſays, That the Emperours ought to be intreated to deſtroy the Remainders of Idolatry, and to demoliſh ſome Temples which were yet ſtanding.

In the 3d. That they muſt alſo be deſired to give Orders, that it ſhall not be lawful to Summon a Clergy-man for a Witneſs before a Secular Judge, who has been Arbitrator or Judge of ſome Difference.

The 4th. That they muſt be deſired to forbid the Feaſts and Dancings which are made to the honour of Falſe Gods.

The 5th. That they muſt be prayed to hinder the ſhowing of Sports, Plays and Comedies, on *Sundays* and Feſtivals, particularly at *Eaſter*-time, when it happens ſometimes that more People go to the *Circus* than to the Church.

The 6th. That they muſt be entreated to give Order, that no Perſon ſhall defend an Eccleſiaſtick condemned by the Biſhops, under the pain of Correction and a Fine.

The

The *Councils.*

The 7th. That they muſt be deſired to hinder Commedians who turn Chriſtians from being forced to exerciſe their Profeſſion.

The 8th. That the Power of enfranchiſing Slaves in the Church muſt be deſired.

The 9th. declares, That if one *Equitius* a Biſhop, be found in *Italy*, who had been condemned in *Africk*, leave ſhall be deſired to make a Proceſs againſt him.

Theſe are the Canons of the Firſt Aſſembly in the Year 401.

The other Aſſembly was held the ſame Year on the 13th. of *September*. In it were read the Letters of Pope *Anaſtaſius*, who exhorted the Biſhop of *Africk* not to diſſemble the Vexations which they ſuffer from the *Donatiſts*. Nevertheleſs the Biſhops were of Opinion, that they ſhould be treated with gentleneſs, and that a Letter only ſhould be written to the Governours of Cities, to pray them to cauſe thoſe Churches to be reſtored to the Catholick Church, which the *Maximianiſts* had uſurped. This is found in the Canons 66 and 67, of the Greek Code of the Canons of the *African* Church.

The 68th. permits the Biſhops for Peace-ſake, to receive into the Catholick Clergy, thoſe Clergymen of the *Donatiſts* who ſhould be converted.

The 69th. declares, That ſome ſhall be deputed to the *Donatiſts*, to remonſtrate to them, that they ought to be reconciled to the Church.

The 70th. Ordains Biſhops, Prieſts and Deacons to have no more to do with their Wives, under pain of Degradation; for the leſſer Orders, it does not oblige them to Celibacy.

The 71ſt. forbids a Biſhop to forſake the principal Church of his Dioceſs and make his abode at another.

The 72d. declares, That Children ought to be baptized, when there is no proof, nor teſtimony that they have been already baptized.

The 73d. renews the Canon which Ordains, That the Biſhop of *Carthage* ſhall publiſh *Eaſter*-day.

The 74th. forbids him, who has the care of a Church committed to him after the death of its Biſhop, to continue there more than one Year; and obliges him to cauſe a Biſhop to be choſen; and if he neglects it, the Canon ordains that at the end of the Year, another Steward ſhall be choſen for the Church.

The 76th. is againſt the Biſhops who abſent themſelves without cauſe from the National Council.

The 77th. is againſt a particular Biſhop named *Creſconius*, who refuſed to come thither. The Council Ordains, That he ſhall come to the Firſt National *African* Council, and if he did not, that a Sentence ſhould be paſs'd againſt him.

The 78th. names Deputies for deciding a Difference of a Church in *Africa*.

The 79th. declares, That thoſe Clergy-men are not to be admitted to juſtify themſelves who have continued a Year without taking pains to take off the Excommunication which was pronounced againſt them.

The 80th. ordains, That if a Biſhop give Holy Orders to a Stranger, or if he make a Monk of another Monaſtery, Superiour of his own Monaſtery, he ſhall be ſeparated from the Communion of the other Biſhops, and ſhall enjoy only that of his own Church, and that he who was made Clergy-man or Superiour, ſhall not enjoy that Honour.

The 81ſt. is againſt thoſe Biſhops who ſhould make Hereticks or Pagans their Heirs, tho' they ſhould be of their Kindred.

The 82d. declares, That the Emperour ſhall be deſir'd to grant the Power of ſetting Servants free to the Church.

The 83d. is concerning the Care which Biſhops ought to take, to hinder the Faithful from honouring Falſe Relicks and Falſe Martyrs.

The 84th. declares, That the Emperour ſhould be requeſted to demoliſh the remaining Temples and Idols.

The 85th. and Laſt gives Power to the Biſhop of *Carthage* to Dictate and Subſcribe, in the name of the whole Council, the Letters which the Council thought fit to write and ſend. Theſe are the Canons of the Fifth Council of *Carthage*, which is commonly plac'd in the Year 398, but was indeed in the Year 401, according to the two Codes of the Canons of the *African* Church.

The Reflections which may be made on the Councils of *Africa* of which we have juſt now ſpoken, are theſe; Firſt, That there were in *Africa* a great number of Biſhops; Secondly, That the Title of Metropolitan in *Africa*, was not as in other places, affixed to the Biſhop of the Civil Metropolis, but to the Antiquity of the Biſhoprick; Thirdly, That the Biſhop of *Carthage* had much Authority over all *Africk*; That he enjoy'd great Juriſdictions and Prerogatives; in a word, That he was as it were, the Exarch or Patriarch of all *Africa*; Fourthly, That Synods were very often held in *Africa*, and they were diſtinguiſhed into two ſorts, one Provincial and the other National or General, which were commonly held at *Carthage*, where the Biſhops deputed from the Provinces aſſembled under the Authority of the Biſhop of that City; Fifthly, That they handled Matters of Diſcipline, and made ſuch Canons as they ſaw the Juncture and State of Affairs requir'd; Sixthly, That their Diſcipline with reſpect to Clergy-men, was very Regular and Exact; Seventhly, That they endeavour'd to maintain the Eccleſiaſtical Authority by the Aſſiſtance of the Imperial Laws; Laſtly, That they made many Canons very uſeful for all Chriſtians. Theſe Reflections ſeem'd neceſſary for explainnig what I have ſaid of theſe Councils, and they may conduce to repreſent and diſcover the uſefulneſs of Councils in general.

Of

Of the COUNCIL *of* Conſtantinople, *in the Year* 394.

BAlſamon has preſerv'd a Fragment of this Council held at *Conſtantinople* on the 27th of *September*, in the Year 394. It was compos'd of three Eaſtern Patriarchs, *Nectarius* of *Conſtantinople*, *Theophilus* of *Alexandria*, and *Flavianus* of *Antioch*, and of Sixteen Biſhops of the Eaſt and of *Aſia*. In it the Difference was examin'd that was between *Agapius* and *Bagadius*, who both pretended to the Biſhoprick of *Boſtra*. *Bagadius* had been depos'd by two Biſhops. The Council diſapproves this Judgment, and declares, That as a Biſhop cannot be ordained but by three Biſhops, ſo neither can he be depos'd by leſs than three. *Theophilus* ſays, That three Biſhops are not ſufficient, but all the Biſhops of the Province ſhould aſſemble if it be poſſible, and all the Synod approv'd his Judgment. This is all we know of this Council.

Of the COUNCIL *of* Alexandria, *in the Year* 399.

THeophilus aſſembled in the Year 399, a Council at *Alexandria*, wherein he condemned the Books of *Origen*. *Juſtinian* quotes a Fragment of the Letter of this Council in his Epiſtle to *Menas*.

Of the COUNCIL *of* Cyprus, *at the ſame time.*

WIthin a little time after St. *Epiphanius*, being perſwaded by the Letters of *Theophilus*, held a Council in the Iſle of *Cyprus*, and there alſo caus'd the Books of *Origen* to be condemned.

Of the COUNCIL *of* Turin.

THE Biſhops of *Africk* were not the only Biſhops who took care to maintain the Diſcipline of the Church about the end of the Fourth Century: Thoſe of *Gaul* and *Spain* have alſo left us authentical Monuments of their Paſtoral Vigilance. The former in the Canons of the Council of *Turin*, and the latter in thoſe of the Council of *Toledo*, for theſe two Councils were aſſembled in the Year 400, or thereabouts.

The Council of *Turin* determined ſeveral Differences between the Churches and Biſhops of *Gaul*.

The 1ſt is, That which *Proculus* Biſhop of *Marſeilles* had with the Biſhops of *Gallia Narbonenſis*, of which he would be acknowledged Metropolitan. The Council, for Peace-ſake granted to the Perſon, and not to the See of *Proculus*, the Juriſdiction of a Primate over all the Churches in the Second *Narbonenſis*.

The 2d Difference was between the Biſhops of the Churches of *Arles* and *Vienna*, who conteſted the Right of Primacy. The Synod declares, That this Right belongs to him who ſhall prove that his City is the Metropolis; but in the mean time it ordains, as a Proviſion for preſerving Peace, That the Biſhops of theſe two Churches ſhall have under their Juriſdiction the Churches which are neareſt to their own Cities, and that they ſhall live hereafter in Peace, without diſturbing one another, by uſurping the Churches that are remote.

The third Queſtion which was to be determined in this Synod, concerned Four Biſhops, who had made Ordinations contrary to Order: The Council remits their Fault, on condition that they will not relapſe into it any more, and Ordains, That for the time to come, thoſe who ſhall relapſe into it, ſhall be diſabled from coming to Synods, and that thoſe who ſhall be ſo ordained, ſhall be depriv'd of the Prieſthood.

The 4th is concerning a Lay-man called *Palladius*, who complained of a Sentence given againſt him by his own Biſhop *Triferius*, before whom he was not able to prove a Crime of which he had accus'd a Prieſt. The Council confirms the Sentence of *Triferius*, leaving him nevertheleſs the Liberty to ſhow favour to *Palladius*.

It confirms alſo in the 5th Canon another Sentence of the ſame Biſhop, given againſt the Prieſt *Exuperantius*, who had vomited forth many Calumnies and Reproaches againſt him.

The 6th Canon is againſt thoſe who communicated with *Felix* Biſhop of *Triers*, who was of the Faction of the *Ithacians*.

The 7th forbids Biſhops to take Clergy-men from any one of their Brethren, to ordain them in their own Churches, and to receive thoſe into Communion who have been excommunicated in ſome other place.

The 8th declares, That thoſe who have been ordained contrary to the Canons, and who being ordain'd have had Children, ought not to be advanc'd to higher Orders.

Of the COUNCIL *of* Toledo.

THIS Council was held in the Year 400. and compos'd of Nineteen *Spaniſh* Biſhops aſſembled at *Toledo*, who having made Profeſſion of the Faith, and condemned the Errors of the *Priſcillianiſts*, made Canons concerning Diſcipline. The Firſt thing which they ordained was, That the Canons of the Council of *Nice* ſhould be obſerv'd: And afterwards they made 20 other Canons.

In the 1ſt they permit the Order of Deacon to be given to married Perſons, provided they be chaſte, and preſerve Continence; but they impoſe no other Penalty upon a Deacon or a Prieſt who

The *Councils.*

[Continence in theſe Canons is to be underſtood of abſtaining from the Rites of Marriage.

has not liv'd in Continence, and who had Children before the Law which the Biſhops of *Luſitania* made upon this Subject: They impoſe upon them, no other Penalty, but that they ſhall not be capable of riſing to a higher Dignity.

The 2d Canon forbids the ordaining of a Perſon who has done publick Penance: It adds, That if neceſſity require, he may be made a Porter, or at moſt a Reader; but upon Condition, that he neither read the Epiſtles nor Goſpels; and that if any ſuch Perſon has been Ordain'd Deacon, he ſhall be only in the rank of Sub-Deacons, without being capable of laying on of Hands, or touching *Holy Things*. 'Tis obſerved afterwards, that a Penitent is he, who having done Publick Penance after his Baptiſm, for Murder, or ſome other Crime of like Nature, has been publickly reconcil'd at the Altar of God.

[*i.e.* The Elements of the Euchariſt.

The 3d Canon declares, That if a Reader marry a Widow, he cannot be advanced to higher Orders, and that at moſt he ſhall only be a Sub-Deacon.

The 4th, That a Sub-Deacon who Marries again, ſhall be put in the rank of Porters or Readers, without being capable of reading the Epiſtles or Goſpels; That he who ſhall Marry a third time ſhall be ſeparated from the Church for the ſpace of two Years; and after he is reconciled, he ſhall never riſe higher than the rank of Lay-men.

The 5th deprives a Clergy-man of Eccleſiaſtical Orders, who being deſign'd for the Service of ſome Church in the City or Country, ſhall not be preſent at the Sacrifice which is made there every Day.

The 6th forbids Virgins conſecrated to God, to have any familiarity with Eccleſiaſtical Men, who are not of their near Kindred.

The 7th gives leave to Clergy-men who have Wives that do not behave themſelves well, to bind them and ſhut them up in their Houſes, and forbids them to eat with them till they have done Penance.

The 8th excludes thoſe from Holy Orders, who have been in the Wars after they have received Baptiſm.

The 9th forbids Virgins and Widows to pray with Strangers in their Houſes, except in the preſence of the Biſhop, a Prieſt, or a Deacon.

The 10th declares, That thoſe muſt not be ordain'd, who have a dependence upon ſome Family, or who are engaged in ſome Farm, unleſs thoſe upon whom they depend, conſent to it.

The 11th declares, That if a Man in Power has robbed a Clergy-man, or a poor Monk, and will not appear before the Biſhop to give an account of what he has done, he ought to be excommunicated till he reſtores the Goods which do not belong to him.

The 12th forbids to receive a Clergy-man from another Biſhop, unleſs he be a Schiſmatick, and declares all thoſe Excommunicated, who ſeparate from Catholicks to join with Schiſmaticks.

The 13th Ordains, that thoſe who come to Church and do not receive the Communion ſhall be admoniſhed, that they muſt either communicate, or be put in the rank of Penitents, and if they will do neither, they ſhall be excommunicated.

The 14th ordains, That he ſhall be driven away as a Sacrilegious Perſon, which having received the Euchariſt from the hand of the Biſhop, does not eat it.

The 15th declares, That we muſt neither eat nor converſe with a Lay-man or Clergy-man who is excommunicated.

The 16th impoſes a Penance of ten Years for Adultery.

The 17th declares, That he who has a Concubine and a Wife both together, ought to be excommunicated, but that he ought not to be excommunicated who has only a Concubine; ſo that it is neceſſary for every one that is a Member of the Church, to ſatisfie himſelf either with one Wife or one Concubine. This Canon may give ſome trouble to thoſe, who know not that the Word *Concubine*, which is at preſent odious, was formerly taken for a Woman, to whom the Marriage Promiſe was given, tho' ſhe was not married with all the Solemnities which the Laws required in Marriage; as St. *Auſtin* has explained it in the 5th Chap. of the Book, about the advantages of Marriage.

The 18th declares, That we ought not to communicate with the Widow of a Biſhop, a Prieſt, or a Deacon, if ſhe marries again, and that ſhe ought not to be reconciled until the Point of Death.

The 19th inflicts the ſame Penalty upon the Daughter of a Biſhop, a Prieſt, or a Deacon, who marries after ſhe has been conſecrated to God.

The 20th is expreſſed in theſe Words: Altho' it is obſerved almoſt every where, not to conſecrate Chriſm without the Biſhop, yet becauſe we are informed that in ſome places the Prieſts do conſecrate it, we have ordain'd, that for the future, none but the Biſhop ſhall conſecrate the Holy Chriſm; and that he ſhall ſend it through all his Dioceſs. And to the end that this Canon may be put in execution, every Church ſhall ſend to the Biſhop a Deacon or Sub-Deacon about *Eaſter*, that he may fetch Chriſm for that day. 'Tis certain, that the Biſhop can conſecrate Chriſm at all times, which the Prieſts cannot do without the Authority and Permiſſion of the Biſhop. The Deacons cannot adminiſter the Holy Chriſm, 'tis only lawful for the Prieſts to do it in the abſence of the Biſhop, or by his Order, if he be preſent.

Theſe are the Eccleſiaſtical Canons which were made at the end of the Fourth Century, and the beginning of the Fifth.

An Abridgment of the Doctrine *of the* Fourth AGE *of the* Church.

THO' there was nothing taught in the Fourth Age of the Church, which was not believed in the Three Firſt; yet it muſt be confeſſed, that in it the chief Myſteries of Religion were very much clear'd up and explained. As to the Divinity and Attributes of God, there was nothing almoſt added to what was ſaid by the ancient Fathers, and they were even leſs handled in this Age then in the preceding. But the Myſtery of the Trinity, as we have ſeen, was the Subject of an infinite number of Books written by the Authors of this Age, and of many Synodical Deciſions. The Divinity of the Son of God and the Holy Spirit was eſtabliſhed. It was proved, That theſe two Perſons are of the ſame Subſtance with the Father; Eſſence and Subſtance was carefully diſtinguiſhed from the Perſon; many Arguments were urged whereon to ground this Doctrine; and the Objections which the Hereticks proops'd againſt it, were anſwered.

There was ſome Difference among the Catholicks, about the Word *Hypoſtaſis*; Some would have it ſaid, That the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, were Three *Hypoſtaſes*, and others maintain'd that we ought to ſay, That they were but one and the ſame *Hypoſtaſis*; but this ſeeming Difference conſiſted only in a Queſtion about a Word, which depended upon the ſignification of the Word *Hypoſtaſis*, which one Party took for the Perſon, and the other for the Nature. All the Fathers of this Age acknowledged, that the Word was a Perſon, diſtinguiſhed from the Perſon of the Eternal Father, and that his Generation was Eternal; but they did not think of explaining how this Generation is made; and they confeſs'd, That it is ineffable and incomprehenſible: neither did they inſiſt upon a multitude of ſubtle Queſtions concerning the Myſtery of the moſt Holy Trinity, and they always continued in the Simplicity of the Faith, which they eſtabliſhed upon the Authority of Scripture and of Tradition. They taught alſo, That the Word appeared to the Patriarchs, and in this ſence they ſaid that he was viſible. Tho' they treated not ſo much in this Age of the Myſtery of the Incarnation, as in the next, yet it was explained very clearly, and not only the Errors of *Arius* and *Apollinarius* were condemned, who denied that Jeſus Chriſt had a Soul or Humane Underſtanding different from the Divinity; but even the Errors of *Neſtorius*, *Eutyches*, and all the other Hereticks were rejected beforehand, who either diſtinguiſh Two Perſons in Jeſus Chriſt, or confound the Two Natures and their Properties. They believed the Incarnation to be neceſſary for the Redemption of Mankind, and acknowledged, that none can be ſaved without Faith in Jeſus Chriſt. Some taught alſo, that Jeſus Chriſt preached the Goſpel to thoſe in Hell, but this Opinion was rejected by many. They affirmed that there were great numbers of Angels and Devils. They determined nothing about the Day of Judgment, and they did all almoſt confeſs, that Men are wholly ignorant of it. They looked upon what the Ancients ſaid concerning the Reign of Jeſus Chriſt upon Earth, for the ſpace of a 1000 Years as a mere groundleſs Imagination. They almoſt all acknowledged, that the Souls which are innocent and purified from their Sins, enjoy Happineſs before the Day of Judgment; and that the Souls of the Wicked are condemned to Eternal Fire, immediately after their Death: Yet they confeſs'd, that after the Reſurrection, their Happineſs or Miſery ſhould ſtill be encreaſed. They believed, that the Souls of Men were Spiritual and Immortal; but they doubted, Whether they were immediately created by God, or produced by the Souls of their Fathers and Mothers. They ſpoke more of Grace than thoſe who lived in the preceding Ages, and yet they aſcribed always very much to Free-Will. Original Sin, begun to be better known. They excluded from the Kingdom of Heaven, Children who died without Baptiſm; but they did not affirm that they ſhould endure the Torments of Fire. They acknowledged the Efficacy and neceſſity of Baptiſm. The Impoſition of the Hands of the Biſhop, or the Anointing with Holy Chriſm, was looked upon as a Sacrament which brought down the Holy Spirit upon the Baptized. They maintained againſt the *Novatians*, that the Church had power to impoſe Penance, and to forgive the moſt Enormous Sins. They taught clearly, That the Bread and Wine of the Euchariſt, were changed into the Body and Blood of Jeſus Chriſt. They gave the Name of a Sacrifice to the Celebration of the Euchariſt, and performed it with particular Ceremonies. They were perſwaded that Men ought to be Ordained, to make them capable of diſcharging the Eccleſiaſtical Functions. They approved of Marriage, and would have the Perſons to be married, contracted in the Face of the Church, and in the preſence of a Prieſt who gave a Bleſſing. They honoured Virginity, and commended thoſe who profeſſed it; and looked upon thoſe as Sacrilegious Perſons who violated that Profeſſion. They had much Reverence and Veneration for the Bleſſed Virgin, and for the Saints; they prayed to them, and alſo honoured their Reliques. They prayed for the Dead. We have often taken Notice of their Opinion concerning the Authority of Holy Scripture and Tradition. They taught, that there was but one Catholick Church, out of which there was no Salvation, and to whoſe Authority all Men ought to ſubmit, becauſe it can neither ceaſe to be, nor Err in Matters of Faith.

Wherefore one may ſay in general, That the Doctrine of the Fourth Age was the belief of the Church of that Age, and ſo the Church not being capable of changing her Belief, it neceſſarily follows, That the Doctrine of that Time, is not at all different from that which the Church teaches ſtill at this Day.

An Abridgment of the Diſcipline *of the* Fourth AGE *of the* Church.

THE Diſcipline of the Church, conſiſts either in the Government, or in the Policy, or in the Ceremonies, or in the Practiſes which concerns Manners and Chriſtian Perfection. It cannot be doubted but theſe Three Points, and eſpecially the Two former, were very much improved in the Fourth

Fourth Age of the Church. For before this time, the Church which had been continually toſs'd and troubled with Perſecutions, could never ſettle one conſtant and uniform Form of Government, nor celebrate the Myſteries with the Pomp and Splendor of Ceremonies: But when once ſhe was perfectly delivered from the Yoke of Tyranny, under which ſhe had groaned before, and eſtabliſhed by the Authority of a Chriſtian Emperour, ſhe made Rules and Laws for the Government of her ſelf, and joined to the purity of Faith the Magnificence of Ceremonies. Thus, tho' there had been ſome Rules for the Government of the Churches of the Firſt Ages, which were eſtabliſhed by Cuſtom and Tradition, and there were already many Ceremonies practis'd; yet it may be affirm'd that theſe things were very much improv'd in the Fourth Age of the Church, as will eaſily appear by comparing what was Ordain'd and Practis'd in that Age, with what was done in the foregoing.

Firſt, As to the Government of the Church. It was in the Fourth Age that the Body of the Churches were perfected, and that certain Rules were eſtabliſhed for Eccleſiaſtical Deciſions. The Diſtinction, Diſtribution and Subordination of Churches were ſettled for the moſt part according to the Form of the Civil Government. The Civil Provinces form'd the Body of an Eccleſiaſtical Province. The Biſhop of the Civil Metropolis was look'd upon as the firſt Biſhop of the Province. Some Rights and Prerogatives were aſſigned to him, and the care of overſeeing the whole Province was committed to him. In every Province there was held twice a Year Provincial Councils, which the Metropolitan called together, and over which he preſided. When a Biſhop died, all the Biſhops of the Province were called together to ordain a Succeſſor in his room. He was commonly choſen by the Clergy and People of the Vacant Church; the Metropolitan was to be preſent at this Ordination, and he could not do it unleſs two Biſhops of the Province were with him, and the reſt conſented to it. As many Civil Provinces made one diſtrict, which was called a Dioceſs, ſo many Eccleſiaſtical Provinces made one Eccleſiaſtical Dioceſs, of which the Biſhop of the Principal City was the Head. This Biſhop had the Rights, Prerogatives, Privileges of Honour and Juriſdiction over the whole Dioceſs; he enjoyed alſo the Right of Ordaining Metropolitans, which belong'd formerly to the Biſhops of the Province. The Biſhop of the Church of *Rome* was in poſſeſſion of the Primacy which he receiv'd from Jeſus Chriſt, as being Succeſſor to St. *Peter* Prince of the Apoſtles. This Primacy gave him great Rights and Prerogatives in the whole Church, to maintain the Faith, and cauſe the Holy Canons to be obſerved. It happened ſometimes, but ſeldom, that he abuſed his Power and Authority, but when this happened, the Church was ſatisfied that ſhe could remedy the Abuſe. So when *Liberius* had ſubſcribed to an *Arian* Creed, and condemned St. *Athanaſius*, the other Biſhops did not think themſelves obliged to follow his Example. The Churches of *Alexandria*, of *Antioch*, and ſome others, had alſo their Privileges founded upon Eccleſiaſtical Cuſtom. The Church of *Jeruſalem* had a degree of Honour, and acquired by little and little ſome Juriſdiction. Laſtly, the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* procured to himſelf the Second Rank of Honour, and in a little time aſſumed to himſelf the Juriſdiction over *Thrace*, *Pontus*, and leſſer *Aſia*. The Suburbicary Churches had in a manner no other Metropolitan but the Biſhop of *Rome*. The Churches of *Gaul* and *Spain* were Governed by Metropolitans and Provincial Synods. The Churches of *Africa* had no fixed Metropolitan; this Dignity belong'd to the moſt ancient Biſhop of the Province: But the Biſhop of *Carthage* had great Rights and Prerogatives, and even a kind of Juriſdiction over all *Africk*. As to the Churches without the *Roman* Empire, they had no certain Form, and they were for the moſt part govern'd by one Biſhop only, who had under him many Prieſts. The Prieſts took care of the People together with the Biſhops: There were alſo Churches in the Cities and the Country, where they preſided over the Aſſemblies of the People, as Pariſh-Prieſts do now. There were alſo Suffragans who held a middle place between Biſhops and Prieſts: There was no Biſhop, Prieſt, Deacon or Miniſter ordain'd, but who was engaged to do his Duty in one certain Church, and this he was obliged to diſcharge.

As for Eccleſiaſtical Deciſions, a Biſhop never judged any thing without the Advice of his Clergy. Provincial Councils were commonly held Twice a Year, where the Determinations and Differences of the Biſhops of the Province were examined: There all Eccleſiaſtical Differences were firſt decided, Matters of Faith only excepted. But thoſe who thought them-

[Whoever has attentively read the foregoing account of the Controverſies by which the Church was divided in this Age, and of the Synods that were convened to determine them, can make a very true Judgment whether this is not ſaid (to ſave himſelf) by a Man, who having in his other Writings appeared ſo zealouſly for the Privileges of the *Gallican* Church againſt the Pretenſions of the Court of *Rome*, thought himſelf obliged to inſert this Period for the ſatisfaction of his ſcrupulous Brethren. Theſe Abridgments are deſigned to be heaps of Concluſions from Premiſes already laid down in the precedent Work, ſo that tho' this Propoſition were true in it ſelf, it were here impertinent, becauſe it cannot be collected from what went before, which makes me think that this Period belongs more to the Licenſers than the Author. I need only appeal to this very Hiſtory, from which two Concluſions may be certainly drawn. Firſt, That the Orthodox Biſhops who were perſecuted by *Conſtantius* and *Valens* in the Eaſt, were glad to fly to *Rome* for ſhelter, and would, as all Men naturally do, make the moſt of the Aſſiſtance they found, that poſſibly they could. Secondly, that every Metropolitical See was equally concerned to preſerve its own Rights, and the reſt of the Church thought it only a Matter of Diſcipline inſtituted for the ſake of Order and Decency, that one Church had the Rights of a Metropolis, rather then another. This laſt Mr. *Du Pin* takes pains himſelf to prove, from whence at leaſt this muſt be plain, That he muſt believe that in the Fourth Age of the Church, all the Supremacy that was allowed to the Church of *Rome* was only Titular out of its own Juriſdiction; and then the Primacy granted to St. *Peter* could not have then been underſtood to belong to any of his Succeſſors, (even tho' we ſhould allow them to have thought that St. *Peter* had a real Authority) ſince the reſt of the Church plainly acted without any regard to it, and teſtified no remorſe for it afterwards.]

themſelves injured, quickly had recourſe to the Biſhop who preſided over the Dioceſs, and to his Synod. The Biſhop of *Rome* pretended to have this Juriſdiction over all the reſt, and the Council of *Sardica* granted him ſomething like it. But the Eaſtern Churches and many others maintained the Authority of their Dioceſan or National Synods: All the Biſhops thought themſelves Judges of Matters of Faith. When any queſtion of Faith became a publick Diſpute, the Biſhops of the Great Sees were conſulted, and chiefly the Biſhop of *Rome*, whoſe Opinion was of great weight, as well upon the account of his Primacy, as becauſe he anſwered in the Name of all the Weſtern Biſhops, and was a Witneſs of their Doctrine. The General Council of the Eaſtern and Weſtern Biſhops, was looked upon as the Sovereign Judge for deciding all ſorts of Eccleſiaſtical Controverſies. Excommunication or Separation from the viſible Communion of the Church, was the Eccleſiaſtical Penalty, which was made uſe of againſt all thoſe who were convicted of an Error or a Crime; if they repented they were put under Penance, and then they might be reſtored to the Communion of the Church; but if they were obſtinate, they were wholly caſt out. The Churches were united together by Letters of Communion. 'Twas forbidden to receive any one into the Church who had been Excommunicated, by his own Biſhop, without his Conſent. And ſo thoſe who were excommunicated, were ſeparated from the Communion of all the Churches in the World. If any particular Church, any Biſhops, or any other Perſons ſeparated themſelves from the Body of the Church, or continued ſeparated from it, they were looked upon as Schiſmaticks. Tranſlations of Biſhops were forbidden; they were very rare in the Weſt; but the Ambition of ſome Biſhops made them common in the Eaſt. Many Canons were made for hindering Biſhops and Clergy-men from going to Court. A Biſhop was forbidden to meddle with the Affairs of another Dioceſs, or to Ordain any Perſons out of his own. Perſons of an unblameable Life, were made choice of to enter into Holy Orders; they were depoſed when they committed any Crime. In many Churches the Age and the neceſſary Times were preſcribed at which any one could be raiſed to Eccleſiaſtical Orders. The Biſhops, Prieſts and Deacons were obliged to Celibacy in the Weſt; which Law was not eſtabliſhed in the Eaſt. The Church begun then to have great Riches, which came to her from the Liberality of the Emperours, and others of the Faithful. The Sacraments were adminiſtred *gratis*, and it was forbidden to take or give any thing for a Spiritual Benefit. Many very uſeful Canons were made concerning the Life and Manners of Eccleſiaſticks. In a word, Nothing can be greater or Wiſer than the Laws which were made at this time, concerning the Government of the Church; but it muſt be confeſſed, That they were not always very exactly obſerved, and that the Intereſts and Paſſions of Men, the Ambition of Biſhops, and the Will of Princes, cauſed them often to be violated, contrary to the Intention of the Church, which uſed all her Endeavours to maintain them.

When Chriſtians began in the Reign of *Conſtantine* to perform Divine Service publickly with Pomp and Solemnity, there is no doubt but the Ancient Eccleſiaſtical Ceremonies were then perfected, and that new ones were added to render the Celebration of the Holy Myſteries more venerable to the People. Some of the chief of them were theſe:

Baptiſm was adminiſtred to Infants and Adult Perſons with many Ceremonies. They were dipped Three times into the Water. Exorciſms and Anointings were in uſe. Milk and Honey were given to the Catechumens. The Solemn times for Adminiſtring Baptiſm were *Eaſter* and *Whitſunday*, and alſo *Epiphany* in ſome Churches. The Adult were prepared for Receiving this Sacrament a conſiderable time before, and there were many Degrees of Catechumens, as we have already obſerved. After Baptiſm the Biſhop conferred the Fulneſs of the Holy Spirit, by Impoſition of Hands in the Latin Church, and by Unction in the Greek. The Times and Degrees of Publick Penance for Crimes committed after Baptiſm, were ſettled by an Infinite number of Canons, yet it was always left to the Diſcretion of the Biſhop, to leſſen or encreaſe them. Publick Penance was impoſed for all the great Crimes, which the Penitents were either convicted of, or confeſſed themſelves to be guilty of. Abſolution was not commonly refuſed for any Crime; but Penance was never granted twice. The Holy Sacrifice of the Euchariſt was celebrated with Ceremonies. The Euchariſt was commonly given to the Laity in both Kinds; but upon certain occaſions they gave it in one kind only. The Bread which was conſecrated was ordinary Bread, broken into many pieces. The Faithful were often preſent at the Holy Sacrifice; Catechumens and Penitents were debarred from it; the Euchariſt was received in the Act of Adoration. The Laity received alſo the Bread of the Euchariſt into their hands, but the cuſtom of carrying it to their Houſes was very rare, and it was commonly ſpent all in the Church, while they were faſting. The Love-Feaſts or Feaſts of Charity, were removed in moſt Churches; almoſt all thoſe that were preſent at the Sacrifice received the Communion; and ſo Chriſtians receiv'd the Body of Jeſus Chriſt very often, and yet were perſwaded, that they ought to be Holy and Innocent to receive it worthily. Before the Communion-Office began, there were ſome Prayers which were made for Catechumens and Penitents. The Holy Scripture was read in the Aſſemblies of Chriſtians, and the Biſhop or one of the Prieſts preached the Word of God. Theſe Aſſemblies were held in Churches conſecrated to God, and built magnificently; they were made very ſplendid, and Divine Offices were celebrated there with much Pomp and Splendor. Singing of Pſalms was alſo uſed; Wax-Candles were lighted chiefly during the Nocturnal Offices. The Dead were buried with much Ceremony and Pomp, the great Feſtivals were celebrated with much Solemnity. Proceſſions began to be introduced. Prayer for the Dead was a common Practice in the Church; they were commemorated at the celebration of the Euchariſt. The Invocation of Saints and Martyrs, and the Celebration of their Feſtivals were common in all the Churches; the uſe of Croſſes was frequent; the Sign of the Croſs was made very often; there were Images in many Churches. A Bleſſing was given for Marriage; but the Church never gave it

for Second Marriages, and they even put Bigamiſts under Penance for ſome time. Marriages contracted between Perſons who could not lawfully Marry according to the Civil Laws, were looked upon as null. Divorce for Adultery was permitted in ſome Churches. Orders were conferred by Impoſition of Hands. Biſhops had the ſole Power of Ordaining Biſhops, Prieſts and Deacons, and of Confirming. Solemn Baptiſm alſo, and the Abſolution of Publick Penitents was reſerv'd to them. The number of leſſer Orders was not fixed; there were more or fewer of them in different Churches. There were Deaconeſſes in almoſt all Churches. The Myſteries were carefully concealed from thoſe who were not yet baptized. The Biſhops, Prieſts, Deacons, and the Laity, had their Places in the Churches. In ſhort, Divine Service was performed with much Decency, Modeſty, Gravity and Pomp.

Faſting is one of the chief external Practices which concern Manners: The Chriſtians of the Fourth Age were very Religious in obſerving it. Lent was eſtabliſhed in all Churches, tho' it was longer or ſhorter in different Places. The Feaſts of *Wedneſday* and *Friday*, (or *Saturday* in the Church of *Rome*) were alſo Religiouſly obſerved. During the time of Faſting, they waited till Night in Lent before they eat any thing, and till three a Clock in the Afternoon in other Faſts; and all this time they commonly abſtained from Meat and Wine in almoſt all Churches. The Monaſtick State was eſtabliſhed in this Age, and became very common in a little time. There quickly appeared a great number of Monaſteries full of an infinite number of Monks, who retir'd from the World, obſerv'd Celibacy, liv'd in Obedience, kept exceſſive Faſts, and perform'd very great Auſterities. Many Virgins were alſo conſecrated to God, made a Vow of Virginity, and liv'd in common under the Government of an Abbeſs. The Monks and Nuns were both under the Juriſdiction of their Biſhops. There were very few Monks who were Prieſts; ſome were taken out of Monaſteries to be made Biſhops. There were alſo ſome Hermits, who dwelt alone in the Deſarts. The Chriſtians were conſtantly at Prayers, and gave great Alms to the Poor, aſſiſted the Sick, viſited Priſoners, and did ſeveral other Works of Charity. They ſometimes undertook Pilgrimages to viſit the Holy Places; but tho' the Holy Fathers approved the Devotion, yet they feared the Accidents which might happen upon it, and were not of Opinion, that theſe kind of Journies ſhould be undertaken raſhly and lightly. They did not tolerate ſuperſtitious Practices, nor any new Devotions founded upon the Imaginations of private Perſons, but they recommended the Practice of Evangelical Counſels, and exhorted all Chriſtians to go on to that Perfection which is deſcribed in many Places of the Goſpel.

Theſe are ſome part of the Points of Diſcipline of the Fourth Age of the Church: I ſhall not ſtay now to obſerve many others, nor to prove theſe by Authentical Teſtimonies: becauſe my Deſign is not to make a Diſſertation upon this Subject, which would be longer then all this Volume, but only to give a ſlight *Idea* of the Diſcipline of that Time. Neither ſhall I undertake to Collect or Abridge what the Writers of this Age have ſaid of Morality, which would be an infinite Work; and the Reader ought to be ſatisfied with the Extracts that are made in the body of our Book, taken from the fineſt Paſſages of the Authors here mentioned.

The End of the Second Volume.

A CHRO-

A CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL AUTHORS Mentioned in this VOLUME.

Giving an Account of the Time of their Birth, their Names, Country and Employments, when they Flouriſhed, with the Time of their Deaths.

EUSEBIUS.

BORN in the Reign of *Galienus*, about the Year 264. Ordained Biſhop of *Cæſarea* in *Palæſtine*, in 313. Flouriſhed under *Conſtantine*. Died in the Year 338.

CONSTANTINE.

Born in the Year 273. The firſt Chriſtian Emperour. Elected the 6th of *Auguſt* 309. Died *May* 22. 337.

C. VECTIUS AQUILINUS JUVENCUS,

A Prieſt of *Spain*. Flouriſhed about the Year 329.

RHETICIUS,

Biſhop of *Autun*. Flouriſhed at the beginning of the Fourth Century.

EUSTATHIUS,

Born about the end of the Third Century. Elected Biſhop of *Antioch*, in the Year 323. Flouriſhed from that time to the Year 330. Died about the Year 335.

PETER,

Ordained Biſhop of *Alexandria* in the Year 300. Suffered Martyrdom in 311.

ALEXANDER,

Ordained Biſhop of *Alexandria* in 305. Died about the end of the Year 325.

St. *ATHANASIUS,*

Born about the Year 300. Ordained Biſhop of *Alexandria* in 326. Maintained the Faith of the Church until the Year 373. Died about the Year 373.

St. *JACOBUS NISIBENUS,*

Flouriſhed at the end of the Third, and the beginning of the Fourth Century. Died about the Year 340.

MARCELLUS,

Biſhop of *Ancyra*, Flouriſhed about the Year 325. till the Year 336.

HOSIUS,

Born *Anno* 267. Biſhop of *Corduba*. Flouriſhed from the beginning to the middle of the Fourth Century. Died in 358.

JULIUS,

Ordained Biſhop of *Rome* in the Year 335. Died in 352.

ASTERIUS,

An *Arian* Philoſopher. Wrote about the Year 330.

THEODORUS,

Biſhop of *Perinthus*. Flouriſhed about the Year 330.

TRYPHILIUS,

Biſhop in *Cyprus*. Flouriſhed under *Conſtantius*.

HELIODORUS,

A Prieſt. Under the ſame.

DONATUS,

Under *Conſtantine* and *Conſtantius*.

VITELLIUS, and *MACROBIUS,* Under *Conſtantius*.

St. *ANTHONY* the Abbot.

Born about the Year 250. He Retired into his Solitude in the Year 270. and Flouriſhed till the middle of the Fourth Century. Died *An.* 356.

St. *PACHOMIUS,*

Abbot. Flouriſhed at the end of the Fourth Century. Died about the Year 400.

ORESIESIS,

Diſciple of St. *Pachomius*. Flouriſhed at the end of the Fourth Century.

THEODORUS,

Prieſt. Succeſſor of St. *Pachomius*. Flouriſhed at the ſame time.

MACARIUS, A Monk of *Sceta*; *MACARIUS,* Abbot in *Thebais*, and *MACARIUS,* Diſciple of St. *Anthony*. Flouriſhed all about the end of the Fourth Century.

SERAPION,

Biſhop of *Thmuis*. Ordained in the Year 340.

EUSEBIUS EMISENUS,

Flouriſhed from the Year 330. Died abous the Year 350.

BASIL,

Ordained Biſhop of *Ancyra*, in the Year 336. Died after the Year 360.

LIBE-

LIBERIUS,
Ordained Biſhop of *Rome* in the Year 352. Driven away in 356. Reſtored in 358. Died in the Year 366.

St. HILARY,
Ordained Biſhop of *Poitiers* about the Year 350. Sent into Exile in 356. and reſtored in 360. Died *Anno* 367.

LUCIFER,
Biſhop of *Calaris*. Flouriſhed about the middle of the Fourth Century. Died about the Year 370.

MARIUS VICTORINUS,
Of *Africa*. Flouriſhed about the end of the Fourth Century. Died about the Year 370.

St. PACIANUS,
Biſhop of *Barcelona*. Flouriſhed about the end of the Fourth Century. Died about the Year 380.

GREGORY,
Biſhop of *Elvira* in *Spain*. Flouriſhed from the Year 357. to the end of that Century.

PHÆBADIUS,
Biſhop of *Agen*. Flouriſhed from the Year 350. almoſt to the end of the Century. Died about the Year 395.

St. OPTATUS,
Biſhop of *Milevis*. Wrote about the Year 370. Died in the Reign of *Valentinian*, about the Year 372.

ACACIUS,
Biſhop of *Cæſarea* in *Palæſtine*. Succeeded *Euſebius* in the Year 338. Died in 366.

PHOTINUS,
Biſhop of *Sirmium*. Diſcovered his Error about the Year 344. Died in 376.

AETIUS,
Taught his Errors in the Year 340. Died in 366.

EUNOMIUS,
Diſciple of *Aëtius*. Publiſhed his Errors from the Year 350. till near the end of the Century. Died about the Year 395.

GEORGE,
Of *Laodicea*. Began to appear about the Year 320. and was ordained Biſhop in 330. Died about the Year 359.

APOLINARIUS the Father,
Prieſt of *Laodicea*. Flouriſhed under *Conſtantius* and *Julian*.

APOLINARIUS the Son,
Biſhop of *Laodicea*. Flouriſhed under *Conſtantius* and *Julian*. Died about the Year 370.

TITUS,
Of *Boſtra*. Flouriſhed in the Reigns of *Julian* and *Jovian*.

DIDIMUS the Blind.
Born towards the Year 300. Profeſſor in the School of *Alexandria*. Flouriſhed about the middle of the Fourth Century. Died about the Year 395.

PETER,
Biſhop of *Alexandria*. Ordained in the Year 373. Died in 381.

LUCIUS,
The pretended Biſhop of *Alexandria*. Invaded that See in the Year 373.

AQUILIUS SEVERUS,
Died about the Year 370.

EUZOIUS,
Died about the Year 390.

St. CYRIL,
Ordained Biſhop of *Jeruſalem* in 356. Died about the Year 386.

St. EPHREM,
The *Syrian* Deacon of *Edeſſa*. Flouriſhed from the Year 360. Died in the Year 378.

DAMASUS,
Ordained Biſhop of *Rome* in the Year 366. Died in 384.

St. BASIL,
Born in the Year 328. Ordained Biſhop of *Cæſarea* in *Cappadocia* in 369. Died in the Year 379.

St. GREGORY NAZIANZEN,
Born about the Year 328. Flouriſhed from the Year 368. Died in the Year 389.

St. GREGORY NYSSEN,
Born in 230. Conſtituted Biſhop of *Nyſſa* in 371. Died in 395.

St. CÆSARIUS,
Born about the Year 330. An Officer of the Emperour. Died in the Year 369.

St. AMPHILOCHIUS.
Ordained Biſhop of *Iconium* in 375. Died about the Year 395.

MAXIMUS,
A Philoſopher. Flouriſhed about the end of the Fourth Century.

EUSEBIUS VERCELLENSIS,
Flouriſhed under the Emperours *Conſtantius* and *Valens*. Died in the Year 370.

MELETIUS,
Choſen Biſhop of *Antioch* in the Year 361. Died in 380.

DIODORUS,
A Prieſt of *Antioch*. Who Flouriſhed about the Year 370. and was ordained Biſhop of *Tarſus* in 375.

HILARY,
Deacon of *Rome*. Flouriſhed under *Liberius* and *Damaſcus*.

PRISCILLIAN,
MATRONIANUS,
TIBERIANUS,
} Executed in 384.

DICTINIUS
Died about the beginning of the Fifth Century.

ITHACIUS or IDACIUS,
Biſhop of *Oſſobona*. Flouriſhed about the end of the Fourth Century.

FAUSTINUS,
A *Luciferan* Deacon preſented his Petition to the Emperours in the Year 384.

PHILA-

A CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE.

PHILASTRIUS,
Biſhop of *Breſcia*. Died in 387.

TIMOTHY,
Ordained Biſhop of *Alexandria* in 381.

NECTARIUS,
Choſen Archbiſhop of *Conſtantinople*, Anno 382. Died in 397.

GELASIUS,
Biſhop of *Cæſarea* in *Paleſtine*. Flouriſhed about the end of the Fourth Century.

SIRICIUS,
Biſhop of *Rome*. Succeeded *Damaſus* in 386.

SABINUS,
Biſhop of the *Macedonians* at *Heraclea*. Flouriſhed about the end of the Reign of *Theodoſius*.

AMBROSE,
Of *Alexandria*, Diſciple of *Didymus*. Died about the Year 375.

THEOTIMUS,
Biſhop of *Tomi* in *Scythia*. Flouriſhed at the end of the Fourth Century.

EVAGRIUS,
Ordained Biſhop of *Antioch* in 386. Died in 393.

St. AMBROSE,
Born about the Year 340. Baptized and Ordained Biſhop of *Milan* in 374. Died in the Year 396.

St. EPIPHANIUS,
Born *Anno* 332. Ordained Biſhop of *Salamis* in the Year 366. Died in 402 or 403.

PHILO CARPATHIUS,
A Suppoſititious Author.

Q. JULIUS HILARION,
Died about the Year 400.

A CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE of the *COUNCILS* held in the *Fourth Age* of the *Church*.

The Figures ſhew the Year in which they were held according to the Vulgar Account.

The Suppoſititious Council of *Sinueſſa*		303
	Cirtha	305
	Alexandria	306
	Eliberis or *Elvira*	335
	Carthage againſt *Cæcilian*	311
	Rome	313
	Arles	314
	Ancyra	cod.
	Neocæſarea	cod.
	Alexandria	322
	Bithynia	323
	Alexandria	324
	Nice	325
	Antioch	330
	Cæſarea	334
	Tyre	335
	Jeruſalem	335
	Conſtantinople	336
	Conſtantinople	338
	Alexandria	340
The Council of	*Rome*	342
	Antioch	341, 342.
	Antioch	345
	Milan	346
	Cologne	cod.
	Sardica	347
	Sirmium, I.	349
	Sirmium, II.	351
	Arles	353
	Milan	355
	Beziers	356
	Sirmium, III.	357
	Antioch	358
	Ancyra	cod.
	Sirmium, IV.	cod.
	Sirmium, V.	359
	Ariminum	cod.
	Seleucia	cod.
	Conſtantinople	360
	Melitine	357
	Antioch	361
	Alexandria	362
	Paris	cod.
	Italy	cod.
The Council of	The Biſhops of *Egypt* at *Antioch*	363
	Antioch under *Meletius*	cod.
	Lampſacus	365
	Singidunum	366
Synods held by the *Semi-Arians*		365, 366
	Tyana	368
	Gangra	370
	Laodicea between	360 and 370
	Rome under *Damaſus*	370
	Rome under *Urſicinus*	372
	Valentia	374
	Antioch for reſtoring Peace in that Church	378
	Conſtantinople, I.	381
	Conſtantinople, II.	382
	Conſtantinople, III.	383
	Aquileia	381
	Saragoſſa	cod.
	Sida	383
	Bourdeaux	384
	Capua	390
The Council of	*Rome* and *Milan* againſt *Jovinian*	cod.
	The *Novatians* at *Sangara*	cod.
	Carthage, I.	348
	Carthage, II.	390
	Cabarſuſſa and *Bagaïs*	393, 394
	Hippo	393
	Carthage	394
	Carthage	397
	Carthage, IV.	398
	Carthage	399
	Carthage, V.	401
	Conſtantinople	394
	Alexandria	399
	Cyprus	cod.
	Turin	400
	Toledo	cod.

A TABLE of all the *Writings of* the *Eccleſiaſtical Authors* mentioned in this Volume.

EUSEBIUS of *Cæſarea.*

Genuine BOOKS ſtill Extant.

AN Apology for *Origen* in five Books; compoſed by him and the Martyr *Pamphilus*, with a Sixth by himſelf alone.
A Treatiſe againſt the Philoſopher *Hierocles.*
Fifteen Books of Evangelical preparation.
Twenty Books of Evangelical Demonſtration.
A Chronicon divided into Two Parts.
An Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory divided into Ten Books.
A little Treatiſe of the Martyrs of *Paleſtine.*
Five Books againſt *Marcellus* of *Ancyra*, of which the Three laſt are entituled, *Of Eccleſiaſtical Theology.*
Four Books of the Life of *Conſtantine.*
An Oration of *Conſtantine*'s to the Aſſembly of the Saints.
A Panegyrick upon *Conſtantine.*
A Treatiſe of Topicks.
A Letter preſerved by *Theodoret.*
A Tranſlation of the Evangelical Canons, and of the Letter to *Carpianus.*

BOOKS Loſt.

The Ten laſt Books of Evangelical Demonſtration.
Part of the Firſt Part of his Chronicon.
A Paſchal Cycle.
Five Books of the Theophany or Incarnation.
Ten Books of Commentaries upon *Iſaiah.*
Thirty Books againſt *Porphyrie.*
A Treatiſe of the ſignification of the Names which the *Jews* give to other Nations.
A Deſcription of the Holy-Land and the Temple.
Three Books of the Life of *Pamphilus.*
Little Tracts upon the Martyrs.
A Commentary upon the 150 Pſalms.
The Evangelical Canons and the Letter to *Carpianus* in Greek.
A Commentary upon the Firſt Epiſtle to the *Corinthians.*
A Treatiſe of the Poligamy of the Patriarchs.
Eclogues upon the Bible.
Letter to *Alexander* and *Euphration*, cited in the Second Council of *Nice.*
An Apology and Refutation.
An Oration made at the Dedication of the Church of *Jeruſalem.*

Suppoſititious BOOKS.

A Commentary upon the Canticles.
Lives of the Prophets.
Sermons publiſhed by *Sirmondus.*
A Concordance tranſlated by *Ambroſe Camaldulenſis.*

CONSTANTINE the Empetour.

Genuine BOOKS ſtill extant.

An Oration made to the Convention of the Saints.
An Oration to the Fathers at the Council of *Nice.*
A Prayer.
Several Letters, of which ſee a Catalogue in *p.* 15. *&c.*
Several Edicts in favour of the Chriſtian Religion, of which you have a Catalogue in *p.* 16, 17, *&c.*

BOOKS Loſt.

Several Harangues.
Several Letters.
Several Edicts.

Suppoſititious BOOK.

The Donation of *Conſtantine* to the Biſhop of *Rome.*

JUVENCUS.

Genuine BOOK ſtill Extant.

A Poem upon the Life of Jeſus Chriſt.

BOOK Loſt.

Hymns.

RHETICIUS.

BOOK Loſt.

A Commentary upon the Canticles.

EUSTATHIUS of *Antioch.*

Genuine BOOKS ſtill Extant.

A Treatiſe concerning the Witch of *Endor.*
Fragments of his Book upon the Soul, and of his Diſcourſe cited by *Theodoret.*

BOOKS Loſt.

A Treatiſe againſt the *Arians.*
Homilies.
Letters.
A Treatiſe of the Soul.

Suppoſititious BOOK.

A Commentary upon the Creation.

PETER of *Alexandria.*

Genuine BOOK Extant.

Canons upon Penance.

BOOKS Loſt.

A Treatiſe upon the Divinity.
A Diſcourſe upon Penance.
A Sermon againſt the pre-exiſtence of Souls.
A Myſtagogical Diſcourſe.

ALEXANDER of *Alexandria.*

Genuine BOOKS ſtill Extant.

Two Letters againſt *Arius*, produced by the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorians.
Paſtoral Letter publiſhed by *Cotelerius.*

St. *ATHANASIUS.*

Genuine BOOKS ſtill Extant.

Two Treatiſes againſt the Gentiles, whereof the Second is Entituled, *Of the Incarnation.*
An Apologetick to the Emperour *Conſtantine.*
A Letter to the *Egyptians*, Entituled, *The Firſt Diſcourſe againſt the* Arians.
A Letter to all the Orthodox Biſhops.
Firſt Apology.
Second Apology.
Four Treatiſes againſt the *Arians.*
Letter to thoſe that lead a Monaſtick Life.
An Hiſtorical Treatiſe to thoſe that lead a Monaſtick Life.
A Letter to *Serapion* concerning the Death of *Arius.*
A Treatiſe of Synods.
Two Letters extant in the Works of *Lucifer.*
A Letter written in the Name of the Council of *Alexandria.*

A Letter

A TABLE of all the Writings of the *Eccleſiaſtical Authors*, &c.

A Letter written in the Name of the Council of *Antioch*.
A Letter to the Biſhop of *Egypt*, *Arabia*, &c.
A Letter to the *Africans*.
A Letter to *Epictetus*.
A Sermon upon theſe Words, *My Father hath given me all things*.
An Epiſtle to *Adelphius*.
Two Letters to *Serapion* upon the Divinity of the Son and the Holy Ghoſt.
An Expoſition of the Faith.
A Letter concerning the Hiſtory of the Deciſion of the Council of *Nice*.
A Letter concerning the Opinion of St. *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria*, upon the Trinity.
A Treatiſe of the Union of the Humane Nature with the Word.
Two Treatiſes of the Incarnation againſt *Apollinarius*.
A Treatiſe againſt the Followers of *Sabellius*.
An Epiſtle to *John* and *Antiochus*.
An Epiſtle to *Palladius*.
An Epiſtle to *Dracontius*.
An Epiſtle to *Marcellinus* upon the Pſalms.
An Homily on the Sabbath, and of the Circumciſion.
A Treatiſe of the Words of Jeſus Chriſt, *Whoever ſhall be guilty of blaſphemy againſt the Holy Ghoſt*, &c.
Two Letters to *Serapion* upon the Divinity of the Holy Ghoſt.
A ſhort Diſcourſe againſt the *Arians*.
Conference between St. *Athanaſius* and the *Arians* in the Preſence of *Jovian*.
Epiſtle to *Ammon*.
A Fragment of a Feſtival Epiſtle.
An Epiſtle to *Ruffinian*.
The Book, Entituled, *An Abridgment of the Holy Scripture*.
The Life of St. *Anthony*, [interpolated extremely, if not Spurious.]

BOOKS Loſt.

A large Treatiſe of Faith.
A Treatiſe upon theſe Words of Jeſus Chriſt: *My Soul is troubled even unto Death*.
Some Dogmatical Treatiſes.

Suppoſititious BOOKS.

A Treatiſe to prove that there is but one Jeſus Chriſt.
A Treatiſe of the Incarnation againſt *Paulus Samoſatenus*.
A Refutation of the Hypocriſie of *Meletius*.
A Treatiſe concerning Virginity.
A Treatiſe of the Teſtimonies of Scripture for the Trinity.
An Homily of the Annunciation of the Virgin.
The Life of St. *Syncletica*.
The Creed which bears the name of St. *Athanaſius*.
An Expoſition of Faith upon the Incarnation.
A Diſputation againſt *Arius*.
A Letter to *Liberius*.
An Explication of theſe Words of Jeſus Chriſt, *Go to the Village*, &c.
A Homily upon the Paſſion.
A Homily upon Seed-time.
A Diſcourſe againſt all Hereſies.
A Diſcourſe of the Aſcenſion of Jeſus Chriſt, and of *Melchizedech*.
A Letter to *Jovian*.
A Book of Definitions.
Seven Dialogues of the Trinity.
A Book entituled, *A Tragedy*.
Queſtions to *Antiochus*, &c.
A Homily upon *Eaſter*-Eve.
A Fragment of a Letter to *Eupſichius*.
Eleven Books of the Unity and of the Trinity.
An Exhortation to the Monks.
A ſhort Inſtruction to the Monks.
Letters of St. *Athanaſius* to the Popes *Marcus* and *Felix*.
A Relation of the Paſſion, and of the Image of Jeſus Chriſt in the City of *Berytus*.
A Fragment upon the Incarnation againſt the Diſciples of *Paulus Samoſatenus*.
A Fragment upon the Sabbath.
Seven Homilies, publiſhed by *Holſtenius*.
Four Diſcourſes, publiſhed by F. *Combefis*.
Fragments and Commentaries upon *Job* and the *Pſalms*, cited in the *Catenæ* upon the Scriptures.

JACOBUS NISIBENUS.

BOOKS Loſt.

Twenty three Treatiſes cited by *Gennadius*, the Titles of which are ſet down in *Pag.* 49.

MARCELLUS of *Ancyra.*

BOOKS Loſt.

Treatiſes on different ſubjects, and particularly againſt the *Arians*; *Euſebius* cites ſeveral Paſſages in them, which he Refutes.

HOSIUS.

Genuine BOOK ſtill Extant.

A Letter to *Conſtantius*.

BOOKS Loſt.

Several Treatiſes againſt the *Arians*.
A Letter to his Siſter in Praiſe of Virginity.

JULIUS.

Genuine BOOKS ſtill Extant.

A Letter to the Biſhops of the Eaſt.
A Letter to the *Egyptians*, produced by St. *Athanaſius*.

Suppoſititious BOOKS.

A Letter to *Dionyſius* concerning the Incarnation.
A Letter to *Docius* upon the ſame Subject.
The Two *Decretals* attributed to this Pope.

ASTERIUS.

BOOKS Loſt.

Commentaries upon the Epiſtle to the *Romans*, upon the Goſpels, and upon the Pſalms.

THEODORUS.

BOOKS Loſt.

Commentaries upon St. *Matthew*, St. *John*, the Epiſtles of St. *Paul*, and upon the Pſalms.

TRYPHILLIUS.

BOOKS Loſt.

Commentaries upon the *Canticles*, and ſeveral other Books.

HELIODORUS.

BOOK Loſt.

A Book of the Nature of Principles.

DONATUS.

BOOKS Loſt.

A Treatiſe of the Holy Ghoſt.
A Letter on the ſame Subject.

VITELLIUS.

A TABLE of the Writings of the *Eccleſiaſtical Authors*, &c.

VITELLIUS.

BOOK Loſt.

A Book ſhewing that the Servants of God are hated by the World; and ſome other Writings concerning Diſcipline.

MACROBIUS.

BOOK Loſt.

A Treatiſe addreſſed to Confeſſors and Virgins.

A Treatiſe Addreſſed to Confeſſors and Virgins.

St. *ANTHONY.*

Genuine BOOKS Extant.

Seven Letters to Monaſteries.
An Exhortation to Monks.
A ſhort Rule.

Suppoſititious BOOKS.

A Sermon againſt Vice.
Other Sermons.

St. *PACHOMIUS.*

Genuine BOOKS Extant.

A Rule for the Monks.
Moral Precepts.
Eleven Letters.

ORESIESIS.

Genuine BOOK ſtill Extant.

A Treatiſe of the Inſtitution of Monks.

THEODORUS.

Genuine BOOK Extant.

A Letter concerning *Eaſter*.

WORKS Loſt.

Several other Letters.

The *MACARII.*

Genuine BOOKS Extant.

Fifty Homilies or Diſcourſes to the Monks.
Seven ſmall Tracts.
A Rule for the Monks.
Another Rule in the Form of a Dialogue.

BOOK Loſt.

A Letter cited by *Gennadius*.

SERAPION.

Genuine BOOK ſtill Extant.

A Treatiſe againſt the *Manichees*.

BOOKS Loſt.

A Treatiſe upon the Titles of the Pſalms.
Several Letters.

EUSEBIUS EMISENUS.

BOOKS Loſt.

A Treatiſe againſt the *Jews*.
Another againſt the *Gentiles*.
Another againſt the *Novatians*.
A Commentary upon the Epiſtle to the *Galatians*.
Several Homilies upon the Goſpels.

Suppoſititious BOOK.

A Homily in Latin.

BASIL of *Ancyra.*

BOOKS Loſt.

A Treatiſe againſt *Marcellus* of *Ancyra*.
A Treatiſe of Virginity.
Some other ſmall Tracts.

LIBERIUS.

Several Letters. See the Catalogue, *p.* 63.

St. *HILARY.*

Genuine BOOKS ſtill Extant.

Twelve Books of the Trinity.
A Treatiſe of Synods.
Three Diſcourſes addreſſed to *Conſtantius*.
Fragments.
Conference with *Auxentius*.
Commentaries upon the *Pſalms*, and upon St. *Matthew*.

BOOKS Loſt.

A Treatiſe againſt *Urſacius* and *Valens*.
An Hiſtorical Treatiſe.
A Tract againſt *Dioſcorus*.
Commentaries upon *Job*.
Commentaries upon the *Canticles*.
A Collection of Hymns.
A Treatiſe of Myſteries to *Fortunatus*.
Letters.

Suppoſititious BOOKS.

A Hymn and Letters to his Daughter *Apra*.

LUCIFER.

Genuine BOOKS ſtill Extant.

Five Books for St. *Athanaſius*, againſt *Conſtantius* and againſt the *Arians*.

VICTORINUS of *Africa.*

Genuine BOOKS ſtill Extant.

Four Books againſt *Arius*.
A Treatiſe in Defence of the Term *Conſubſtantial*.
Three Hymns of the Trinity.
A Poem of the *Maccabees*.
A Treatiſe againſt the *Manichees*.
A little Tract about the beginning of Day.

BOOKS Loſt.

Commentaries upon St. *Paul*.

St. *PACIANUS.*

Genuine BOOKS ſtill Extant.

Three Letters againſt the *Novatians*.
A Treatiſe of Baptiſm.

GREGORY of *Batica.*

BOOKS Loſt.

Several Treatiſes.
A Book concerning Faith; unleſs this be the ſame with the 49th Diſcourſe among St. *Gregory Nazianzen's*.

PHÆBA-

A TABLE of the Writings of the *Eccleſiaſtical Authors*, &c.

PHÆBADIUS.

Genuine BOOK *ſtill Extant.*

A Treatiſe againſt the Second Creed of *Sirmium*.

OPTATUS.

Genuine BOOKS *ſtill Extant.*

Six Books againſt the Schiſm of the *Donatiſts*.

Suppoſititious BOOK.

A Seventh Book.

ACACIUS of *Cæſarea*.

BOOKS Loſt.

A Treatiſe againſt *Marcellus* of *Ancyra*.
The Life of his Predeceſſor *Euſebius*.
Seventeen Volumes of Commentaries upon the Scripture.
Seven Volumes upon divers Subjects.

PHOTINUS.

BOOKS Loſt.

A Treatiſe againſt the Gentiles.
A Treatiſe addreſſed to the Emperour *Valentinian*.
A Conference with *Marcellus* of *Ancyra*, cited by St. *Epiphanius*, Hæreſ. 71.
Several other Diſcourſes.

AETIUS.

BOOK Loſt.

An Impious Libel upon the Trinity, whereof St. *Epiphanius* relates ſome Fragments, *Hæreſ.* 76.

EUNOMIUS.

BOOKS Loſt.

Seven Books of Commentaries upon the Epiſtle to the *Romans*.
Several Diſcourſes againſt the Church.
An Apology againſt the Treatiſe of St. *Baſil*.

GEORGE of *Laodicea*.

Genuine BOOKS *ſtill Extant.*

Two Letters produced by St. *Athanaſius*.
A Circular Letter againſt *Aëtius*. cited by *Sozomen*.

BOOKS Loſt.

A Treatiſe againſt the *Manichees*.
The Life of *Euſebius Emiſenus*.

The APOLLINARII.

Genuine BOOK *ſtill Extant.*

A Tranſlation of the Pſalms in Verſe.

BOOKS loſt.

Several Commentaries upon the Scriptures.
Treatiſes againſt the *Arians*, againſt *Origen*, and againſt ſeveral other Hereticks.
A Treatiſe againſt *Porphyrie*, divided into Thirty Books.
A Treatiſe of the Truth of the Chriſtian Religion againſt *Julian*.
Some Letters.
A Poem containing the Hiſtory of the *Jews*, divided into twenty four Books.
Tragedies and other Poetical Pieces, the Subjects whereof were Piety.
The Goſpels and the Epiſtles in Dialogues.

TITUS of *Boſtra*.

Genuine BOOK *ſtill Extant.*

A Tranſlation of Three Books againſt the *Manichees*.

BOOKS Loſt.

The Fourth Book againſt the *Manichees*, and the Greek Text of all the Four.
Some other Diſcourſes.

Suppoſititious BOOKS.

Commentaries upon the Goſpel of St. *Luke*.
A Sermon upon *Palm-Sunday*.

DIDIMUS of *Alexandria*.

Genuine BOOKS *ſtill Extant.*

A Tranſlation of his Treatiſe concerning the Holy Spirit; made by St. *Jerom*.
A Tranſlation of his Commentaries upon the Canonical Epiſtles.
A Fragment of a Tract againſt the *Manichees*.

BOOKS Loſt.

See the Catalogue of them, *p.* 103.

PETER of *Alexandria*.

Genuine BOOK *ſtill Extant.*

A Letter quoted by *Theodoret*, Book IV. Ch. 22, of his Hiſtory.

BOOK Loſt.

A Letter to thoſe that were Baniſhed, whereof *Facundius* cites two Fragments.

LUCIUS.

BOOKS Loſt.

A Letter upon the Feaſt of *Eaſter*.
Some other Treatiſes.

AQUILIUS SEVERUS.

BOOK Loſt.

The Hiſtory of his Life, Entituled, *Cataſtrophe*.

EUZOIUS.

BOOKS Loſt.

Several Treatiſes of which we have no Knowledge.

St. CYRIL of *Jeruſalem*.

Genuine BOOKS *ſtill Extant.*

Eighteen Catechetical Diſcourſes to the Catechumens.
Five Myſtagogical Lectures.
A Letter upon the Apparition of the Croſs.
A Letter concerning the Preſentation of Jeſus Chriſt in the Temple.

Suppoſititious BOOK.

A Letter to St. *Auſtin*.

St. EPHREM the *Syrian*.

See the Catalogue of his Works, *p.* 118, 119, and 120.

A TABLE of all the Writings of the *Eccleſiaſtical Authors*, &c.

DAMASUS.

Genuine BOOKS ſtill Extant.

Two Letters to St. *Jerom*, to be found in the Works of that Father.
A Letter to the Biſhops of *Illyricum*.
A Letter to *Paulinus*.
Anathematiſms ſent to *Paulinus*.
A Letter to the Biſhops of the Eaſt againſt *Timothy*, produced by *Theodoret*.

Suppoſititious BOOKS.

A Letter of *Damaſus* to St. *Jerom*.
A Decretal Epiſtle.
Epigrams, Epitaphs, and other Poems.

St. *BASIL.*

Genuine BOOKS ſtill Extant.

431 Letters of this Saint.
Three Canonical Letters to St. *Amphilochius*.
Nine Homilies upon the beginning of *Geneſis*.
Two Homilies upon the Creation of Man.
A Homily upon Paradiſe.
A Homily concerning Watchfulneſs, upon the 6th. Chapter of *Proverbs*.
Twenty two Homilies upon the *Pſalms*.
A Commentary upon the Sixteen firſt Chapters of *Iſaiah*
Five Books againſt *Eunomius*.
A Book concerning the Holy Ghoſt, to St. *Amphilochius*.
Two Books of Baptiſm.
Thirty one Homilies upon divers Subjects.
Three Treatiſes concerning a Monaſtick Life.
A Treatiſe of Judgment, and another of Faith.

Aſcetical Diſcourſes, viz.

The greater and leſſer Rules.
The Book of a Monaſtick Life.
The Conſtitutions.
A Treatiſe of the Chaſtiſements of Monks.
A Treatiſe concerning Virginity.

BOOKS Loſt.

Commentaries upon the whole Bible.
A Genuine Liturgy.
Some other Treatiſes.

Suppoſititious BOOKS.

Letters to *Julian* and to *Apollinarius*.
Commentaries upon the Pſalms.
A Panegyrick upon St. *Barlaam*.
A Diſcourſe of Conſolation.
An Admonition to his Spiritual Son.
A Treatiſe of the Praiſes of a Solitary Life.
Three Liturgies.
A Grammar.

St. *GREGORY NAZIANZEN.*

Genuine BOOKS ſtill Extant.

Forty Four Diſcourſes or Sermons.
A Letter to *Evagrius*.
A Letter to *Nectarius*.
Letters to *Cledonius*, Entituled, *Diſcourſes 51ſt and 52d.*
Several Poems.
A Diſcourſe in *Latin* concerning Biſhops.
242 Letters.
His Laſt Will and Teſtament.

Suppoſititious BOOKS.

The 47th, 48th, 49th, and 50th Diſcourſes.
The Paraphraſe upon *Eccleſiaſtes*.

St. *GREGORY NYSSEN.*

Genuine BOOKS ſtill Extant.

A Treatiſe upon the Creation of the World.
A Treatiſe of the Formation of the World.
A Treatiſe concerning the Witch of *Endor*.
A Book of the Life of *Moſes*.
Two Treatiſes upon the Inſcriptions of the Pſalms.
A Homily upon the Sixth Pſalm.
Homilies upon *Eccleſiaſtes* and the *Canticles*.
Twelve Books againſt *Eunomius*.
The greater Catechiſm.
A Treatiſe concerning Faith, addreſſed to *Simplicius*.
A Diſcourſe upon the Great *Abraham*, or of the Divinity of the Son and of the Holy Ghoſt.
A Treatiſe on the Trinity to *Ablabius*.
A Treatiſe to *Euſtathius*.
A Treatiſe of the Difference between the Nature and Hypoſtaſis.
A Treatiſe of common Notions.
Two little Treatiſes againſt *Apollinarius*.
A Treatiſe againſt the *Manichees*.
A Treatiſe of the Soul.
Another Treatiſe of the Soul, and of the Reſurrection.
A Treatiſe to *Jerius* of untimely Death of Children.
A Treatiſe of Virginity.
Sermons upon ſeveral Subjects, whereof ſee the Catalogue, *p.* 179.
Funeral Orations and Panegyricks.
A Canonical Epiſtle to *Letoius*.
Letter to *Olympius*.
Letter concerning the Profeſſion of a Chriſtian.
A Treatiſe of the End that a Chriſtian ought to propoſe to himſelf.
A Letter concerning Pilgrimages.
A Letter to *Flavianus*.

BOOKS Loſt.

Commentaries upon the *Proverbs*, and an entire Commentary upon *Eccleſiaſtes*.
Commentaries upon the Epiſtles of St. *Paul*.
Some other Books whereof we have no Knowledge.

Suppoſititious BOOKS.

A Latin Treatiſe containing the Paſſages in the Old Teſtament to prove the Divinity.
A Book of Philoſophy written by *Nemeſius*.

St. *CÆSARIUS.*

Suppoſititious BOOKS.

Dialogues upon ſeveral Queſtions in Divinity.

St. *AMPHILOCHIUS.*

Genuine BOOKS ſtill Extant.

A Synodical Letter, publiſhed by *Cotelerius*.
Several Fragments quoted by *Theodoret* in the Councils of *Epheſus* and *Chalcedon*, and by ſeveral Authors.

BOOKS Loſt.

Several Homilies upon the Scripture.
Some Letters.

Suppoſititious BOOKS.

Eight Sermons publiſhed by *F. Combefis*.
The Life of St. *Baſil*.

MAXIMUS.

BOOK Loſt.

A Treatiſe concerning Faith.

EUSEBIUS.

A TABLE of the Writings of the *Eccleſiaſtical Authors*, &c.

EUSEBIUS VERCELLENSIS.

Genuine BOOK ſtill Extant.

Three Letters.

BOOK Loſt.

A Tranſlation of *Euſebius*'s Commentary on the Pſalms.

MELETIUS.

Genuine BOOK ſtill Extant.

A Homily upon theſe Words in the Proverbs, *God hath created me*, &c. quoted by St. *Epiphanius*, *Hæreſ.* 73.

DIODORUS of *Tarſus.*

BOOKS Loſt.

A Treatiſe of Deſtiny.
A Treatiſe of the Holy Ghoſt.
A Treatiſe againſt Hereticks.
Commentaries upon ſeveral Books of the H. Scripture.
A Treatiſe againſt the *Jews*, and againſt the *Melchiſedechians*.
Treatiſes of the Trinity, of the Reſurrection, of the Soul, and of Providence.
A Tract to *Euphronius* againſt *Ariſtotle*.

HILARY the Deacon.

BOOKS attributed to him.

Commentaries upon St. *Paul*, which carry the Name of St. *Ambroſe*.
Queſtions upon the Old and New Teſtament, which bear St. St. *Auguſtin*'s Name.

PRISCILLIAN.

BOOKS Loſt.

Some little Diſcourſes.

MATRONIANUS.

BOOKS Loſt.

Some Pieces in Verſe.

TIBERIANUS.

BOOK Loſt.

His Apology.

DICTINIUS.

BOOKS Loſt.

Some little Treatiſes.

ITHACIUS.

BOOK Loſt.

A Treatiſe in form of an Apology againſt the *Priſcillianiſts*.

Suppoſititious BOOK.

A Book againſt *Varimadus*.

FAUSTINUS.

Genuine BOOKS ſtill Extant.

Seven Books againſt the *Arians* and the *Macedonians*, falſly attributed to *Gregory* of *Bætica*.
His Petition to the Emperours *Valentinian* and *Theodoſius*.

PHILASTRIUS.

Genuine BOOKS ſtill extant.

A Treatiſe of Hereſies.

TIMOTHY of *Alexandria.*

Genuine BOOKS ſtill Extant.

Canonical Reſponſes.

BOOK Loſt.

A Letter to *Diodorus*.

NECTARIUS.

Genuine BOOKS ſtill Extant.

A Homily upon the Holy Martyr *Theodorus*.

GELASIUS of *Cæſarea.*

BOOKS Loſt.

A Continuation of the Hiſtory of *Euſebius*.
Some Homilies and Treatiſes.

SIRICIUS.

Genuine BOOKS ſtill Extant.

A Letter to *Himerius*.
The Second and Third Letter to the ſame.
The Fifth to *Anyſius*.
The Fourth is dubious.

SABINUS.

BOOKS Loſt.

A Hiſtory of the Councils or a Collection of their Acts.

AMBROSE of *Alexandria.*

BOOKS Loſt.

A Dogmatical Treatiſe againſt *Apollinarius*.
A Commentary upon *Job*.

THEOTIMUS.

BOOKS loſt.

Short and Sententious Tracts in form of Dialogues.

EVAGRIUS of *Antioch.*

BOOKS Loſt.

Treatiſes of which we know nothing.

St. *AMBROSE.*

Genuine BOOKS ſtill Extant.

A Treatiſe of the Creation of the World, compoſed of Nine Sermons, and divided into ſix Books.
Upon the Terreſtrial Paradiſe.
Upon the Hiſtory of *Cain* and *Abel*; divided into 2 Books.
Of the Ark, and of the Life of *Noah*; not perfect.
Two Books upon the Life of *Abraham*.
A Treatiſe of *Iſaac* and the Soul.
A Treatiſe of the Benefits or Advantages of Death.
A Treatiſe of forſaking the World.
Two Books of *Jacob* and a happy Life.
A Diſcourſe of the Life of the Patriarch *Joſeph*.
A Diſcourſe upon the Benedictions of the Patriarchs.

The

A TABLE of the Writings of the *Eccleſiaſtical Authors*, &c.

The Book of *Elias*, and of Faſting.
A Treatiſe of *Naboth* and the Poor.
A Treatiſe upon *Tobit*.
Four Books concerning the Interceſſion or the Complaints of *Job* and *David*.
The firſt Apology for *David*.
An Explication of Twelve Pſalms, *viz.* Pſal. 1, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 43, 45, 47, 48, 61.
A Book upon Pſal. 119.
A Commentary upon the Goſpel of St. *Luke*, divided into Ten Parts.
Three Books of the Offices of Miniſters.
Three Books concerning Virgins, to *Marcellina*.
A Treatiſe concerning Widows.
A Treatiſe of Virginity.
A Diſcourſe of the perpetual Virginity of *Mary*.
An Exhortation to Virginity.
A Book of Myſteries.
Two Books of Penance.
Five Books concerning Faith, or of the Trinity.
Three Books of the Holy Spirit.
A Treatiſe of the Incarnation.
Ninety two Letters.
Funeral Orations upon *Valentinian* and *Theodoſius*.
Hymns for the Office, and upon the Six Days of the Creation.

BOOKS Loſt.

Part of the Treatiſe of the Ark, and of *Noah*.
A Treatiſe of the Incarnation, whereof *Theodoret* quotes a Fragment.
A Treatiſe upon the Sacraments, and of Philoſophy.
A Commentary upon *Iſaiah*.
Inſtruction to *Fritigildis*.
Another Inſtruction to *Panſophius*.
Caſſiodorus mentions ſome Homilies upon the Book of *Wiſdom*, a Commentary upon all the Prophets, and a Commentary upon the Epiſtles of St. *Paul*.
A Commentary upon all the Pſalms, according to *Trithemius*.

Suppoſititious WORKS.

A Second Apology for *David*.
Commentaries upon the *Canticles*.
A Treatiſe of the fall of a Virgin conſecrated to God.
Several Hymns upon *Feſtivals*.
All his Sermons upon the Year and upon the Feaſts.
A Diſcourſe upon the Dignity of Humane Nature.
A Sermon upon the Forbidden Fruit.
The Treatiſe of the Forty two Manſions or Encampments of the Children of *Iſrael*.
A Commentary upon the Epiſtles of St. *Paul*.
A Commentary upon the *Apocalypſe*.
The Harmony of the Evangeliſts, St. *Matthew* and St. *Luke*, concerning the Genealogy of our Saviour.
A Treatiſe upon the Creed.
A Diſcourſe of the Divinity of the Son.
A Treatiſe entituled, *Of the Myſtery of* Eaſter.
A Diſcourſe to a Virgin conſecrated to God.
A Diſcourſe of the Vocation of the Gentiles.
An Epiſtle to *Demetrias*.
The 29, 34, 35, and 55 Letters.
The Preparatory Prayers for ſaying of Maſs.
The Book of the Combat between Virtues and Vices.
The Expoſition of Faith.
A Treatiſe of the Holy Spirit.
A Book of Penance.
A Hiſtory of the Life and Manners of the *Brachmans*.

St. *EPIPHANIUS*.

Genuine BOOK ſtill Extant.

The Book againſt Hereſies, Entituled, *Panarium*.
The Recapitulation or Abridgment of his Book of Hereſies.
A Diſcourſe of Faith, Entituled, *Ancoratus*.
A Treatiſe of Weights and Meaſures.
The Phyſiologus.
A Treatiſe of the Twelve precious Stones.
A Book of the Life and Death of the Prophets.
A Letter to St. *John* of *Jeruſalem*.
Nine Sermons, dubious.

PHILO CARPATHIUS.

Suppoſititious BOOK.

A Commentary upon the Canticles.

Q. *JULIUS HILARION*.

Genuine BOOK ſtill Extant.

A Chronicon, or a Treatiſe of the Duration of the World.

A TABLE of the *Acts, Profeſſions of Faith*, and *Canons* of the *Councils* mentioned in this Volume.

Councils.	*Years* held in	*Acts, Profeſſions* of *Faith*, and *Canons.*
Of *Sinueſſa*	303	Suppoſititious Acts.
Of *Cirtha*	305	Acts in St. *Auguſtin.*
Of *Alexandria*	306	
Of *Elvira*	306	81 Canons.
Of *Carthage*	307	Fragments of its Acts in *Optatus* and St. *Auguſtin.*
Of *Rome*	313	Some Fragments of its Acts in *Optatus.*
Of *Arles*	314	22 Canons, and a Letter to St. *Sylveſter.*
Of *Ancyra*	314	25 Canons.
Of *Neocæſarea*	314	15 Canons.
Of *Alexandria*	322	
Of *Bithynia*	323	
Of *Alexandria*	324	
Of *Nice*	325	A Profeſſion of Faith, a Decree concerning *Eaſter.*
Of *Antioch*	330	25 Canons and a Letter to the *Egyptians.*
Of *Cæſarea.*	334	
Of *Tyre*	335	
Of *Jeruſalem*	335	A Synodical Letter in Favour of *Arius.*
Of *Conſtantinople*	336	
Another of *Conſtantinople*	338	
Of *Alexandria*	340	A Synodical Letter in Favour of St. *Athanaſius.*

A TABLE of the *Acts, Profeſſions of Faith, Canons*, &c.

Councils.	*Years* held in	*Acts, Profeſſions of Faith,* and *Canons.*
Of *Rome*	341	A Letter written by Pope *Julius*, in the Name of the Council, in 342.
Of *Antioch*	342	Three Profeſſions of Faith, and 25 Canons.
Another of *Antioch*	345	
Of *Milan*	346	A Profeſſion of Faith.
Of *Cologne*	346	Suppoſititious Acts.
Of *Sardica*	347	20 Canons, two Synodical Letters; one by the Biſhops of the Weſt, another by thoſe of the Eaſt, and a Profeſſion of Faith made by ſome Biſhops.
Of *Sirmium*, I.	349	
Of *Sirmium*, II.	357	A long Profeſſion of Faith.
Of *Arles*	353	
Of *Milan*	355	Doubtful Acts, taken out of the Life of *Euſebius Vercellenſis.*
Of *Beziers*	356	
Of *Sirmium*, III.	357	A Second Profeſſion of Faith.
Of *Antioch*	358	A Letter to *Urſacius* and *Valens.*
Of *Ancyra*	358	A Synodical Letter, a Profeſſion of Faith, and 18 Anathematiſms.
Of *Sirmium*, IV.	358	A Collection of Profeſſions of Faith.
Of *Sirmium*, V.	359	A Profeſſion of Faith, with the Names of the Conſuls.
Of *Ariminum*	359	A Catholick Definition, a Condemnation of *Urſacius, Valens*, and *Germinius*: A Letter to the Emperor, before his Subſcription to the Profeſſion of Faith of the Eaſt; a Letter to the Emperor after his Subſcription.
Of *Seleucia*	359	
Of *Conſtantinople*	360	
Of *Melitine*	357	A Profeſſion of Faith.
Of *Antioch*	361	A Letter to the Catholicks of *Antioch*, written by St. *Athanaſius.*
Of *Alexandria*	362	
Of *Paris*	362	A Letter of this Council.
Of *Italy*	362	A Letter to the Biſhops of *Illyricum.*
Of the *Egyptian* Biſhops at *Antioch*	363	A Letter to *Jovian.*
Of *Antioch*	363	A Letter containing a Profeſſion of Faith.
Of *Lampſacus.*	365	
Of *Singidunum*	366	A Letter to *Germinius.*
Of *Illyricum*	366	A Synodical Letter confirmed by an Edict of the Emperour.
Of *Aſia*	366	
Of *Sicily*	365	
Of *Tyana*	368	
Of *Gangra*	370	A Letter and 20 Canons.
Of *Laodicea*	370	60 Canons.
Of *Rome* under *Damaſus*	360, and 370	
Of *Rome* againſt *Urſicinus.*	372	A Letter to the Biſhops of *Illyricum.*
Of *Valence*	372	A Synodical Letter and four Canons.
Of *Antioch*	378	A Profeſſion of Faith call'd *The Tome of the Weſtern Church*, ſigned in this Council.
Of *Conſtantinople*	381, 382, 383	A Profeſſion of Faith and 7 Canons.
Of *Aquileia*	381	Acts of the Council, a Letter to the Biſhops of the Eaſt.
Of *Saragoſſa*	381	8 Canons.
Of *Sida*	383	
Of *Bourdeaux*	384	
Of *Capua*	390	
Of *Rome* and *Milan*	390	
Of *Sangarus*	390	
Of *Carthage*, I.	348	14 Canons.
Of *Carthage*, II.	390	23 Canons.
Of *Cabarſuſſa* & *Bagaïs*	394	Acts in St. *Auguſtine.*
Of *Hippo*	393	The Canons are in the Council of *Carthage* of the Year 397.
Of *Carthage*	394	47 Canons.
Of *Carthage*	397	105 Canons.
Of *Carthage*, IV.	398	
Of *Carthage*	399	
Of *Carthage*	401	28 Canons.
Of *Conſtantinople*	394	Acts.
Of *Alexandria*	399	Fragment of its Acts in the Epiſtle to *Menna.*
Of *Cyprus*	399	
Of *Turin*	400	8 Canons.
Of *Toledo*	400	21 Canons.

A TABLE of all the Genuine extant *Writings* of the *Eccleſiaſtical Authors*, according to the Order of their Arguments, that are mentioned in this Volume.

Treatiſes in Defence of the Chriſtian Religion, againſt the Pagans *and* Jews.

A Treatiſe of *Euſebius* againſt *Hierocles.*
The Books of the Evangelical Preparation and Demonſtration, by the ſame Author.
An Oration of *Conſtantine* to the Aſſembly of the Saints.
A Treatiſe of St. *Athanaſius* againſt the Gentiles.
St. *Gregory Nazianzen*'s Third and Fourth Diſcourſe againſt *Julian.*
St. *Ambroſe*'s 17, 18, 40, and 58 Letters.
The firſt Part of the Books of *Philaſtrius* and St. *Epiphanius* concerning Hereſies.

A TABLE of the *Works* of the *Authors*, according to the Subjects.

Books againſt Hereticks.

Euſebius's Book againſt *Marcellus* of *Ancyra*.
St. *Athanaſius*'s Treatiſe againſt the *Arians*. *See the Catalogue of the Hiſtorical and Dogmatical Books.*
Serapion's Treatiſe againſt the *Manichees*.
St. *Hilary*'s againſt the *Arians*.
Lucifer's Books againſt *Conſtantius* and againſt the *Arians*.
Victorinus againſt *Arius*.
——againſt the *Manichees*.
St. *Pacianus*'s Letters againſt the *Novatians*.
Optatus's Book againſt the *Donatiſts*.
Titus of *Boſtra* againſt the *Manichees*.
A Fragment of *Didymus*'s againſt the ſame Hereticks.
St. *Baſil*'s Book againſt *Eunomius*, and other Dogmatical Treatiſes of his.
St. *Gregory Nazianzen*'s Diſcourſe of Theology.
——other Diſcourſes of his.
——Two Letters to *Cledonius* againſt *Apollinarius*, and ſeveral other Dogmatical Treatiſes againſt the *Arians*.
——A Diſcourſe againſt the *Manichees*.
Meletius's Homily and Profeſſion of Faith.
Fauſtinus's Book againſt the *Arians* and *Macedonians*.
St. *Ambroſe*'s Book of the Trinity and of the Holy Ghoſt.
——Two Books of Penance againſt the *Novatians*.
Philaſtrius and St. *Epiphanius*'s Treatiſes againſt all Hereſies.

Diſcourſes upon the Articles of Faith in general.

St. *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem*'s Catechetical Letters.
The great Catechiſm or Inſtruction of *Gregory Nyſſen*.
St. *Epiphanius*'s Book againſt all Hereſies.
——His *Anchoratus*.

Upon the Trinity.

Euſebius's Books of Divinity againſt *Marcellus* of *Ancyra*.
——His Letters to the Church of *Cæſarea*.
Alexander's Letter againſt *Arius*.
St. *Athanaſius*'s Diſcourſes upon the Trinity.
——Four Treatiſes againſt the *Arians*.
——Homilies upon theſe Words: *My Father hath given all things*, &c.
——Letter to *Serapion*.
——Expoſition of Faith.
——Letter to *Maximus*.
——Treatiſe againſt the *Sabellians*.
——Short Treatiſe againſt the *Arians*.
St. *Hilary*'s Twelve Books of the Trinity.
——againſt *Auxentius*.
Lucifer's Books.
Victorinus againſt *Arius* and his Tract concerning the Word *Conſubſtantial*.
——His Hymns upon the Trinity.
Phœbadius his Diſcourſe againſt the Second *Sirmian* Creed.
George of *Laodicea*'s Circular Letter.
Didymus's Treatiſe upon the Holy Ghoſt, Tranſlated into *Latin* by S. *Jerome*.
Damaſus's Anathematiſm and Letter.
St. *Baſil*'s Dogmatical Letters; particularly the 41ſt, 63, 64th, 65th, 74th, 78th, 141ſt, 203d, 204th, 325th, 343d, 344th, 387th, 399th, and 401ſt.
——Five Books againſt *Eunomius*.
——A Diſcourſe concerning the Holy Ghoſt to *Amphilochius*.
——Homilies 9th, 12th, 15th, 16th, 17th, 25th, 27th, 29th, 31ſt, upon different Subjects.
St. *Gregory Nazianzen*'s Diſcourſes 25th, 31ſt, 32d, 33d, 34th, 35th, 36th, and 45th.
St. *Gregory Nyſſen*'s Twelve Books againſt *Eunomius*.
——A Treatiſe concerning the Faith addreſſed to *Simplicius*.
——A Treatiſe of the Divinity of the Son and of the Holy Ghoſt.
——A Treatiſe to *Euſtathius*.
——Of Notions.
St. *Amphilochius*'s Synodical Letter.
Meletius's Homily and Profeſſion of Faith.
Fauſtinus's Seven Books againſt the *Arians*.
Creeds and Profeſſions of Faith of the Councils.
St. *Ambroſe*'s Five Books concerning the Trinity.
——His Three Books concerning the Holy Ghoſt.
——His 9th, and 42d Letters.

Upon the Incarnation.

St. *Athanaſius*'s Treatiſes.
——His Treatiſe of the Incarnation.
——Epiſtle to *Adelphius*.
——Treatiſe of the Union of the humane Nature with the Word.
——Two Treatiſes of the Incarnation againſt *Apollinarius*.
——Letter to *Epictetus*.
St. *Gregory Nazianzen*'s 46th Diſcourſe, and the Two Letters to *Cledonius*, which are entituled the 51ſt and 52d Diſcourſes.
St. *Gregory Nyſſen*'s two little Treatiſes againſt *Apollinarius*.
——Sermon upon the Nativity.
St. *Ambroſe*'s Treatiſe upon the Incarnation.

Miſcellanies.

St. *Optatus* againſt the *Donatiſts*.
St. *Gregory Nyſſen* concerning the Soul.
——Another Treatiſe of the Soul, and of the Reſurrection.
——Of Deſtiny.
——Of the Death of Infants.
Siricius's Five Letters.
St. *Ambroſe*'s Diſcourſe of perpetual Virginity.
——Two Letters concerning Penance.

Upon the Diſcipline of the Church.

Conſtantine's Letters and Edicts.
Peter of *Alexandria*'s Canons concerning Penance.
St. *Athanaſius*'s Letters to *Dracontius* and *Ammon*.
St. *Pacianus*'s Letters, and his Treatiſes of Baptiſm.
Optatus's Books againſt the *Donatiſts*.
St. *Cyril*'s Five Myſtagogical Letters, and ſome of the others.
The greateſt part of St. *Baſil*'s Letters, and chiefly the Canonical Letters to *Amphilochius*, and the 63d, 79th 190th, 191ſt, 192d, 196th, 244th, 289th, 304th, 305th, 340th, 381ſt, 391ſt, 408th, 410th, 412th, 413th, 417th.
St. *Baſil*'s two Books of Baptiſm.
——A Treatiſe of Virginity.
——The End of his Book concerning the Holy Ghoſt to *Amphilochius*.
St. *Gregory Nazianzen*'s Diſcourſes 31ſt, 39th, and 40th.
St. *Gregory* Nyſſen's Treatiſe concerning Virginity.
——Canonical Epiſtle to *Letoïus*.
——Letter concerning Pilgrimages.
Siricius's 2d, 3d, and 4th Letters.
St. *Epiphanius*'s Letter to St. *John* of *Jeruſalem*.
St. *Ambroſe*'s Book of Myſteries.
——Three Books of Virgins.
——Exhortation to Virginity.
——Treatiſe concerning Widows.
——Two Books of Penance.
——Treatiſe of *Elias*, and of Faſting.

——Letters

——Letters 2d, 5th, 6th, 19th, 23d, 25th, 26th, 56th, 57th, 61ſt, 62d, 64th, 75th, 82d.
Canons of the Council.

Books of Morality and Piety.

Conſtantine's Prayer.
St. *Athanaſius*'s Letters to *Dracontius* and *Ammon*.
——Homily upon the Sabbath and the Circumciſion.
The Life of St. *Anthony*.
St. *Anthony*'s Letters.
——His Rule.
St. *Pachomius* his Letters, Rules and Precepts.
Oreſieſis of the Inſtitution of Monks.
Theodorus's Letter.
Homilies, Tracts, and Rules of the *Macarii*.
All St. *Ephrem*'s Works.
Several Letters of St. *Baſil*, and chiefly the Four firſt which are not of the Number of the other Letters, and the 1ſt, 19th, 165th, 166th, 184th, 302d, 383d, 411th.
——Treatiſes concerning a Monaſtick Life.
——Of Judgment and of Faith.
——Greater and Leſſer Rules.
——Book of a Monaſtick Life.
——Conſtitutions, and a Treatiſe of the Chaſtiſements of Monks.
——Three Homilies of Faſting.
——Homilies 3d, 4th, 6th, 7th, 8th, 10th, 11th, 12th, 13th, 15th, 21ſt, 22d, 23d, and 24th.
——Panegyricks upon St. *Julitta*, St. *Gordus*, and St. *Mamas* and *Barlaam*.
The greateſt part of St. *Gregory Nazianzen*'s Sermons, and all his Poems.
——Diſcourſe concerning Biſhops.
St. *Gregory Nyſſen* concerning Prayer.
——Moſt of his Sermons and Panegyricks.
——Diſcourſe concerning Virginity.
——Letter to *Olympius*.
——Treatiſes of the Profeſſion, and of the End of a Chriſtian.
——Letters concerning Pilgrimages.
Nectarius's Homily upon the Martyrdom of *Theodorus*.
St. *Ambroſe*'s Books of Offices.
——Books of Virgins and Widows.
——Of Penance.
——The greateſt part of his Diſcourſes upon the Holy Scripture, and chiefly that of *Naboth* concerning Riches, and that of *Tobit* upon Uſury.
——His 37th and 38th Letters.

COMMENTARIES AND DISCOURSES Upon the *Holy Scripture.*

Books of Criticiſm.

EUſebius's Treatiſe of the Places in the Holy Land.
——Evangelical Canons and Letters to *Carpianus*.
Euſtathius of *Antioch*'s Diſcourſe of the *Pythoniſs*, or Witch of *Endor*.
St. *Gregory Nyſſen*'s Treatiſe on the ſame Subject.
Fragment of St. *Athanaſius*'s Feſtival Epiſtle.
St. *Athanaſius*'s Abridgment of the Scriptures.
——Book to *Marcellinus* upon the Pſalms.
St. *Gregory Nyſſen*'s Treatiſe upon the Inſcriptions of the Pſalms.
Queſtions upon the Old and New Teſtament, believed to be written by *Hilary* the Deacon.
St. *Ambroſe*'s Preface upon St. *Luke*.
St. *Epiphanius* of Weights and Meaſures.
——*Phyſiologus*.
——Of the Twelve precious Stones on the Breaſt of the High-Prieſt.
——Of the Life and Death of the Prophets.

Upon the Old Teſtament.

Victorinus's Tract upon the beginning of Day.
St. *Baſil*'s Commentary upon the beginning of *Geneſis*.
——Two Homilies upon the Creation of Man.
——A Homily upon Paradiſe.
St. *Gregory Nyſſen* of the Creation of the World.
——Of the Formation of Man.
——Of the Life of *Moſes*.
St. *Hilary*'s Commentary upon the Pſalms.
Tranſlation of the Pſalms in Verſe, by *Apollinarius*.
Twenty Two Homilies of St. *Baſil* upon the Pſalms.
St. *Gregory Nyſſen*'s Homily on the fifth Pſalm.
St. *Baſil*'s Homily upon the ſixth Chapter of *Proverbs*.
——Commentary upon the ſixteen firſt Chapters of *Iſaiah*.
St. *Gregory Nyſſen*'s Homily upon *Eccleſiaſtes* and the *Canticles*.
Victorinus's Poem upon the *Maccabees*.
St. *Ambroſe*'s Treatiſe of the Creation of the World, and the reſt that follow in the firſt Volume of his Works.

Upon the New Teſtament.

Juvencus's Paraphraſe of the Goſpels, in Verſe.
St. *Hilary*'s Commentary on St. *Matthew*'s Goſpel.
St. *Gregory Npſſen* upon the Lord's Prayer, and upon the Beatitudes.
St. *Athanaſius* upon theſe Words of our Saviour, *Whoever ſhall Blaſpheme*, &c.
——Fragments upon theſe Words of our Saviour, *My Soul is heavy even unto Death*, &c.
Commentaries upon all the Epiſtles of St. *Paul*, attributed to St. *Ambroſe*, but believed to belong to *Hilary* the Deacon.
St. *Gregory Nyſſen*'s Homily upon the fifteenth Chapter of the Firſt Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*.
Didymus's Commentary upon the Canonical Epiſtles.
St. *Ambroſe*'s Commentary upon St. *Luke*'s Goſpel.
——Letters 7th, 8th, 27th, and the five following, alſo 43d, 44th, 50th, 65th, and the nine following.

Hiſtorical Diſcourſes.

Euſebius's Apology for *Origen*.
——Chronicon.
——Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory.
——Treatiſe concerning the Martyrs of *Paleſtine*.
——Books of the Life of *Conſtantine*.
——Of the Names of Places in the Holy Land.
——Panegyrick upon *Conſtantine*.
Conſtantine's Letters and Edicts.
——Harangue to the Council of *Nice*.
Juvencus's Poem of the Life of Jeſus Chriſt.
St. *Athanaſius*'s Hiſtorical Treatiſes.
——Apologetick to *Conſtantius*.
——Letters to the *Egyptians*, and to the Orthodox.
——Firſt Apology.
——Second Apology.
——Hiſtorical Treatiſes to thoſe that lead a Monaſtick Life.
——Letter to *Serapion*, upon the Death of *Arius*.
——Diſcourſe of Synods.
——Letters to *Lucifer*.
——Letters to the Biſhops of *Egypt*, *Arabia*, &c.
——Letters of the Council of *Alexandria*.
——Letter to *Jovian*.
——Letter to the *Africans*.
——Letter to *John* and *Antiochus*.

——Letter

An INDEX of the *Principal Matters*, &c.

——— Letter concerning the Opinion of *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria*.
——— Letter concerning the Deciſion of the Council of *Nice*.
——— Epiſtle to *Palladius*.
——— Conference with the *Arians*.
——— Life of St. *Anthony*.
Hoſius's Letter to *Conſtantius*.
Julius's Letter to the Eaſtern and *Egyptian* Biſhops.
Liberius's Letters.
St. *Hilary*'s Treatiſe of Synods.
——— Diſcourſes to *Conſtantius*.
——— Fragments.
——— Conference againſt *Auxentius*.
Peter of *Alexandria* II. his Letters.
St. *Cyril*'s Letter upon the Apparition of the Croſs.
Damaſus's Letters.
The greateſt part of the Letters of St. *Baſil*.
St. *Gregory Nazianzen*'s Diſcourſes 7th, 25th, 26th, 30th, 41ſt and ſome others.
——— His Panegyricks, which are Sermons 6th, 10th, 11th, 18th, 19th, 20th, 22d, 23d, and 24th.
——— Firſt Poem upon his Life.
——— Diſcourſe upon Biſhops.
——— His Teſtament.
St. *Gregory Nyſſen*'s Funeral Orations and Panegyricks.
——— Letter to *Flavianus*.
Euſebius Vercellenſis his Three Letters.
Marcellinus and *Fauſtinus*, *Luciferians*, their Petition addreſſed to the Emperours *Valentinian* and *Theodoſius*.
St. *Ambroſe*'s Letters, 20th, 22d, and 24th.
——— Panegyrick on *Theodoſius* and *Valentinian*.
Philaſtrius of Hereſies.
St. *Epiphanius* of Hereſies.
——— An Abridgment of it by himſelf.
——— His Hiſtory of the Lives and Deaths of the Prophets.
Hilarion's Chronicle.

A General INDEX of the *Principal Matters* contained in the Second Volume.

The Figures ſhew the Pages, and the Small Letters the Notes.

A.

Aſtinence from Meats. Uſage and Uſefulneſs of it. III. Faſting conſiſts not in abſtaining from Meats, 150.
Acacius of *Cæſarea*, ſucceeds *Euſebius*, 97. His Doctrine and Writings, *ibid.* Difference with St. *Cyril*, *ibid.* Death, *ibid.*
Achillas Biſhop of *Alexandria*, 27.
Aceſius a *Novatian* Biſhop, 253.
Adultery. Canons againſt Adulterers, and againſt other Sins of Uncleanneſs, 140, 141, *&c.* 196.
Arian Pope. Upon what occaſion he implored the Succour of *Charlemaign*, 19.
Aëtius. Hiſtory of his Life, and of his Condemnation, 98, 99. Death. 99.
Africanus's Chronicon, 5.
Agapæ. Feaſts of Charity, 268, 269.
Agapetus Pope, ſent by *Theodatus* to the Emperour *Juſtinian*, ——— 18.
Agapius Biſhop of *Cæſarea*, 2.
Agapius Biſhop of *Boſtra*. Difference with *Bagadius* for that Biſhoprick, 285.
St. *Agnes*, 207, 209.
Alexander Biſhop of *Alexandria*. Ordination, 27. Aſſembles a Council at *Alexandria* againſt *Arius*, ibid. Letter to his Collegues, *ibid.* Another Letter of this Biſhop, *ibid.* Advertiſement or Paſtoral Letter, *ibid.* Aſſiſts in the Council of *Nice*, 28. Death, *ibid.*
Alexandria. Council of *Alexandria*, of the Year 306. under *Peter* Biſhop of that City, 242. Council in 323, againſt *Arius*, 250. Another Council againſt *Arius*, in 324, *ibid.* Another in 362, to determine how the *Arians*, that deſired to be reunited to the Church, ſhould be received, 265. Another in 341, in favour of St. *Athanaſius*, 255. Council of *Alexandria* in the Year 399, where the Books of *Origen* were condemned, 284.
Alipius, Prieſt of *Alexandria*, defends St. *Athanaſius* before *Conſtantine*, 29.
Alms. Effects and Neceſſity of Alms-Deeds, 151, 181. Exhortation to it, 166. Not to be done to Perſons unworthy, 207.
Alms of *Conſtantine*, 12, 15.
Ambroſe of *Alexandria*. His Writings, 196.
St. *Ambroſe* Biſhop of *Milan*, 198. Time and Place of his Birth, *ibid.* and [a]. [b]. Parents, 198. Prodigy at his Birth, *ibid.* 199. Education and Studies, *ibid.* Elected Governour, *ibid.* And after Biſhop, 200. Avoided being Biſhop, *ibid.* At laſt Ordained, *ibid.* and [c]. —— acquits himſelf worthily in the Function of the Miniſtry, *ibid.* Perſecuted by *Juſtina*, *ibid.* and 201. Writings, *ibid.* 202, *&c.* Stile, 232. —— Editions of his Works, 233.
St. *Amphilochius*. His Country, 184. Ordained Biſhop of *Iconium*, *ibid.* Aſſiſts in the Council of *Conſtantinople*, and holds one at *Sida* againſt the *Maſſilians*, *ibid.* Handſome reply to the Emperour *Theodoſius*, *ibid.* Writings, 185.
Ancyra. Council there in 314, 248. Its Canons, *ibid.* 249. Another Council in 358, againſt *Aëtius*, 263.
Anger. Contrary to the Spirit of Chriſtianity, 153.
Angels. Not to be adored, 5.
Antioch. A pretended Council held there in 330. againſt *Euſtathius*, 254. Councils of *Antioch* in the Years 341, and 342. Upon what Subject, 256. Another in 345. 258. Another in 358. which condemned the Terms *Conſubſtantial* and *of like Subſtance*, 263. —— Synod in 361. *Conſtantius*'s Order, 265. Another Council there in 363, under *Meletius*, 266. Another in 378, to reſtore Peace in that Church, 271.
St. *Anthony*, Inſtituter of the Monaſtick Life. Time and Place of his Birth, 53. His Parents, *ibid.* In what Time, and in what Country he began to Build Monaſteries, 54. He came to *Alexandria* during the Perſecution of *Maximinus*, and why afterwards returned to his Monaſtery, 53. His Miracles, *ibid.* His Death, 54. The Author of his Life, 35, 54. Books attributed to him, *ibid.*
The *Apollinarii*. Their Life 100. [a]. [b]. Knowledge and Writings, 100, 101. [c]. Doctrine and Errours, 101. Condemnation of *Apollinarius* and his Followers, *ibid.* His Genius, 102, 103, Loſs of his Writings, 102. Edition of his Books, *ibid.*
Apollonius Tyanæus, by whom compared with Jeſus Chriſt, 6.
Apra, Daughter of St. *Hilary*, 64.

An INDEX of the *Principal Matters*, &c.

Aquileia, Council of *Aquileia*, 221. and [d] 273.

Arius Prieſt of *Alexandria*. Diſcovers his Opinions in the Council of *Nice*, 2. His principal Errours, 7. Condemnation of his Hereſie by *Alexander*, 27.--St. *Athanaſius* oppoſes him in the Council of *Nice*, 28. Who joined with him, 2. His Death, 13. Councils held upon occaſion of his Hereſie, 250.

Ariminum. Synod there in 359. Hiſtory of it, 263, 264.

Arles. Council there under *Conſtantine* againſt the *Donatiſts*, 12. Another Council in 314. 247. & [a]. [b]. ——Canons of that Council, *ibid.* and 248. Another upon occaſion of St. *Athanaſius*, 262.

Arnaud de Pontac. Edition of St. *Jerom*'s Verſion of *Euſebius*'s Chronicon. 5.

Arſenius. A *Meletian* Biſhop, 29. Aſſemblies of the Faithful, upon what Accounts permitted, 2.

Aſterius. Why, and by whom put among the Eccleſiaſtical Writers, 52. his Writings, *ibid.* Not Biſhop of *Amaſea*, *ibid.*

Aſtolphas, Brother to *Rachiſius* King of the *Lombards*, takes *Ravenna*, 19. Demands Peace of *Pepin*, and breaks it ſoon after, *ibid.* Beſieges *Rome*, *ibid.*

Athalaricus and *Theodatus*, maintain themſelves in the Poſſeſſion of *Rome*, 18. They are driven from thence by *Beliſarius*, *ibid.*

St. *Athanaſius*. His Country, 28. [a]. His Parents unknown, *ibid.* [b]. The Baptiſm he is ſaid to confer upon ſome Children, eſteem'd a Fable, *ibid.* [d]. He accompanies *Alexander* to the Council of *Nice*, when he was but a Deacon, *ibid.* His promotion to the Biſhoprick of *Alexandria*, *ibid.* and [e]. endeavours of the *Arians* to drive him thence, *ibid.* The Biſhops that favoured *Arius*, accuſe him of having impoſed a New Tribute upon the *Egyptians*, and of conſpiring againſt the Life of the Emperour, who notwithſtanding, declares him Innocent, 29. Accuſed again of Murdering *Arſenius*, *ibid.* Called to the Council of *Cæſarea*, but appears not, and why. Cited to that of *Tyre*, he appears, *ibid.* His Accuſation by a lewd Woman fabulous, *ibid.* Retires from the Council, and is depoſed, *ibid.* Another Accuſation againſt St. *Athanaſius*, *ibid.* He is baniſhed to *Triers*, and recall'd by *Conſtantine*'s Son, *ibid.* and 30. [h]. New Accuſations againſt this Saint, 30. ——He retires to *Rome*, and is well received by Pope *Julius*, *ibid.* Is juſtified in a Council held at *Rome*, *ibid.* Is abſolved by the Council of *Sardica*, and recall'd in 348. 31. Letters and Edicts to abrogate all that had been done againſt St. *Athanaſius*, *ibid.* Re-enters his Dioceſs, where he is favourably received, *ibid.* A Report ſpread againſt him, *ibid.* He flies to the Deſart, *ibid.* Where he compoſed ſeveral Books, *ibid.* Being returned from the Deſart, he aſſembled a Council at *Alexandria*, and why, *ibid.* Flies again to the other ſide of the *Nile*, 32. Goes to *Antioch* to meet the Emperour *Jovian*, where he held a Synod, What was done in it, *ibid.* His Death, *ibid.* His Works, 32, 33, 34, *&c.* Abridgment of his Works, 39, 40, *&c.* His Genius, Stile and Doctrine, 46, 47, 48. Editions of his Works, 48. His Funeral Oration, 167. Synods for and againſt St. *Athanaſius*, 254, 255.

Auxentius, an *Arian* Biſhop, 201.

B.

Baptiſm. Neceſſity and Effects of Baptiſm, 84, 85. 109, 170, 178. It is not lawful to Repeat it when conferred in the Name of the Trinity, 93, 96. Effects of Baptiſm, 47, 93. Diſpoſitions neceſſary to the well Receiving it, 109. The Ceremonies of Baptiſm, 113. 171. The Receiving of Baptiſm not to be deferr'd, 154, 155, 171. The Miniſters of Baptiſm, 88, 89. The Baptiſm of Hereticks, 88, 89, 96, 140, 143.

Barbarians, When, and how they made themſelves Maſters of *Italy* and *Rome*, 18.

St. *Barlaam*. His Panegyrick, 156.

Baſil of *Ancyra*. His Life and Doctrine, 59. Book againſt *Marcellus* of *Ancyra*, *ibid.*

St. *Baſil* Biſhop of *Cæſarea* in *Cappadocia*. Names of his Father and Mother, 122. By whom brought up, *ibid.* His Life, *ibid.* and 123. His Qualities and Epiſcopal Actions, *ibid.* &c. His Death, 124. His Funeral Oration, 167. A Chronological Catalogue, and an Abridgment of his Letters, 124, and to 143. His other Writings, 144, &c. to 157. His Character, 157, Judgment on, and Abridgment of his Doctrine, 157, 158. Editions of his Works, 158. Names of the Tranſlators of his Works, 159. Project for a new Edition of them, *ibid.*

Beliſarius a *Roman* Captain, takes by force the City of *Rome*, 18.

Beziers. Council there in 356.

Bithynia. Pretended Council of *Bithynia* in 323, for *Arius*, 250.

Biſhops. Are above Prieſts, 96, 237. Qualities neceſſary in a Biſhop, 48.

Bourdeaux. Council there in 383. Againſt *Inſtantius* a *Priſcillianiſt*, 275.

Bruno. Biſhop of *Signi*, 59. Writings attributed to him, *ibid.*

Byzantium. By whom named *Conſtantinople*, 13.

C.

Calaris. Metropolitan City of *Sardinia*, 79.

Chalice. Reſpect due to Chalices wherein the Euchariſt is Conſecrated, 40, 94.

Callinicus. A *Meletian* Biſhop, 29.

Capua. Council of *Capua* in 390. By whom held, and why, 275.

Carthage. A pretended Council there in 311. where *Cæcilian* is Elected Biſhop of *Carthage* by *Felix* Biſhop of *Aptungis* 245. I. Council of *Carthage* in 348. 275. Its Hiſtory *ibid.* and 276. II. In 390. *ibid.* Its Canons, *ibid.* and 277. Another Council of *Carthage* in 394. 277. Another in 397. Its Canons, 277. *&c.* Another in the Year 398. Called the Fourth, 280. Hiſtory of this Council, *ibid.* Canons, 281. *&c.* Another in the Year 399. 283. Another in 401. called the Fifth, *ibid.* Canons, *ibid.* and 284.

Catechumens. Diſtinction of different Sorts of Catechumens, 108. Diſpoſition requiſite in Catechumens for receiving Baptiſm, 109.

Celibacy. More perfect than a Married State, 77. Canons againſt Perſons in Orders, who do not keep it, 141, 196, 197, 207, 243, 248.

St. *Cæſarius*. His Panegyrick, 165. Life and Employment 184. Not Author of the Dialogues attributed to him, *ibid.*

Cæſarea of *Paleſtine*. Synod held there in 334. Whither St. *Athanaſius* was cited, but appeared not, 29, 254.

Charlemaigne, or *Charles the Great*. Defeats *Deſiderius* King of the *Lombards*, and ſhuts him up in *Pavia*, 19. Surrenders to the Pope all the Cities which *Pepin* his Father had given him, *ibid.* Is made *Patricius* by Pope *Adrian*, *ibid.* In what time and by whom declared Emperour, *ibid.* His Treaty for the Diviſion of *Italy* with the *Grecian* Emperour, *ibid.* The Succeſſors of *Charlemaigne* have been Kings of *Italy* and Soveraigns of *Rome*, *ibid.*

Charles Martel, Maire of the Palace, or General of *France*, 19.

Charles the Bald. Gives up to the *Romans* the Right of Soveraignty, 19. *Suffragans* how ordained, 129, 130. Their Power, 249, 250, 257.

Chriſtian. The Name uſeleſs to thoſe who lead a Life unworthy of a Chriſtian, 142.

Chriſtophorſon. Judgment upon his Tranſlation of the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, 4.

An INDEX of the *Principal Matters*, &c.

Church. Authority and Mark of the Catholick Church, 81, 82, 111. But one Catholick Church ſpread over the whole Earth, 90, 112. Principal Mark of that Church, 90, 91.

Churches of the Eaſt. Divided upon occaſion of that of *Antioch*, 123, 130, 136, 137, *&c.* 187, 188.

Church of *Rome.* Its Authority, 90.

Churches Principal, and their Rights.

Church of *Jeruſalem.* Eſtabliſhment of their Dignity, 107. 252.

Churches of *Gaul.* Difference for Primacy, 285.

Circus. Canon againſt thoſe which run in the *Circus*, 247.

Cirtha, City of *Numidia.* Council there in 305. The Names of the Biſhops that aſſiſted in it, 241.

Clergy. Canons concerning the Qualities, Life, and Manners of Prieſts, Biſhops and other Clerks, 141, 142, 143, 205, 207, 247, 248, 249, 250, 268, 270, 273, 276, 277, 280, 281, 284, 285, *&c.* Not ſubject to Publick Penance, 26. 143. Immunities and Exemptions, 15, 16. Edicts of *Conſtantine* in their favour, *ibid.*

Cologne. Council of *Cologne* in 346. againſt *Euphratas*, 258.

Communion. How it ought to be Received, 114. Of frequent Communion, 137.

Confirmation. Given by the Biſhop with the Holy Chriſm, confers the Holy Ghoſt, 85.

Conſtantius Emperour of the Eaſt, 30. Cauſes Pope *Liberius* to be impriſoned, 18.

Conſtantinople. Council there in 336, againſt *Marcellus* of *Ancyra*, 255. Another in 338, againſt *Paul* Biſhop of that City, *ibid.* Another in 360. by the *Acacians*, 265

Conſtantine, the firſt Chriſtian Emperour, 11. His Parents, *ibid.* Proclaimed Emperour by his Souldiers, *ibid.* Defeats the Tyrant *Maxentius*, *ibid.* Goes to *Milan* to Celebrate the Marriage of his Siſter with *Licinius*, 12. Quarrels with him, *ibid.* His care for the Church and what belonged to it, *ibid.* Aſſembles a Council at *Rome*, *ibid.* Gives Judgment at *Milan* in favour of *Cæcilian* againſt the *Donatiſts*, *ibid.* Declares War againſt *Licinius*, *ibid.* Makes Laws in favour of the Chriſtians, and for the Celebration of the Lord's Day, *ibid.* Abrogates the Edicts of *Licinius* againſt the Chriſtians, *ibid.* Labours to appeaſe the Quarrel between *Alexander* and *Arius*, *ibid.* Aſſembles a Council of both the Eaſt and Weſt at *Nice*, where he Aſſiſts. What paſs'd there, *ibid.* What he did at *Jeruſalem*, 13. His Zeal for the Chriſtian Religion, *ibid.* Unblamable if he had not favoured the Biſhops of *Arius*'s Party againſt St. *Athanaſius*, *ibid.* He calls to *Tyre* the Fathers of the Council of *Jeruſalem*, and why, *ibid.* Baniſhes St. *Athanaſius* to *Triers*, *ibid.* His Baptiſm, *ibid.* In what Place and by whom, *ibid.* His Death, and how long he Reigned, 14. His Character, *ibid.* Is put among the Saints by the Greeks, 14. Account of his Speeches by *Euſebius*, 14, 15. Diſcourſe upon the Feaſt of *Eaſter*, 15. Letters, *ibid.* and 16. Edicts in favour of the Chriſtian Religion, 16, 17. Suppoſititious donation, 17, *&c.*

Conſtantius Chlorus. The only Emperour in the Tenth Perſecution, that did not perſecute the Chriſtians, 11. and [a].

Conſtans Emperour, Protector of St. *Athanaſius*, Died in 350. 31.

Conſubſtantial. When and where that Word was firſt uſed, 2.

Councils. Hiſtory and Abridgment of the Councils held in the Fourth Century, 241, *&c.* to the end.

Councils of *Cabarſuſſa* and *Bagaïs* in 393 and 394, 277.

Councils of *Conſtantinople.* I. In 381. 271. II. In 382, *ibid.* III. In 383. 272. Another in the Year 394. 285.

Couſin Preſident. His French Tranſlation of *Euſebius*'s Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, and his Judgment upon that Author, 4.

Creed. of the Creed of St. *Cyryl*, 110.

Croſs. Sign of the Croſs, 111, 115. Apparition of a Croſs, 12, 115. Invention of the true Croſs, 13.

St. *Cyprian* the Martyr. His Character by St. *Gregory Nazianzen*, 166.

Cyprus. Council of *Cyprus* in the Year 399, where the Books of *Origen* were condemned, 285.

St. *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem.* Life and Ordination, 107. Judgments for and againſt him, *ibid.* 115. His Quarrel with *Acacius*, who Aſſembled a Council againſt him, in which he is Depoſed, and upon what pretence, 107. And is ſo again in the Council of *Conſtantinople*, *ibid.* His Succeſſors, *ibid.* Catechetical Lectures juſtified, *ibid.* [d]. [e]. [f]. Letters attributed to him, 115. Judgment upon his Stile and Doctrine, *ibid.* Different Editions of his Works, *ibid.*

D.

Damaſus Pope. His Ordination diſturbed by *Urſicinus*, 120. His Genuine Letters, 121. Suppoſititious Letters, 122. Poems and Epigrams, *ibid.* Editions of his Works, *ibid.* Council under *Damaſus*, 270. *Tome* ſent to the Eaſt by *Damaſus*, 271.

Deacons. Canons concerning them, 247, 248, 253, 257, 261, 269, 276, 278, 280, 284, 285.

Dead. Prayer of the Church for the Dead, 8, 237, 238, 289.

Dedication. Dedication or Conſecration of a Church neceſſary before Celebration in it, 39, 40.

Depoſition. What is neceſſary for the Depoſition of a Biſhop, 285.

Deſiderius King of the *Lombards*, invades the Exarchate of *Ravenna*, 19.

Deſtiny. Againſt Deſtiny, 6, 15, 179, 188, 206.

Dianius. Biſhop of *Cæſarea* in *Cappadocia*, enemy to St. *Athanaſius*, 122, 132.

Dictinius. Errors and Writings of this *Priſcillianiſt*, 191.

Didymus of *Alexandria.* His profound Learning, 103. Catalogue of his Works, *ibid.* Abridgment of his Book of the Holy Ghoſt, *ibid. &c.* Excellency of that Book, 104. Commentaries upon the Canonical Epiſtles, 105. Treatiſe againſt the *Manichees*, *ibid.*

Diodorus of *Tarſus.* His Life, 188. His Writings, *ibid.* His Doctrine, 125, 189.

Dionyſius of *Alexandria.* His Opinion upon the Trinity, 42.

Diſcipline of the Church. Canons concerning the Diſcipline of the Church, 140, 141, 195, 196, 197, 242, *&c.* to 245. 247, 248, *&c.* 252, 256, *&c.* 260, 267, 268, 273, 276, *&c.* 280, 283, *&c.* Abridgment of the Diſcipline of the Church in the Fourth Century, 287, *&c.* to the end. Regulation of the Diſcipline of the Church. See the Extract of the Canons of the Councils, from *p.* 241. to the end.

Diviners. Canons againſt thoſe who pretend to Divination, 143, 249.

Divine. Qualities neceſſary in a Divine, 170.

Divinity of the Jews, by whom embraced, 5.

Doctrine. Abridgment of the Doctrine of the Church in the Fourth Century, 287.

Donatiſts. Hiſtory of them, 12, *&c.* 15, *&c.* 241, 246. Refutation of their Error, 87, 88, *&c.* Convicted of delivering up the Scripture, and of making a Schiſm, 89, 90. Judgment given againſt them, 90, *&c.* Several Books againſt them, 93, 94, 95, 96.

Donatus Biſhop of *Carthage*, chief of the *Donatiſts*, not Biſhop of *Calama*, 66. and [a]. Writ ſeveral little Treatiſes, *ibid.* and [b].

Duties of Chriſtians, and principally the Eccleſiaſtical, 205, *&c.*

Drunkenneſs. A Diſcourſe againſt this Vice, 153.

An INDEX of the *Principal Matters*, &c.

E.

Egypt. Council of the Biſhops of *Egypt* in 363, held at *Antioch*, 266.

Elvira. Council held in that City in the Year 305. The time of this Council not certainly known, nor the Name of the City, 242. and [a]. [b].

St. *Ephrem* the *Syrian*, Deacon of *Edeſſa*. Time of his Birth, Country and Life, 115. Writings juſtified, 116, *&c.* Catalogue of his Works, 118, *&c.* Their Editions, 120.

St. *Epiphanius*. Time and Place of his Birth, 234. Education, *ibid.* Election to the Biſhoprick of *Salamis*, *ibid.* Quarrel with *John* of *Jeruſalem*, *ibid.* Aſſembles a Council in the Iſland of *Cyprus*, *ibid.* Comes to *Conſtantinople*, *ibid.* Will not Communicate with St. *Chryſoſtom*, *ibid.* *Eudoxia* conjures him to pray for her ſick Child, and his Anſwer, 235. His Death, 235. His Writings, *ibid.* *&c.* Doctrine 236, 237. Stile and Genius, 239. Editions of his Works, 240.

Epiſcopacy. Monks ought not to refuſe it when they are worthy, 44, 45. When they are to Refuſe and when Accept it, 45, 160, 161, 200.

Evagrius of *Antioch.* A Biſhop of *Paulinus*'s Party, 198. His Books upon different Subjects, *ibid.*

Euchariſt. Sacrilege to Profane it, 91, 94, 115, 149, Sacrifice of the Euchariſt, 96, 113, 114. Celebration of the Euchariſt, and Ceremonies then uſed, 48, 96. 113, 114. To be taken faſting, 203.

Eugenius the Tyrant. When defeated and killed, 230.

Evil not a Subſtance, 59. Not a Nature incorruptible, and uncreate, 179.

Eulalius and *Boniface* their Schiſm. By whom appeaſed, 18.

Eunomius, Diſciple of *Aëtius*. Country, 99. Life, Errors, Writings and Genius, *ibid.* Book of St. *Baſil* written againſt him, *ibid.* St. *Gregory Nyſſen*'s Book againſt him, *ibid.*

Euſebius of *Cæſarea.* Country, 1. and [b]. Surname, 1. and [a]. By whom ordained Prieſt, 1. During the Perſecution exhorts the Chriſtians to ſuffer courageouſly for the Faith, and remains firm in it, 2 [c]. Is ſuſpected to have offered Incenſe to Idols, 1. Succeeds *Agapius* in the Biſhoprick of *Cæſarea*, 2.---And protects *Arius*, *ibid.* Signs the Profeſſion of Faith of the Council of *Nice*, 2. And in the mean time holds Correſpondence with the *Arians*, *ibid.* Refuſes the Biſhoprick of *Antioch*, *ibid.* Aſſiſts at the Councils of *Antioch*, *Tyre* and *Conſtantinople*, *ibid.* Makes a Panegyrick in honour of *Conſtantine*, *ibid.* Death, *ibid.* Works, 2, 3. Account of his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, and other Works, 3, 4, 5, *&c.* to 9. His Judgment upon the Trinity, 6, 7. Upon the other Points of Religion, 7, 8. A Judgment upon ſome of the Works of this Author, 8. Of his Sermons, 8, 9. His Character, 9. Whether he be to be called a Saint, 10. and [f]. Different Editions of his Works, 10, 11.

Euſebius of *Nicomedia*, 2, 9, 22.

Euſebius Vercellenſis. His Country, 186. Aſſiſts at the Council of *Milan*, from whence he is ſent into Exile; and at that of *Alexandria*, *ibid.* His Death, *ibid.* Called Confeſſor by the Ancients, *ibid.* Letters and Writings, *ibid.*

Euſtathius Biſhop of *Antioch.* Country, 21. and [a]. Life, 21, 22. Aſſiſts at the Council of *Nice*, 21. and [c]. Unjuſtly depoſed, 22. and [d]. [e]. [f]. [g]. Writings, 23, 24. and [k]. [l]. [m]. [n]. Commentary upon the beginning of *Geneſis* falſly attributed to him, 24.

Euſtathius of *Sabaſtea.* Quarrels with St. *Baſil*: His Frauds, 123, 124, 130, 135.

Euzoïus, an *Arian* Author, 106. Different from the famous *Arian*, *Euzoïus* Biſhop of *Antioch*, 106.

Exarchs eſtabliſhed at *Ravenna*, 18.

Excommunication. The ancient manner of it, 137.

F.

Faſt. The Uſefulneſs and Obligation of Faſting, 150, 181, 203, 243, 268, 369. Faſt of *Wedneſday* and *Friday*, 26, 226, 290. Faſt of *Lent*, 48, 195, 226. Canons concerning Faſting, 26, 195, 268, 269, 282.

Fauſtinus, a *Luciferian.* His Petition to the Emperors *Valentinian* and *Theodoſius*, 192.

Felix. Ordained Biſhop of *Rome*, in the Place of *Liberius*, who was baniſhed, not a lawful Pope, 61, 62. and [a]. Neither Saint, nor Martyr, *ibid.* 1. and [b].

Flacillus Biſhop of *Antioch*, 6.

Fulradus Abbot of St. *Denys.* Received in the Name of *Pepin* the Exarchate of *Ravenna*, which he immediately reſtored to the Pope, 19.

G.

Galerius Emperour, 11.

Galienus Emperour, 1. and [c].

Gangra. Council of *Gangra* in 370. 267.

St. *Gaudentius*, Succeſſor to *Philaſtrius*, 193.

Gelaſius of *Cæſarea.* Author of ſome Writings, 196.

George of *Laodicea.* Driven from the Church by *Alexander*, engaged in the Party of *Arius*, and Author of ſome Books, 100.

George, Uſurper of the Church of *Alexandria*, killed in a Popular Sedition, 31.

St. *Gervaſius*, and St. *Protaſius*, 226.

God. Of the Nature of God, 5. Of his Providence and Juſtice, 9. *&c.*

St. *Gordius*, Martyr. His Panegyrick, 155.

St. *Gorgonia*, Siſter to St. *Gregory Nazianzen.* Her Panegyrick, 165.

Grace. What Opinion we ought to have concerning the Queſtions of Grace and Free-Will, 58. Neceſſity of Grace, 119, 149, 154.

Gregory III. and *Zachary*, Popes. Demand Succours of *Charles Martel*, 19.

Gregory of *Bætica.* Life, Writings and Genius, 85.

Gregory, Father of St. *Gregory Nazianzen.* Life and Conduct, 159, Funeral Oration for him, 166.

St. *Gregory Nazianzen.* Names of his Father and Mother, and Time of his Birth, 159. His Life, *ibid.* and [c]. Ordained Prieſt by his Father, afterwards Biſhop by St. *Baſil*, *ibid.* Abridgment of his Sermons, 160, *&c.* to 172. Subject of his Poems, 172, *&c.* to 175. Letters and Will, 175. Their Number, *ibid.* His Commendation, *ibid.* Editions of his Works, 175, and 176.

St. *Gregory Nyſſen.* Time of his Birth and Ordination, 176. Life, *ibid.* Writings, 177, *&c.* to 182. and [c]. [d]. [e]. His Character, 183. Editions of his Works, *ibid.* Perſecutions he ſuffered from the *Arians*, 131, 135.

H.

Heliodorus, Prieſt. Book of his, concerning Principles, 53.

Heraclius, Count. Raiſes a Tumult in *Alexandria*, againſt *Athanaſius*, 38.

Heraclius. Ordained Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, 107.

Heremius. Ordained Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, 127.

Hereticks. *Conſtantine*'s Edicts againſt them, 17.

Hierocles, Philoſopher. His two Books againſt the Chriſtian Religion, 2, 6.

Hilary, Ordained Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, 107.

St. *Hilary* Biſhop of *Poictiers.* His Life, 64, *&c.* His Ordination, *ibid.* Baniſhed by the Order of the Emperour *Conſtantius*, and why, *ibid.* Aſſiſts at the Council of *Seleucia*, *ibid.* and 65. His Writings, 65, 66. Diſpute againſt *Auxentius*, *ibid.* Abridgment of his Books of the Trinity, 66, *&c.* And of his other Books, 69, *&c.* to 78. Judgment upon his Style, Genius and Doctrine, 79. Editions of his Work, *ibid.*

Hilary

An INDEX of the *Principal Matters*, &c.

Hilary the Deacon. His Life, 189. His Works, *ibid.*
Q. Julius Hilarion, Author of a Chronicle.
Hippo. Council of *Hippo* in 393. 277.
Homicide. Canons againſt it, 140, 141, 142, 143, 182.
Hoſius Biſhop of *Corduba*. In what time he generouſly Confeſſed the Faith: When? 50. The *Donatiſts* falſely calumniate him, *ibid.* Why ſent by *Conſtantine* to *Egypt*, *ibid.* Preſides in the Councils of *Nice* and *Sardica*; and what he did there, *ibid.* Communicates with *Urſacius* and *Valens*, and ſubſcribes the Second *Sirmian* Creed, *ibid.* Why, and by whom accuſed, 51. Hiſtory of the two *Luciferians*, touching him, *ibid.* How long he lived, *ibid.* His Death, *ibid.* His Writings, *ibid.* His Authority could not prejudice the Truth, 86, 87.
Hoſpital of St. *Baſil* at *Caſarea*, 165.
Humility. Exhortation to Humility, 154.

I.

Jacobus Niſibenus. Life and Miracles, 49. His Writings, *ibid.*
Iconium, Metropolis of *Lycaonia*, 184.
St. *Jerom*. His Tranſlation of *Euſebius*'s Chronicon, 4.
Jeruſalem. Synod there in 335. for the Dedication of the Church built there in 255.
JESUS CHRIST. His Divinity, 44.
Images defaced by St. *Epiphanius*, at *Anablatha*.
Incarnation of *JESUS CHRIST*. Explication of that Myſtery, 5, 7, 8, 44, 47, 111, 149, 170, 171. Its Cauſes and Effects, 9, 43.
Inſtantius a *Priſcillianiſt*, 190, 275.
Joy of a Chriſtian in Afflictions, 151.
Iſchyras, a falſe Prieſt. His Hiſtory, 29.
Iſion, a *Meletian* Biſhop, 29.
Italy. Council of *Italy* in 362. againſt the Synod of *Ariminum*, 266.
Ithacius or *Idacius*, Biſhop. A *Spaniſh* Author, Enemy of the *Priſcillianiſts*, 191, 192.
Judgment Laſt. In what place it will be made, 75, 77.
Judgments Eccleſiaſtical, 249, 257, 278, 279, *&c.*
Julian the Apoſtate. Succeeds *Conſtantius*, and concerns not himſelf in the Affairs of the Chriſtians, 31. Sends an Order to *Alexandria* to drive St. *Athanaſius* thence, and what followed thereupon, 31, 32. Declaration againſt *Julian*, 162, 163.
St. *Julitta*. Her Martyrdom, 151.
Julius Biſhop of *Rome*. Aſſembles a Council at *Rome*, and declares St. *Athanaſius* innocent, 51. His Judgment in favour of that Saint, 30, 40. Hiſtory of the Life of this Pope, 51. His Writings, *ibid.* His Letters upon the Incarnation, and his Decretals ſuppoſitious, 52. Death, *ibid.*
Juſt. Of the State of their Souls between their Death and the laſt Judgment, 165.
Juſtina an *Arian*. Perſecutes St. *Ambroſe*, 200, 223, *&c.*
Juſtinian Emperour. Become Maſter of *Italy*: Treats the Popes hardly, 18.
Juſtinian the younger. Cauſes Pope *Sergius* to be baniſhed, 19.
Juvencus, a Chriſtian Poet. His Life and Writings, 20, 21.

K.

Kings. Reſpect and Obedience due to them, 39, 41, 91, 92. Ought not to meddle with Matters of Faith, 41, 224, 225, 226. Ought to protect Religion, 222.

L.

Lampſacus. Council there in 365. Under the Emperours *Valens* and *Valentinian*, 266.
Laodicea. Council celebrated between 360 and 370. the Canons of it received by the whole Church, 268, *&c.*
St. *Lawrence*. Hiſtory of his Martyrdom, 207. A good Action of his, *ibid.*
Law of the *Jews* but for one Nation, 6.
Leo Iſauricus. Would have killed Pope *Gregory* II. 19.
Leontius, Governour of *Rome*, puts Pope *Liberius* in Priſon, 19.
Liberius Biſhop of *Rome*, Succeſſor to *Julius*, 60. Impriſoned by *Conſtantius*, 18. Letter to the Biſhops of the Eaſt, attributed to him, is not Genuine, 60. Maintains the Party of St. *Athanaſius* with Vigour, 61. Therefore baniſhed, *ibid.* He ſigns the Condemnation of St. *Athanaſius*, approves an Heretical Profeſſion of Faith, 62. and [c]. Returns to *Rome*, and changes his Opinion, 63. Defends St. *Athanaſius*, and the Faith of the Church, *ibid.* His Death, *ibid.* and [d]. Letters and Writings, *ibid.* A Judgment upon this Biſhop, *ibid.*
Liberty of the Chriſtian Religion, where firſt allowed, 12.
Licinius, Emperour of the Eaſt, Loſes a Battle againſt *Conſtantine* in *Pannonia*, 12. Second Battel in *Thrace*, between them, *ibid.* Publiſhes Edicts againſt the Chriſtians, and perſecutes them, *ibid.* Overcome at the Siege of *Nicomedia*, throws himſelf at *Conſtantine*'s Feet, who gives him his Life, *ibid.* Put to Death afterwards by *Conſtantine* at *Theſſalonica*, *ibid.*
Longinus firſt took upon him the Quality of Exarch or Vice-Roy of *Italy*, 18.
Lord's Day. Celebration of the *Lord's Day*, 12, 14, [c]. 17, 26. Not to Faſt on it, 203. Succeeded the *Jewiſh Sabbath*, 45.
Lucifer Biſhop of *Calaris*, Deputed by Pope *Liberius* to *Conſtantinople*, 79. Aſſiſts at the Council of *Milan*, and vigorouſly defends St. *Athanaſius*, *ibid.* His Conſtancy and Steadineſs cauſes his Exile, *ibid.* Genius and Writings, *ibid.* Unadviſedly ordains *Paulinus* Biſhop of *Antioch*, 80. Separates from the Church, *ibid.* Judgment upon his Style, *ibid.* Subject of his Writings, *ibid.*
Lucilla, a Lady of *Carthage*, her Hiſtory, 89.
Lucius Biſhop of *Alexandria*, an *Arian*, Author of ſome Letters touching the Feaſt of *Eaſter*, and of ſome Books upon ſeveral Subjects, 106.
Ludovicus Pius, Son of *Charlemaign*. Sends *Bernard* to *Rome*, and why, 19.
Luitprandus King of the *Lombards*, 19.

M.

Macarius, Prieſt of *Alexandria*. Defends St. *Athanaſius* before *Conſtantine*, 29. Accuſed of breaking a Chalice, *ibid.*
The *Macarii*. How many of them, 55. Their Works, 56, 57. Rules attributed to the *Macarii*, 58.
Maccabees. Their Panegyrick, 167.
Macrobius, a *Donatiſt* Prieſt, Author of a Book addreſſed to Confeſſors and Virgins, 53.
Magick. Canons againſt Magicians, 269.
Mamas Martyr. His Panegyrick, 156.
Marcellus of *Ancyra*. Wrote againſt his Brethren, and why? 3. i. 6. Life, Fortune and Actions, 50. St. *Athanaſius* always defended him, *ibid.* Fragments of his Works, *ibid.* Judgment upon his Doctrine, *ibid.* Refutation of his Errours, 6.
Marcellus Biſhop in *Campania*. Sent by Pope *Liberius* to the Council of *Arles*, 61.
Marcellinus Biſhop of *Rome*, Never Sacrificed to Idols.
Marcellina, St. *Ambroſe*'s Siſter, 210.
Marriage. Not forbidden, 47, 110. Canons againſt Marriages forbidden by the Laws. See St. *Baſil*'s Canons of Penance, 140. and [c]. In what manner married Perſons ought to behave themſelves, 110.
Marriage between Brother and Siſter-in-Law forbidden, 137. 140. Divorce, 237. Polygamy forbidden, 197. Of the Marriage of Children under the Power of their Parents, 142. 229. Second and Third Marriages, 140, 141, 142, Marriage with Infidels forbidden, 223.
Martyrs. Hiſtory and Commendation of the Forty Martyrs, 156.

Martyrs, may be ſaved without Baptiſm, 110.
Matter, not Eternal, 5.
Matronianus a *Priſcillianiſt*, 190.
Maxentius, Tyrant. Deſtroys *Rome*, afterwards Conquered by *Conſtantine*, 11.
Maximus, Philoſopher of *Alexandria*, 186. His Panegyrick, 167. Procures himſelf to be ordained Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, 160. His irregular Manners, 169. His Writings, 186.
Meletius. His Life, Ordination and Actions, 187.
Melitius. Author of the Sect of *Melitians*, condemned by *Peter* of *Alexandria*, 26. 242.
Melitians. Schiſmaticks, 28. and [f]. Judgment of the Council of *Nice* concerning them, 251.
Melitine. Synod there about the Year 357. 265.
Metropolitan. His Authority and Rights, 257, 269, 277, 278. Ought not to aſſume the Quality of Prince of Prieſts, or Sovereign Prieſt, 278.
Meſſiah. Came into the World for all Mankind, 6.
Milan. Council there in 346. To find means of terminating the Differences between the Biſhops. Another Council in 355, under Pope *Liberius*. Another againſt *Jovinian*, 390.
Monks. Inſtitution of Monks, 53. Precepts and Inſtructions for Monks, 124. 156. A good Deſcription of Monks anciently, 164. Of their Habits and of the Auſterity of their Life, 165. Might be Ordained Biſhops, 45.
Muſculus a Proteſtant. His Tranſlation of *Euſebius*'s Hiſtory, what, 4.
Myſteries, hidden from Catechumens and Pagans, 48.

N.

Narſes Count. Delivers *Italy* from the Tyranny of the *Barbarians*, 1.
Nature. Not evil of it ſelf, 59.
Nectarius Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*. His Death, 195. A Judgment upon this Author, *ibid.*
Neocæſarea. Council there in 314. 248. Canons, 248, 249, *&c.*
Nice in *Bithynia*. Hiſtory of the Council of *Nice*, and Circumſtances concerning it, 2, 7, 12, 15, 23, 250, *&c.* The *Nicene* Creed, the only Rule of Faith, 42.
Nicephorus Calliſtus, compoſed an Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, and when, 4. Put many uncertain and Fabulous Stories into it, *ibid.*
Niſibis a City of *Meſopotamia*, 49.
Niſmes. Council held in that City in the Time of St. *Martin*, 275.
Nonna, Mother of St. *Gregory Nazianzen*, 166.
Novatian. Character of that Heretick, 83. Refutation of his Doctrine, *ibid.* 216, *&c.*

O.

Optatus Biſhop of *Milevis*. Time when he lived, 87. Died in the Reign of *Valentinian*, *ibid.* & [c]. Number of his Books, 87. and [d]. [e]. Abridgment of his Books againſt the *Donatiſts*, 87, 88, *&c.* Judgment upon his Stile and Doctrine, 96. Editions of his Books, 97.
Oreſiieſis, Succeſſour to St. *Pachomius*. Treatiſe concerning the Inſtruction of Monks, 55.

P.

St. *Pacianus* Biſhop of *Barcelona*. Time of his Death, 81. An Extract of his Writings, 81, 82. A good ſaying of his, 82. His Doctrine, 84. Editions of his Works, 85.
St. *Pachomius*. Author of a Monaſtick Life, 54. Country and Relations, *ibid.* Life and Time of his Death, 55. Rules and Letters, *ibid.*
Palæmon Hermit, Maſter of St. *Pachomius*, 54.
Pamphilus Martyr, Friend to *Euſebius*, 1. and [a]. And not his Brother, 1. [a]. Suffered two Years Impriſonment, and after Martyrdom, 1. Compoſed Apologies for *Origen* with *Euſebius*, 2. Life written by *Euſebius*, 3.
Permenian a *Donatiſt*, his Miſtakes, 88.
Paris. Council of *Paris* in 362. where *Auxentius*, *Urſacius*, *Valens*, and *Saturnus* were condemned, 266.
Patrophilus, an *Arian* Biſhop. Enemy to *Euſebius Vercellenſis*, 186.
Paul I. Pope, wrote to *Pepin*, 19.
Paul of *Emiſa*. Aſſiſts at the Council of *Seleucia*, 59. St. *Jerom*'s Judgment upon his Works, *ibid.*
Paulinus of *Antioch*. His Ordination unlawful, 136.
Penance. Which is true 77. Abſolution to be granted to Sinners, 82, 83. and [c]. Neceſſity of Penance, *ibid.* 180. Qualities of true Penance, 83, 118, 217. Publick Penance, 84. 217. and [e]. Canons of St. *Baſil* concerning Penance, 140. and [c]. Canons of St. *Gregory Nyſſen* upon the ſame Subject, 181, 182. Canons of *Peter* of *Alexandria* concerning Penance and Idolaters, 26. Canons of the Council of *Elvira* concerning Penance, and depriving of thoſe that are guilty of ſome Crimes of Communion even when they are dying, 242, *&c.* Other Canons of the Councils of the Fourth Century; See *the Extract of the Councils*. If a Judge who has condemned Criminals to Death ought to do Penance, 227.
Pepin Beſieges *Padua*, 19. and afterwards cauſes *Aſtolphus* to raiſe the Siege of *Rome*, and obliges him to execute the Treaty of Peace, *ibid.*
Perſecution. Flight in Perſecution, 26, 40, 41. Of the *Arians* againſt the Church, 41, 71, *&c.* To be ſuffered with Conſtancy, 151.
Peter Biſhop of *Alexandria*, under the Emperour, and in what time he ſuffered Martyrdom, 25, and [a]. The Acts of his Martyrdom doubtful, 25. and [b]. His Canons are drawn from one of his Diſcourſes upon Penance. 26.
Peter another Biſhop of *Alexandria*, Succeſſor to St. *Athanaſius*, 105. Driven away by *Palladius* Governour of the Province, and retires to *Rome*, *ibid.* Fragments of his Letter, 106. Death, *ibid.*
Phœbadius Biſhop of *Agen*. His Steadineſs in the Council of *Ariminum*, 85. Subſcribes nevertheleſs a Profeſſion of Faith made by the *Arians*, 86. Laments his Fault and Repairs it, *ibid.* Writes a Book againſt the Second *Sirmian* Creed, *ibid.*
Philaſtrius Biſhop of *Breſſia*. His Life, 193. Judgment upon his Treatiſe of Hereſies, 194.
Philo-Carpathius. A Suppoſititious Author, 240.
Philoſtratus. An Author not to be credited, 6.
Photinus Biſhop of *Sirmium*. His Country, Errour, Writings, Condemnation, 98.
Pilgrimage. Uſe and Abuſe of Pilgrimages, 182.
Plato. His Doctrine agreeable to *Moſes*'s, but not free from Errour as that of the Holy Scripture, 6.
Popes. Popes never received from *Conſtantine* the Empire of *Rome*, 18. and [e]. Subject to the Grecian Emperours, *ibid.* Obliged to the Kings of *France* for their Temporalities, 19. At laſt became Sovereigns of the City of *Rome*, and by what Degrees, *ibid.*
Prayer. What it is to Pray, 151.
Prieſts. Formerly preſided in the Aſſemblies of the Faithful in ſome Churches, 48.

Pretextatus Governour of *Rome*, baniſhes *Urſicinus* by the Emperour's Order, 120.
Priſcillian. Hiſtory of that Heretick, 190. Councils celebrated againſt him and his Followers, 274.
Providence of God, extends to all Creatures, 206.
Pſalms. Uſefulneſs of Pſalms, 45, 46. Diviſion of the Pſalms, 177. Remarks upon the Pſalms, 75, 76.

R.

Rachiſius. King of the *Lombards*, 19.
Rapes. Forbid and puniſhed by the Eccleſiaſtical Laws, 137, 141.
Reformers. Character and Genius of the Reformers, 193.
Religious Perſecuted well received at *Conſtantinople* by St. *Chryſoſtom*, Cauſe of *Theophilus*'s hatred to that Saint, 234.
Religion Chriſtian. Proofs of it, 5, 6, 15, 42, 178. Edicts of *Conſtantine* for Religion, 15, 16.
Relicks. Reſpect due to them, what? 90, 96, 226.
Repentance: See *Penance*.
Reſurrection. Proofs of the Reſurrection, 8, 112.
Rheticus Biſhop of *Autun*. Life and Writings, 21.
Rhodanius Biſhop of *Thouloſe*, 262.
Riches. Their Uſe, 75, 77, 151, 203.
St. *Romanus*, a Deacon of *Antioch*, Martyr, 9.
Rome. Council held there in 313, in favour of *Cæcilian*, 246. Another in 341, under Pope *Julius*, for St. *Athanaſius*, 253. Another in 370, under *Damaſus*, 270. Another in 372, againſt *Urſicinus*, *ibid.* Another in 390, againſt *Jovian* and his Followers, 275.
Ruffinus, Judgment upon his Tranſlation of *Euſebius*'s Hiſtory, 14.

S.

Sabinus, a *Macedonian* Author, 198.
Saints. Veneration and Prayer to Saints, 8, 156, 237.
Sangarus. Council of the *Novatians* there in 390, 275.
Saragoſſa. Council of *Saragoſſa* in 347. 274.
Sardica. Council there in 347. 259. Its Canons and Letters, *ibid.* &c.
Saturninus Biſhop of *Arles*, Sided with the *Arians*.
Scaliger (*Joſeph.*) Firſt collected the Greek Fragments of *Euſebius*'s Chronicon, 5.
Scripture Holy. Canonical Books of the Sacred Scripture, 45, 46, 111, 270, 279. The Rule of Faith, 47, 48.
Seleucia. Council of *Seleucia* in 359. Hiſtory of it, 264. and c.
Septuagint. Hiſtory of their Verſion, 5, 111.
Serapion Biſhop of *Thumis*, different from him of *Arſinoe*, 58. His Life and Writings, *ibid.*
Sergius Pope. By whom Baniſhed, 19.
Servatio Biſhop of *Tongres*. By ſurpriſal Signs a Profeſſion of Faith made by the *Arians*, 86.
Silverius and *Vigilius* Popes, ill uſed by *Juſtinian*, 18.
Simony, Receiving Money for the Adminiſtration of the Sacraments to be Deteſted, 137.
Sin againſt the Holy Ghoſt, in what ſence unpardonable, 46. Diſtinction of Sins, 83, 84.
Singing the Prayers in Churches, 133.
Singedunum. Council there in 366. Compoſed of *Arian* Biſhops, 267.
Sinueſſa. Council held there in 303. The Acts of it Suppoſititious, 241.
Siricius Pope, Succeſſor to *Damaſus*, 196. Abridgment of his Letters, *ibid.* and 197.
Sirmium. I. Council of *Sirmium* in 349. 261. II. Council there in 351. 262. III. In 357. 263. IV. In 358. *ibid.* V. In 359. *ibid.*
Socrates Hiſtorian. Begins his Hiſtory where *Euſebius* ends, 4.
Solitude. Its Uſefulneſs, 124.
Soul. Immortal and Spiritual, 9, 47, 110, 236. Book of the Soul by *Euſtathius* of *Antioch*, 22. Queſtion concerning the Soul of *Samuel*, 24. Grace and an inclination to Sin to be found at the ſame time in the ſame Soul, 57. Of its Nature, 57, 58, 74, 79, 174, 177, 179, 183, 201.
Sozomen Hiſtorian. Begins his Hiſtory where *Euſebius* Ends his, 4.
Stephen, II. Pope, makes a Truce with the King of the *Lombards*, 19. Has recourſe to *Pepin*, *ibid.*
Sida in *Pamphylia*. Council there in 383, againſt the *Maſſalians* or *Euchaitæ*, 274.
Synods, held by the *Semi-Arians* in 365, and 366, 267.
Syrianus. Uſes the Faithful of *Alexandria* ill, even in the Church, 31.

T.

Tabenna. Monaſtery in *Egypt*, Founded by St. *Pachomius*, 54.
Taverns. Canons againſt Taverns, 269.
Teſtament New. For all Mankind, and the Law of the Jews for the Nation only, 6.
Theater Canons againſt Stage-Players, 244.
Theft. Vide *Violence*.
Theodatus. Sends Pope *Agapetus* to *Juſtinian*, 19.
Theodorus Biſhop of *Perinthus*. Life and Writings, 18.
Theodorus Diſciple of St. *Pachomius* his Letters, 55.
Theodorus Martyr, 181. and c.
Theodoret Hiſtorian. Begins his Hiſtory where *Euſebius* ends his, 4.
Theodoric King of the *Oſtrogoths* makes himſelf Maſter of *Italy* and *Rome*, 18. Appoints a Viſitor over that Church, and ſends Pope *John* to the Grecian Emperour, and why, *ibid.*
Theoſebia. Wife to *Gregory Nyſſen*, 176, and c.
Theotimus Biſhop of *Tomi*, his Writings, 198.
Tiberianus, a *Priſcillianiſt*, 191.
Timothy of *Alexandria*. Life, 195. Abridgment of his Canons, *ibid.*
Titus of *Boſtra*. Circumſtances of his Life, 102. Aſſiſts at the Council of *Meletius* held at *Antioch*, *ibid.* Subject of his Book againſt the *Manichees*, *ibid.* and 103. The Opinion we ought to have of it, 103. Commentary upon St. *Luke*'s Goſpel attributed to him, not his, *ibid.* His Death, 102.
Toledo. Council there in the Year, 400. 285. Canons of it, *ibid.* 286.
Triers. Council ſaid to be held there in the Time of St. *Martin*, 275.
Trinity. *Euſebius*'s Opinion upon the Trinity, 7. Explication of the Myſtery of the Holy Trinity, and Proofs of the Divinity of the Son and Holy Ghoſt, 27, 44, 47, 48, 66, &c. 110, 111, &c. 146, 147, 178, 220, 251, &c.
Triphillius Biſhop in *Cyprus*, 52.
Turin. Council there in 400. 285. Hiſtory of it, *ibid.*
Tyana. Synod held there in the Year 368.
Tyre. Pretended Council of *Tyre* in 335, againſt St. *Athanaſius*, 254.

V.

Valence. Council there in 347. Its Canons for the Reformation of Diſcipline, 270.
Valens Biſhop of *Murcia*, 99.
Valens Emperour. In what Year and by whom Baptized, 32. His Edict, and what he ordained by it, *ibid.*
Valeſius. His Tranſlation, of *Euſebius*'s Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, 10.

Victo-

Victorinus of *Africa*. His Converſion, 80. His Baptiſm, *ibid.* Writings againſt *Arius* and againſt the *Manichees*, 81. Other Works, *ibid.*
Vigilance Chriſtian, recommended, 151.
Violence, exerciſed by the *Donatiſts* againſt the Catholicks, 91, 92. The Church did not exerciſe any againſt them, *ibid.* Princes might uſe their Authority to procure a Re-union of Schiſmaticks and Hereticks, 92.
Violence and *Theft*. Canons againſt theſe Sins, 141. 182.
Vincenſius of *Capua*. Sent to the Council of *Arles* by Pope *Liberius*, 61.
Virgins. Conſecrated to God. Made a Vow of Virginity, 94. Had a Veil, *ibid.* 210. Penance impoſed on thoſe who violated their Vow of Chaſtity, 142, 213. Not to be condemned without good Proof of their Guilt, 221.
Virginity. The moſt perfect State, 8, 47, 110, 150, 179, 228, 230.
Virginity Perpetual of *Mary*, 212. 228.
Vitellius a *Donatiſt*. Author of a Book for his Party, and another againſt the Gentiles, 53.
Vito a Prieſt, 30 and 1.
Vows. Indiſcreet Vows forbidden, 142.
Urſicinus, his Conteſt againſt Pope *Damaſus*, 120, 121.
Uſury. Condemnation of Uſury, 181. 203. Canons againſt Uſury, 141, 247, 253, 268.
Uſurers. Diſcourſe againſt Uſurers, 181. 203.

W.

Wiſdom. Book of *Wiſdom* attributed by the *Latins* to *Solomon*, 78.
Women, Not to be clad with Eccleſiaſtical Habits, 137.
Word. Not a Creature drawn from naught, 27.
Witch of *Endor*. Hiſtory of it Explained, 23. 24.

ADVER-

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE French *Copy of this Book is so very uncorrectly Printed, that those who took Care of this Translation, found it necessary in great Numbers of Places to examine it by those Original Books which were quoted or epitomized: So that though very many Faults were amended in the Body of this Translation, yet upon a Review of the Work since it came from the Press, several others were observed, which are here set by themselves, lest they should be imputed to the Printer's Carelessness.*

ERRATA in the *French* Text.

PAge 4. col. 1. line 6. from bot. read B. 1. C. 12 col. 2. l. 2. r. C. 17. p. 10. l. ult. for 13. r. 15. p. 11. l. 4. r. *Hopperus.* p. 21. l. 3. r. B. VIII. c. 1. *ibid.* col. 2. l. 3. r. *Theodoret.* B. 1. c. 7. p. 27. l. 30. dele *and Theodoret.* p. 33. col. 1. l. 4. r. τῆι Ευσεβίου. p. 35. col. 2. l. 6. r. c. 21. for c. 17. and l. 7. r. c. 23. for c. 14. p. 51. l. 18. from bot. r. B. 1. c. 5. p. 63. l. 4. from bot. for 6. r. 16. p. 70. l. 40. for *Ariminum and Ancyra*, r. *Ariminum and Seleucia.* ibid. l. 17. from bot. r. *exhorts the Western.* p. 85. l. 4. from bot. r. *composed by Potamius and Subscribed by Hosius.* p. 100. l. 15. r. *ch.* 15. *of B.* IV. p. 102. *Nazianzen's* Words end at *Admiration of all Mankind.* p. 107. l. 21. r. *Eustathius of Sebastea.* ibid. col. 1. l. 1. r. *B.* 11. *c.* 38. l. 2. r. *B.* 4. *c.* 20. p. 145. l. 22. from bot. r. *ch.* 15. *B.* III. p. 183. l. 24. from bot. r. *Margunius.* p. 221. col. 1. l. 2 dele p. 824. p. 223. l. 8. from bot. for 383. r. 388. p. 233. l. 16. for 1606. r. 1506. p. 237. and p. 239. for *Aëtius* r. *Aërius.* p. 250. l. 33. r. *B.* I. for *B.* 3. p. 256. for *Edessa* r. *Emisa.* p. 258, 259. for *Servatus of Tongres*, r. *Servatio.*

Those likewise who are acquainted with the French *Language, know what a Liberty the* French *Writers take in altering of Proper Names, and in bringing them to the Genius of their own Tongue: For which Reason they will easily pardon some Mistakes of that kind in so long and various a Work as this. However, lest any one should think that this has been neglected, which might occasion Confusion, when the same Persons Names otherwise turned occur in other Books, the following Catalogue was drawn up; in which those Names to which no Page is set, are several times to be met with, whereas the others are hardly ever mistaken any where else.* Bostria *(p.* 9.*) for* Bostra. Eucherus *(p.* 24.*) for* Eucherius. Zosinus *(p.* 27*) for* Zosimus. Eudoxus *for* Eudoxius. Cotelierius *for* Cotelerius. Vurimadus *for* Varimadus. Tapsa *for* Tapsus. Emesa *for* Emisa. Rhebadius *(p.* 50*) for* Phebadius. Damascus *(p.* 33.*) for* Damasus. Docus *(p.* 51.*) for* Docius. Elpidus *and* Elpides *for* Elpidius. Poëmius *(p.* 135.*) for* Poëmenius. Narsetes *for* Narses. Logothera *(p.* 158.*) for* Logothera. Fumanus *for* Fumancellus. Doaza *(p.* 169.*) for* Doara. Florus Magister *(p.* 205.*) not to be divided.* Brughem *(p.* 233.*) for* Beughem. Marcina *(p.* 179.*) for* Macrina.

CORRIGENDA.

PAge 3. line 22. read *Euphration.* l. 27. dele *of.* p. 5. l. 43. for *with* r. *which.* p. 7. l. 24. for *formerly* r. *formally.* p. 9. l. 23. dele C. p. 10. l. 1. r. *Offices* for *Officers.* l. 31. for *revised* r. *reprinted.* ibid. l. 5. from bot. for *Four* r. *Fourteen.* p. 13. l. 25. for *the*, r. *their.* p. 17. l. 28. r. *Clergy.* p. 19. l. 37. for *as it plainly appears*, r. *he declaring himself openly.* p. 22. *b.* l. 8. r. *suffered Paulinus to have been.* p. 24. col. 2. l. 7. for *S. Austin*, r. *S. Justin.* p. 26. l. 18. dele *not.* p. 27. l. 14. from bot. for *the best*, r. *a Masterpiece.* p. 33. l. 12. r. *so that.* p. 36. l. 2. r. *Frenchman.* p. 37. l. 16. for *the Act*, r. *Action.* p. 39. l. 33. r. *Retractation.* p. 41. l. 9. before *goes*, r. *he.* p. 44. l. 33. dele *so that.* p. 46. l. 48. r. *do not mean.* p. 52. l. 28. for *who Heracleus*, r. *which Heraclea.* p. 53. col. 1. l. 8. r. *by the latter*, for *the last by.* p. 63. l. 35. for *two Volumes*, r. *2d. Volume.* p. 65. l. 18. from bot. for *viz.* r. *Vir.* p. 68. l. 3. r. *perception.* p. 73. col. 2. after l. 1. add 459. *To Vincentius of Capua.* p. 82. l. 8. for *Doctrine* r. *Doctor.* p. 87. l. 32. for *since St. Jerom's*, r. *in St. Jerom's* p. 100, *b.* l. 6. r. *but it was.* p. 107. col. 1. l. ult. r. *of the Words.* p. 108 col. 1. l. 8. r. *wrote some.* p. 116. l. 8. for *Aversation* r. *Aversion.* p. 122. l. 44. r. 1672. [*in Octavo*; *his Poems.* l. 45. dele *in Octavo.* p. 135. l. 4. r. *pretended for little.* 136. l. 39. r. *his Carriage deserved.* p. 146. l. 20. r. *at Laciza.* p. 154. l. 10. for *honest*, r. *decent.* p. 170. l. 9. for 41*st.* r. 32*d.* ibid. l. 40. for *of* r. *and.* and for *and* r. *of.* p. 171. l. 28. r. *his Custom.* p. 173. l. 2. for *likeness* r. *Lightness.* ibid. l. 15. from bot. for *Hermetical.* r. *Eremetical.* p. 190. l. 18. for *Provocation* r. *Vocation.* p. 193. l. 11. Marg. Note from bot. dele. p. 198. l. 31. r. *Sozomen commends him.* p. 215. l. 11. from bot. for *it is*, r. *is it.* p. 222. col. 2. for *Lieutenancy* r. *Vicariate* twice. 238. l. 10. from bot. Marg. Note. for *she knows*, r. *he knows.* p. 241. l. 5. for *pretended* r. *supposititious.* 244. l. 36. r. *Defamatory Libels.* p. 256. l. 35. for *though*, r. *thought.* p. 259. l. 7. from bot. after *is*, for *to the Churches of Alexandria.* r. *produced.* ibid. l. 6. after *third*, add, *is to the Churches of Alexandria.* p. 94. The Sentence *As if a Belief*—should have been placed in the Margin against *believed to be the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ.* p. 117. The Sentence Mr. *Du pin*—should have been against these Words, in the next Line, *Other Criticks of his Way.*

FINIS.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE French *Copy of this Book is ſo very uncorrectly Printed, that thoſe who took Care of this Tranſlation, found it neceſſary in great Numbers of Places to examine it by thoſe Original Books which were quoted or epitomized: So that though very many Faults were amended in the Body of this Tranſlation, yet upon a Review of the Work ſince it came from the Preſs, ſeveral others were obſerved, which are here ſet by themſelves, leſt they ſhould be imputed to the Printer's Careleſſneſs.*

ERRATA in the *French* Text.

PAge 4. col. 1. line 6. from bot. read B. 1. C. 12 col. 2. l. 2. r. C. 17. p. 10. l. ult. for 13. r. 15. p. 11. l. 4. r. *Hupperus.* p. 21. l. 3. r. B. VIII. c. 1. *ibid.* col. 2. l. 3. r. *Theodoret.* B. 1. c. 7. p. 27. l. 30. dele *and Theodoret.* p. 33. col. 1. l. 4. r. τῆς Ἐυσίου. p. 35. col. 2. l. 6. r. c. 21. for c. 17. and l. 7. r. c. 23. for c. 14. p. 51. l. 18. from bot. r. B. 1. c. 5. p. 63. l. 4. from bot. for 6. r. 16. p. 70. l. 40. for *Ariminum and Ancyra*, r. *Ariminum and Seleucia.* ibid. l. 17. from bot. r. *exhorts the Weſtern.* p. 85. l. 4. from bot. r. *compoſed by Potamius and Subſcribed by Oſius.* p. 100. l. 15. r. *ch.* 15. *of B. IV.* p. 102. *Nazianzen's* Words end at *Admiration of all Mankind.* p. 107. l. 21. r. *Euſtathius of Sebaſtea.* ibid. col. 1. l. 1. r. *B.* II. *c.* 38. l. 2. r. *B.* 4. *c.* 20. p. 145. l. 22. from bot. r. *ch.* 15. *B.* III. p. 183. l. 24. from bot. r. *Margunius.* p. 221. col. 1. l. 2 dele p. 824. p. 223. l. 8. from bot. for 383. r. 388. p. 233. l. 16. for 1606. r. 1506. p. 237. and p. 239. for *Aëtius* r. *Aërius.* p. 250. l. 33. r. *B.* I. for *B.* 3. p. 256. for *Eduſſa* r. *Emiſa.* p. 258, 259. for *Servatus of Tongres*, r. *Servatio.*

Thoſe likewiſe who are acquainted with the French *Language, know what a Liberty the* French *Writers take in altering of Proper Names, and in bringing them to the Genius of their own Tongue: For which Reaſon they will eaſily pardon ſome Miſtakes of that kind in ſo long and various a Work as this. However, leſt any one ſhould think that this has been neglected, which might occaſion Confuſion, when the ſame Perſons Names otherwiſe turned occur in other Books, the following Catalogue was drawn up; in which thoſe Names to which no Page is ſet, are ſeveral times to be met with, whereas the others are hardly ever miſtaken any where elſe.* Boſtria (*p.* 9.) *for* Boſtra. Eucherus (*p.* 24.) *for* Eucherius. Zoſinus (*p.* 27) *for* Zoſimus. Eudoxus *for* Eudoxius. Cotelierius *for* Cotelerius. Vurimadus *for* Varimadus. Tapſa *for* Tapſus. Emeſa *for* Emiſa. Rhebadius (*p.* 50) *for* Phebadius. Damaſcus (*p.* 33.) *for* Damaſus. Docus (*p.* 51.) *for* Docius. Elpidus *and* Elpides *for* Elpidius. Poëmius (*p.* 135.) *for* Poëmenius. Narſetes *for* Narſes. Logothera (*p.* 158.) *for* Logothera. Fumanus *for* Fumancellus. Doaza (*p.* 169.) *for* Doara. Florus Magiſter (*p.* 205.) *not to be divided.* Brughem (*p.* 233.) *for* Beughem. Marcina (*p.* 179.) *for* Macrina.

CORRIGENDA.

PAge 3. line 22. read *Euphration.* l. 27. dele *of.* p. 5. l. 43. for *with* r. *which.* p. 7. l. 24. for *formerly* r. *formally.* p. 9. l. 23. dele C. p. 10. l. 1. r. *Offices* for *Officers.* l. 31. for *reviſed* r. *reprinted.* ibid. l. 5. from bot. for *Four* r. *Fourteen.* p. 13. l. 29. for *the*, r. *their.* p. 17. l. 28. r. *Clergy.* p. 19. l. 37. for *as it plainly appears*, r. *he declaring himſelf openly.* p. 22. *b.* l. 8. r. *ſuffered Paulinus to have been.* p. 24. col. 2. l. 7. for *S. Auſtin*, r. *S. Juſtin.* p. 26. l. 18. dele *not.* p. 27. l. 14. from bot. for *the beſt*, r. *a Maſterpiece.* p. 33. l. 12. r. *ſo that.* p. 36. l. 2. r. *Frenchman.* p. 37. l. 16. for *the Act*, r. *Action.* p. 39. l. 33. r. *Retractation.* p. 41. l. 9. before *goes*, r. *he.* p. 44. l. 33. dele *ſo that.* p. 46. l. 48. r. *do not mean.* p. 52. l. 28. for *who Heracleus*, r. *which Heraclea.* p. 53. col. 1. l. 8. r. *by the latter*, for *the laſt by.* p. 63. l. 35. for *two Volumes*, r. *2d. Volume.* p. 65. l. 18. from bot. for *viz.* r. *Vir.* p. 68. l. 3. r. *perception.* p. 73. col. 2. after l. 1. add 459. *To Vincentius of Capua.* p. 82. l. 8. for *Doctrine* r. *Doctor.* p. 87. l. 32. for *ſince St. Jerom's*, r. *in St. Jerom's* p. 100, *b.* l. 6. r. *but it was.* p. 107. col. 1. l. ult. r. *of the Words.* p. 108 col. 1. l. 8. r. *wrote ſome.* p. 116. l. 8. for *Averſation* r. *Averſion.* p. 122. l. 44. r. 1672. [*in Octavo*; *his Poems.* l. 45. dele *in Octavo.* p. 135. l. 4. r. *pretended for little.* 136. l. 39. r. *his Carriage deſerved.* p. 146. l. 20. r. *at Laciza.* p. 154. l. 10. for *honeſt*, r. *decent.* p. 170. l. 9. for 41*ſt.* r. 32*d.* ibid. l. 40. for *of* r. *and.* and for *and* r. *of.* p. 171. l. 28. r. *his Cuſtom.* p. 173. l. 2. for *likeneſs* r. *Lightneſs.* ibid. l. 15. from bot. for *Hermetical.* r. *Eremetical.* p. 190. l. 18. for *Provocation* r. *Vocation.* p. 193. l. 11. Marg. Note from bot. dele. p. 198. l. 31. r. *Sozomen commends him.* p. 215. l. 11. from bot. for *it is*, r. *is it.* p. 222. col. 2. for *Lieutenancy* r. *Vicariate* twice. 238. l. 10. from bot. Marg. Note. for *ſhe knows*, r. *he knows.* p. 241. l. 5. for *pretended* r. *ſuppoſititious.* 244. l. 36. r. *Defamatory Libels.* p. 256. l. 35. for *though*, r. *thought.* p. 259. l. 7. from bot. after *is*, for *to the Churches of Alexandria.* r. *produced.* ibid. l. 6. after *third*, add, *is to the Churches of Alexandria.* p. 94. The Sentence *As if a Belief*—ſhould have been placed in the Margin againſt *believed to be the Body and Blood of Jeſus Chriſt.* p. 117. The Sentence Mr. *Du pin*—ſhould have been againſt theſe Words, in the next Line, *Other Criticks of his Way.*

FINIS.

A NEW

HISTORY

OF

Eccleſiaſtical Writers:

Containing an ACCOUNT

Of the LIVES and WRITINGS of the

PRIMITIVE FATHERS;

A

Judicious Abridgment

AND

A Catalogue of all their WORKS;

WITH

Cenſures Determining the GENUINE and SPURIOUS:

AND A

Judgment upon their *Style* and *Doctrine:*

Alſo their various Editions.

Together with

A Compendious Hiſtory of the COUNCILS.

Written in *FRENCH*

By *Lewis Ellies du PIN*, Doctor of the *SORBON.*

VOLUME the THIRD,

Containing the AUTHORS *that Flouriſhed in the Beginning of the* FIFTH CENTURY.

LONDON,

Printed by *J. H.* for **Abel Swall** and **Tim. Childe**, at the *Unicorn* at the Weſt-End of St. *Paul's* Church-yard. MDCXCIII.

1693

UMI

PREFACE.

SINCE the Publication of the former Volumes of this *Bibliotheca* in our Language, we have had an account, That the Author was cenſured for it at *Paris*: It was reaſonable enough to expect, that ſome notice would be taken of that great freedom, with which he ſo induſtriouſly aſſerts the Privileges of National Churches, againſt the Pretenſions of the Court of *Rome*; eſpecially if ever the French King ſhould command thoſe of his Clergy, who aſſiſted in the General Aſſembly in 1682. to make ſuch Submiſſions as the Court of *Rome* would accept of. The great care which M. *Du Pin* has taken to get full Approbations from ſeveral Doctors of the *Sorbonne*, to every Volume, ſeem'd ſufficient to ſecure him from any ignominious Cenſures which he might have been in danger of at home; but when a Man meets with Enemies upon other Accounts, they will fall upon him for thoſe things which at any other time would not have been regarded.

It is commonly ſaid, That the firſt beginning of M. *Du Pin*'s Misfortune, proceeded from a private Quarrel of the Biſhop of *Meaux*'s, who was angry with him for publiſhing a Tranſlation of the *Pſalms*, when himſelf had publiſh'd another not long before This was interpreted to be a Trial of Skill in an inferior Presbyter, who preſumed to conteſt with ſo great a Biſhop, that had ſo long been famous for his skill in Writing: It touch'd M. *de Meaux* the more ſenſibly, becauſe M. *Du Pin* is ſaid to have corrected ſeveral Things in his Tranſlation, wherein the Biſhop was miſtaken. Therefore, ſince he could take no hold of that, without expoſing himſelf, which he would not run the hazard of, he collected ſeveral bold Expreſſions in M. *Du Pin*'s *Bibliotheca*, and exhibited an Accuſation of Hereſie againſt him to the Arch-biſhop of *Paris*, who accordingly proceeded upon it.

This Accuſation was ſeconded by the Pope's Nuncio, who concerned himſelf ſo far in this Matter, that M. *Du Pin* thought it neceſſary to yield to his Dioceſan, who oblig'd him to retract ſeveral Propoſitions, and to mollifie others that were thought too hard, and to ſubmit his Book entirely to the Arch-biſhop's Mercy. How great that was, appears by the Arch-biſhop's Condemnation and Cenſure of M. *Du Pin*'s *Bibliotheca*, printed at *Paris*, with M. *Du Pin*'s Retractation annex'd to it. I have not been able to procure the Condemnation it ſelf, but the Author of the *Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Scavans*, has printed an Extract out of it in his laſt Volume, which ſays, That the printed Cenſure condemns M. *Du Pin*'s *Bibliotheca*, becauſe it contains, "Several Propoſitions that are falſe, raſh, ſcandalous, capable of giving offence to "pious Ears, tending to weaken the Arguments that are brought from Tra-"dition for the Authority of the Canonical Books, and of ſeveral Articles of Faith, "injurious to General Councils and the Apoſtolick See, erroneous and leading to "Hereſie; and, therefore, it forbids all Perſons to read it, or to keep it by them.

This Ordonnance of the Arch-biſhop of *Paris* was ſeconded by an Order of the Parliament of *Paris*, bearing date *April* 25. 1693. which ſays, "That the *Gens* "*de Roy* acquainted the Court, that they thought it was their Duty to inform them, "That the Arch-biſhop of *Paris* had lately condemned a Book, Entituled, *A new* "*Bibliotheca of Eccleſiaſtical Authors*, written by M. *Ellies Du Pin*, Doctor in Divinity "of the Faculty of *Paris*, becauſe it contain'd Propoſitions contrary to ſound Do-

" trine: That the cognizance of every thing that relates to the Faith belonging " to the Church, and the decision of those Matters to the Bishops within their re- " spective Dioceses, the suppression of the Books which they condemn, and the " *afflictive* Punishment of those who persist in Opinions which have been censured by " the Bishops, belong to the Kings Officers, and principally to the Court, the De- " positary of Sovereign Justice: That they have nothing to object against the Au- " thor of this Book, because he has submitted himself to the Judgment of his Bishop, " and because it appears by a Writing, which he has published, That he has retra- " cted some of those Propositions which he had advanced, and explain'd the rest in " such a manner as frees them from all suspicion of Error: That they are willing to " believe, That the Faults which M. *Ellies Du Pin* fell into, and which deserv'd the " Censure pronounced against him, proceeded rather from the Greatness of the " Work that he undertook, than from any formed Design of introducing new Opi- " nions; and, besides, that there is a great deal of Learning in his Books: That " they were oblig'd to take notice to the Court, upon this occasion, of the Care, " the Application and Vigilance, which the Arch-bishop of *Paris* shews to preserve " sound Doctrine in his Dioceses, and to stifle every thing, in the beginning, which " may disturb the Peace and Tranquillity of the Church. And, therefore, they omitted " nothing in those Stations in which they had the Honour to be placed, that could " second such good Designs; and this it was that obliged them to demand of the " Court, That those Books that the Arch-bishop had condemned, might be suppres- " sed; and that all Booksellers should be forbidden to sell them, till they should be " corrected according to the Writing of the said *Du Pin*, annex'd to the Arch-bi- " shop's Censure, and that the Corrections should be approved by him the said " Arch-bishop. The *Gens de Roy* withdrawing, the Court took the Matter into " Deliberation, and it was *Resolved*, That all Booksellers and others, should be com- " manded not to sell or keep by them any Copies of the said Books, which have " hitherto been printed; and it was *Ordered*, That they should be brought forth- " with into the Greffe of the said Court there to be suppressed; with very expres " Prohibitions to all Persons to Reprint that Book in any manner whatsoever for the " time to come, without the Advice and Consent of the Arch-bishop of *Paris*. So far the printed Extract out of the Register of the Parliament of *Paris*.

If we may judge of all those things which M. *Du Pin* has retracted or mollified by that Specimen in the *Histoire des Ouvrages des Scavans*, the Proceedings against him have been spiteful and malicious, rather to satisfie those particular Persons who are concerned to see his Credit lessened, than because he really deserv'd so rough a Treatment. He acknowleges, for instance, That the Title of *Mother of God*, given to the blessed Virgin, is not only an innocent Expression, but was always consecrated to her, and ought to be used; That when he said, That there are no positive Authorities for Purgatory in the Writings of the Fathers of the 3 first Centuries, he expressed himself too generally; That when he says, That S. *Cyprian* was the first that spoke very clearly of the necessity of the Grace of *Jesus Christ*, he did not pretend to say, That the Fathers did not speak clearly concerning it, before him; That when he said, That General Councils called about Matters of Faith, have seldom given Peace to the Church, he did not mean, That Councils do not bring Peace, or that they ever take the wrong side: These are all the Doctrinal Retractations which the Author of the above-mentioned Extract has taken notice of; and then adds, *That his Explications are often very much forced.*

It is evident enough, from this short Specimen, That his Accusers had no Inclination to spare him, but would make him smart for all that Liberty with which he made his Abridgments, and passed his Censures upon the Writings of the ancientest Fathers of the Church. In Justice, they ought also to have proceeded against those Doctors of the *Sorbonne* who gave the Approbations, that are prefixed to the several Volumes, wherein they commend the Faithfulness and Judiciousness of his Extracts, and propose his Work as extreamly useful to all sorts of Men: These Doctors certainly knew very well what they did; they knew what use Protestants would make of this Work and of their Approbations; yet this did not, it seems, de-

ter

ter them from giving ſuch Characters as no Man could give who was not himſelf in earneſt, or at leaſt would have others believe him to be ſo: Accordingly the firſt Volume, againſt which there has been the greateſt Clamour, was not animadverted upon for near ſix Years.

It appears by the Order of the Parliament, That that Court acted only *ex Officio*, and that that Illuſtrious Body has a great value for M. *Du Pin*. Otherwiſe the *Gens de Roy* would not have made ſuch Excuſes for a Man, upon whoſe Writings they are then paſſing Cenſure; but the Pope's Nuncio is at preſent too great a Man to be deny'd ſatisfaction, when he may be gratified with ſo ſmall a Sacrifice; and it is probable, That the Arch-biſhop of *Paris*, who went along with his Maſter in the greateſt Oppoſitions which he made to Pope *Innocent* XI. was willing to embrace this Opportunity to ſhew the Pope how zealouſly he is concerned for the Intereſts of the See of *Rome*; eſpecially, when he can gratifie a private Revenge at the ſame time.

In the Second Edition of the Firſt Volume of M. *Du Pin's Bibliotheca*, when he gives an Account of the Condemnation of *Paulus Samoſatenus* by the Council of *Antioch*, he has this Expreſſion, "*Enfin apres l'avoir accuſe de tous les Vices* "*Ordinaires aux Eveques des grands Sieges, ils diſent qu'ils l'ont condamne* principalement a Paris *qu'il renouvelloit l' Erreur d' Artemas. In ſhort, after they have accuſed him of all thoſe Vices that are ordinary in Biſhops of great Sees, they ſay they condemned him,* principally at *Paris, becauſe he revived the Error of* Artemas. Theſe Words, *at Paris*, make the latter part of the Period non-ſenſe; and could ſignify nothing to the Author's Purpoſe if they had been Senſe: it ſhould be read, *principalement parce qu'il renouvelloit*; *principally becauſe he revived:* And ſo it is in the *Engliſh* (edit. 1. p. 193. edit. 2. p. 173.) This unfortunate *Erratum* coming juſt after a very ſevere Character of *Paulus Samoſatenus*, out of *Euſebius*, put every body upon making a Parallel between this Ancient Biſhop of *Antioch* and the preſent Archbiſhop of *Paris*: And if the Reports that are ſpread againſt this Archbiſhop are true, the Compariſon was too juſt to be overlooked; and it is ſaid at *Paris*, That this Sentence, thus faultily printed in the ſecond Edition, did M. *Du Pin* a great deal of Miſchief.

A Cenſure thus carried on, will be ſo little to our Author's Diſadvantage, that few Perſons will think the worſe of this Book upon that account; it is his Misfortune that he lives in a Country where he had no other way to ſave his Liberty, and perhaps his Life, but by yielding to the Storm: And, according to the Principles of his Religion, he was bound to ſubmit to his Dioceſan. But this will leſſen the Authority of any Books that M. *du Pin* may hereafter print upon Eccleſiaſtical Matters, becauſe Fear of giving Offence will make him extreamly cautious, and he will dread a ſevere Inquiſition that may ſet upon every thing which he ſhall write.

Thoſe who are unacquainted with Antiquity will be hereby further confirmed in their Opinion, of the Impartiality of our Author, in his Abridgment of the Writings of theſe Ancient Doctors of the Church, when they ſee how ſeverely he has been dealt withal upon that account: Otherwiſe it is very probable that ſome might think him too favourable in his Accounts of Monkery, Invocation of Saints and ſome other Superſtitions which aroſe very early, and which were a means of introducing, in a courſe of Ages, ſuch enormous Abuſes into the Church; but tho' ſome Errors have a more ancient Original than is commonly believed, yet that ought not to be wondred at by any Man, who believes that the Church was never Infallible ſince the Apoſtle's Days. Still, as we read downwards, we ſhall ſee how that Primitive Simplicity, which adorn'd the Profeſſion of the firſt Chriſtians, who were almoſt always under Fear of Perſecution, leſſened and wore away. Thoſe who were ſenſible of the decay of the Primitive Zeal, ſought to retrieve it by placing great Merit in the practice of monaſtical Auſterities, whereby they hoped to obtain that Reward which was believ'd to be peculiarly reſerved for thoſe who laid down their Lives for the Name of Chriſt: This put them upon all thoſe Opinions that tended to mortify, not only forbidden Luſts, but alſo the allowed Appetites of Human Nature, which the Chriſtian Religion intended to regulate, and not to remove. And when thoſe who could not be Martyrs, ſaw what Honours were paid to thoſe who had formerly ſuffered for the Truth, it raiſed

raiſed in them an Emulation to do ſomething for the ſake of Jeſus Chriſt, that ſhould be more diſagreeable to Fleſh and Blood than Death itſelf. This, I believe, is the moſt probable Reaſon of that great Ardour wherewith ſo very many Perſons bound themſelves under Vows to embrace a Monaſtical Life, in the fourth and fifth Ages of the Church. The firſt Monks were ſome *Ægyptians*, who in the tenth Perſecution fled into the Deſerts of *Thebais*; there they accuſtomed themſelves to Retirement, and Uſe taught them to reliſh the Satisfactions of a Contemplative ſtate: When the Storm was over, they returned home, and eaſily perſwaded others, who had then, as they thought, no other way of ſhewing their Zeal for Jeſus Chriſt, to embrace this auſtere Courſe of Life. In ſuch warm Climates this was not ſo extraordinarily difficult: Thoſe Eaſtern People could live upon a very little, better than other Men; ſo that the terrible Mortifications, mentioned in the oldeſt Aſcetical Books, were not ſo impracticable, as we, at this Diſtance of Place and Time may be apt to think them. The Monk in *Sulpicius Severus*, who heard *Poſthumianus* give an account of the Abſtinences of the Eaſtern Monks, cries out, *Edacitas in Græcis Gula eſt, in Gallis natura. Exceſſive Eating is Luxury in a* Greek, *it is Nature in a* Gaule: And though one can hardly believe all that *Poſthumianus* there relates, of the Abſtinence of the Monks of *Nitria* and *Cyrene*, yet it is moſt certain that they put a mighty Force upon Nature, ſuch a one as nothing but the modern Practices of ſome of the *Mahometan* Derviſes could make us believe to be poſſible.

But though the Honours paid to Martyrs, which gave Riſe to an Opinion, That they could intercede for us in Heaven, or at leaſt hear our Prayers, together with the Love which moſt Men then ſhewed for a ſingle and a retired Life, may ſeem too exceſſive, yet the Opinions and Practices of theſe Ages were, generally ſpeaking, very venerable. One ſees a great and a ſerious concern for the Truths of the Goſpel in almoſt all their Writings; one ſees a ſincere Reſpect paid by Men of all Parties, to the Cenſures of the Church, and to the Perſons of thoſe with whom they were entruſted. They always diſtinguiſhed between the Faults of Men and their Character and Employment, and when they puniſhed the one, they took care not to caſt a Diſreſpect upon the other; by which means they preſerved a real Veneration for Holy Things in their Minds, though their Diviſions run as high, and were as eagerly managed as ever they have been ſince. This is not the only Age wherein Men have met with Temptations, and have ſhewn their Frailty, by being too weak to withſtand them; ſo that an Acquaintance with the Opinions and Practices of theſe earlier Ages, before a general Corruption had infected the Church, will be of great Uſe to ſuch as value Religion and Godlineſs for their own ſakes, when it ſuggeſts ſuch Thoughts as can only be effectual to reſtore that Senſe of Piety and Charity which is ſo generally loſt amongus.

July 25.
1693.

W. W.

ERRATA.

PAge 96. line 10. from bottom. read 140*th*, *ibid.* l. *ult.* r. *that Hoſhaana*, p 97. l. 22. r. *againſt Jovinian*, p. 99. l. 3. r. *altered in it*, p. 100. l. 15. from bot. for *ſpeaking*. r. *when he ſpeaks*, p. 112. l. 12. r. *publiſhed five*, ibid. l. 25. for *Sons of Men*. r. *Sons of God*, p. 192. l. 6. from bot. del. *being*, p. 204 l. ult. for *yea*. r. *yet*. p. 206. l. 5. r. *working by Love*, ibid. l. 18. from bot. for *ſuſpicious*. r. *ſuſpected*, l. ult. r. *Opinator*, p. 208. l. 28. r. *Zozimus's*, l. 29. r. *for their making default*, p. 215. l. 16. r. *he maintains*, p. 217. l. 2. r. *This Practice is forbidden in very ſtrong Terms, and upon*, p. 222. l. 20. for *retrait*. r. *re-examine*, p. 226. l. 16. for *Parents*. r. *Relations*.

Proper Names miſtaken.

Ruſinus for *Ruffinus*, *Zoſimus* for *Zozimus*, *Province of Byzacena* for *Provincia Byzacena*. paſſim. S. *Maura* (p. 106.) for S. *Maurus*. *Lodevæ* (p. 210.) for *Lodeve*.

CONTENTS of the *Third Volume.*

Of the Lives *and* Writings *of the* Eccleſiaſtical Authors *that Flouriſhed in the Beginning of the* Fifth Century, *viz.*

Evagrius Ponticus 1
Mark *the Hermit* 2
Simplicianus *Biſhop of* Milan 3
Vigilius *Biſhop of* Trent 3
Prudentius 4
Diadochus *Biſhop of* Photice 5
Audentius 5
Severus Endelechius 5
Flavianus, *Presbyter of* Antioch 6
St. John Chryſoſtom 6
Antiochus *and* Severianus 52
Aſterius *of* Amaſea 53
Pope Anaſtaſius I. 58
Chromacius *Biſhop of* Aquileia 58
Gaudentius *Biſhop of* Breſcia 59
John *Biſhop of* Jeruſalem 61
Theophilus *Biſhop of* Alexandria 62
Theodorus *Biſh. of* Mopſueſtia 64
Palladius 66
Pope Innocent I. 67
St. Jerom 73
Rufinus Toranius 107
Sophronius 111
Sulpicius Severus *Ibid.*
St. Paulinus 113
Pelagius *the Monk* 119
Cœleſtius, *Diſciple of* Pelagius 120
Niceas 120
Olympius 120
Bachiarius 121
Sabbatius 121
Iſaac 121
Paulus Oroſius 122
Lucian, Avitus, Evodius *and* Severus 122
Marcellus Memorialis 123
Euſebius 123
Urſinus, *Monk* 123
Macarius, *Monk* 123
Heliodorus, *Presbyter of* Antioch 123
Paul 123
Helvidius *and* Vigilantius, *Hereticks* 124
St. Auguſtin 125
The firſt Vol. of his Works 126
The ſecond Volume 135
The third Volume 169
The fourth Volume 175
The fifth Volume 175
The ſixth Volume 176
The ſeventh Volume 187
The eighth Volume 191
The ninth Volume 195
The tenth Volume 200
Pope Zoſimus 207
Pope Boniface I. 210
Syneſius *Biſhop of* Ptolemais 211
Polychronius. 215

The COUNCILS *held between the Beginning of the* Fifth Century, *and the Year* 430.

Canons of a Roman *Synod believed to be held under Pope* Innocent I. 216
Council of Milevis. 217
Councils held by S. Chryſoſtom *at* Conſtantinople, *and at* Epheſus *in* 400, *and* 401. 217
Council ad Quercum, *in the Suburbs of* Chalcedon, *in* 403. Ibid.
Council of Carthage *in the Year* 403. 218
Council of Carthage, *in the Year* 404. 218
Council of Carthage, *in the Year* 405. 218
Council of Carthage, *in the Year* 407. 218
Two Councils of Carthage, *in the Year* 408. 219
Council of Carthage, *in the Year* 409. 219
Council of Carthage, *in the Year* 410. Ibid.
Council of Ptolemais, *in the Year* 411. 220
Conference of Carthage, *in the Year* 411. Ibid.
Council of Cirta, *or* Zerta, *in the Year* 412. 221
Firſt Council of Carthage, *againſt* Cœleſtius, *in the Year* 412. Ibid.
Conference of Jeruſalem, *in the Year* 415. Ibid
Council of Dioſpolis, *in the Year* 418. Ibid
Second Council of Carthage, *againſt* Cœleſtius *and* Pelagius. *Council of* Milevis *againſt the ſame, in the Year* 416. 222
Council of Carthage, *held about the End of the Year* 417. Ibid.
Council of Carthage, *in the Year* 418. Ibid.
Council of Tella *or* Zella, *and ſome other Councils in* Africa, *in the Year* 418. 224
Councils of Carthage, *concerning the Cauſe of* Apiarius, 418, *and* 419. Ibid.
Council of Ravenna. 227
Council of Carthage, *in the Year* 420. 228
Council of Conſtantinople, *in the Year* 426. *ibid*
Council of Carthage, *againſt* Leporius. *ibid*
Council of Conſtantinople, *in the Year* 428. *ibid*

An

An Alphabetical Table *of the* Names *of the* Authors *mentioned in this Volume.*

Anaſtaſius 58
Antiochus 52
Aſterius 53
Audentius 5
S. Auguſtin 125
Avitus 122
Bachiarius 121
Boniface 210
Cœleſtius 120
Chromacius 58
S. John Chryſoſtom 6
Diadochus 5
Endelechius Severus 5
Evagrius 1
Evodius 122
Euſebius 123
Flavianus 6
Gaudentius 59
Heliodorus 123
Helvidius 124
S. John *of* Jeruſalem 61
S Jerom 73
Innocent I. 67
Iſaac 121
Lucian 122
Mark 2
Marcellus Memorialis 123
Macarius 123
Niceas 120
Olympius 120
Oroſius 122
Palladius 66
Prudentius 4
Paulus 123
Paulinus 113
Pelagius 119
Polychronius 215
Rufinus 107
Sabbatius 121
Severianus 52
Simplicianus 3
Severus 122
Sophronius 111
Sulpicius Severus *Ibid.*
Syneſius 211
Theodorus 64
Theophilus 62
Vigilantius 124
Vigilius 3
Urſinus 123
Zoſimus 207

An Alphabetical Table *of the* Councils *held, from the Year* 400, *to the Year* 430.

Councils of Conſtantinople, *in the Year* 400, *and* 401. 217
Council of Carthage, *in* 403. 218
At Carthage, *in* 404. Ibid.
The ſame, in 405. Ibid.
The ſame, in 407. Ibid.
The ſame, in 408. 219
The ſame, in 409. Ibid.
The ſame, in 410. Ibid.
Conference of Carthage, *in* 411. 220
Council of Carthage *againſt* Cœleſtius, *in* 412. 221
Second Council againſt the ſame, in 416. 222
Council of Carthage, *in* 417. Ibid.
Council of Carthage, *in* 418. Ibid.
Councils of Carthage, *in* 418, *and* 419, *concerning the Cauſe of* Apiarius 224
Council of Carthage, *in* 420. 282
Council in the Suburbs of Chalcedon *againſt* S. Chryſoſtom, *in* 403. 217
Council of Conſtantinople, *in* 426. 228
Council of Carthage, *in* 427. *ibid*
Council of Conſtantinople, *in* 426.
Council of Carthage, *in* 427.
Council of Conſtantinople, *in* 428. 228
Council of Dioſpolis, *in* 418. 221
Council of Epheſus, *in* 400, *and* 401.
Conference of Jeruſalem, *in* 415. 221
Council of Milevis, *in* 402. 217
The ſame againſt Cœleſtius *and* Pelagius, *in* 416 222
Council of Ptolemais, *in* 411. 220
Roman *Synod under* Innocent I. *in* 430. 216
Council of Ravenna, *in* 419.
Council of Zirta, *in* 412. 221
Council of Zella, *in* 418. 224

BIBLIOTHECA PATRUM:

OR, A

NEW HISTORY

OF

Eccleſiaſtical Writers.

TOME III. PART I.

CONTAINING

An Account of the LIVES and WRITINGS of the *Primitive FATHERS*, that Flouriſhed in the Beginning of the *Fifth Century* of *Chriſtianity*, with *Cenſures* upon all their *BOOKS*, determining which are *Genuine*, and which *Spurious*.

EVAGRIUS PONTICUS.

Evagrius Ponticus.

Evagrius Ponticus, a Diſciple of the *Macarii* (not *Evagrius* of *Antioch*, mentioned in the Second Volume, nor *Evagrius Scholaſticus*) was ordained Deacon of *Conſtantinople* by S. *Gregory Nazianzen*. He Sided with the Defenders of *Origen*, and left *Conſtantinople*; but returned thither in the Year 379, to meet *Melanius*, and there took upon him the Habit of a Monk. From thence he retired into the Solitudes of *Nitria*, where he ſpent the reſt of his Life untill about the Year 406. *Socrates* affirms that he wrote very uſefull Books: "One, ſaith he, is intituled, *The Monk*, or, Of an Active Life; the Other, *The Gnoſtick*; *i. e.* Of a Contemplative Life, or for Enlightned Men. This Book is divided into Fifty "Chapters. The Third is intituled *Antirrheticus*, which is a Collection of Paſſages out of Scripture againſt the Temptations of the Devil; divided into eight Parts, according to eight Sorts "of Thoughts. He wrote, beſides Six hundred *Gnoſtick* Problems, Two Books of Sentences: "Whereof one is Addreſſed to the *Cœnobites*, and the other to a Virgin. Whoſoever reads thoſe "Books, will eaſily ſee their Worth, and find them to be worthy of admiration. *Palladius*, *Evagrius*'s Diſciple, in the 86*th*. Chapter of his *Monaſtick Hiſtory*, ſpeaks much in his Commendation, and obſerves that his Writings were either Books of Piety, or Monaſtical, or Polemical Books; and this agrees with what *Socrates* ſaid before. S. *Jerom* in his Second Book againſt *Pelagius*, ſays, That he wrote to Virgins, to Monks, and to *Melanius*, and that he compoſed a Treatiſe of *Apathy*, i.e. *Of freedom from Paſſion*; and that the Books of this Author were known in the Weſt as well as in the Eaſt, becauſe ſome of them had been Tranſlated by *Ruffinus* his Diſciple. *Gennadius* mentions this Author in his Catalogue of *Eccleſiaſtical Writers*; and ſays, That he had Tranſlated into Latin *Evagrius*'s Treatiſe againſt the Eight principal Temptations, One hundred Sentences for the *Anchorets*, Fifty for learned Men, and ſome other Sentences that were ſomething obſcure: He ſpeaks alſo of certain Rules dedicated to the Monks and Nuns. There is a Book commonly aſcribed to this Author, entituled, *The Lives of the Fathers*; and ſome have believed that *Gennadius* ſaid ſo: but they miſunderſtood him; for he doth not ſay that *Evagrius* was the Author of thoſe Lives, but that the Book intituled, *The Lives of the Fathers*, did make mention of *Evagrius* as a learned and pious Man: and accordingly we find in the 27*th*. Chapter of the Second Book of thoſe Lives, that *Evagrius* is mentioned, and his Learning and Piety are commended; whereas it is not likely that *Evagrius* would have commended himſelf.

Evagrius Ponticus.

We have ſome Fragments of this Author's Works, and ſeveral of his Sentences in the Code of *the Monaſtick Rules*, in *the Lives and Apophthegms of the Fathers*, in *the Aſcetick Treaſure*, publiſhed by *Pouſſin*, and particularly amongſt the Works of S. *Nilus*, where there are ſeveral of *Evagrius*'s Writings; whether S. *Nilus* quoted them, or whether it happened by the Additions of Tranſcribers, is uncertain. *Socrates*, Chap. 7. of the Third Book of his Hiſtory, cites a paſſage of *Evagrius*, taken out of his *Gnoſtical Treatiſe*, where it is ſaid, That it is impoſſible to define the Divinity, and to expound the Trinity. The ſame Author afterwards cites two paſſages of *Evagrius* in the 23d. Chapter of the 4th. Book of his Hiſtory; whereof one is taken out of the Gnoſtical Book, and the other out of the Practical Book. *Maximus*, S. *John Damaſcene* and *Antony*, quote many Sentences of this Author, which are found amongſt the Works of S. *Nilus*.

Cotelerius in the Third Volume of his *Monuments of the Greek Church*, Page 68, &c. hath given us part both of the Gnoſtical and of the Practical Books of *Evagrius*, which he took out of two Greek Manuſcripts, and out of Authors who quoted thoſe Diſcourſes. They begin with a Letter to *Anatolius*, which is as a Preface to the whole Work of the two Books: This Preface is followed by 71 Chapters or Sentences drawn from the Gnoſtical Book, which are written without Order, and confounded one with another: There is more Order in the 100 Chapters drawn from the Practical Book. The following Treatiſe contains eleven Inſtructions for the Monks. And this is what *Cotelerius* could find of the Works of *Evagrius*.

His Antirrhetical Treatiſe, or of the Eight Evil Thoughts, is equally imperfect, as we have it: For that which *Bigotius* hath given in Greek, the Tranſlation whereof was found in S. *John Damaſcene*, and in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, before the Book of S. *Nilus* of the Eight Vices, is not the intire Treatiſe of *Evagrius*, but only an Epitome containing the Titles, and the Summ of thoſe Eight Chapters, as *Bigotius* judiciouſly obſerves, and may be proved by the Teſtimony of *Socrates*; who aſſures us, That that Book of *Evagrius* contained ſeveral paſſages of Scripture, whereas there is not one in this.

Some alſo aſcribe to *Evagrius* the Hiſtory of an Hermite called *Pacon*, related in *Palladius*, Chap. 29. and to be found amongſt the Works of S. *Nilus*, publiſhed by *Suarez* at *Rome*, who obſerves that this Treatiſe was aſcribed to *Evagrius* in his Manuſcript, as well as the following, which is a Dogmatical Letter concerning the Trinity; the Author whereof refutes the Errors both of the *Arians* and *Macedonians*. This Letter belongs to *Evagrius*, who writ it while he was at *Conſtantinople* with S. *Gregory Nazianzen*.

It is very probable alſo, that the Sentences or Maxims which are from Page 543, to 575, of the Writings attributed to S. *Nilus*, are written by *Evagrius*, as *Holſtenius* confeſſes, upon the Authority of Manuſcripts. The Greek Manuſcripts have quoted ſome of them under his Name, and they have great relation to thoſe which *Gennadius* ſpeaks of. To theſe muſt be added thoſe which we find under the Name of *Evagrius*, at the latter end of the Firſt Volume of the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, in Greek and Latin, of the Year 1624; and a ſmall Treatiſe of the Names of God, which is very obſcure, publiſhed by *Cotelerius* in the Second Volume *of his Monuments of the Greek Church*, p. 116.

MARK.

Mark.

MARK the Hermite, of whom we are to ſpeak in this place, lived about the end of the Fourth Century; *Palladius* and *Sozomen* ſpeak of him as of a very holy Man. He compoſed ſome Aſcetical Treatiſes, which have been attributed by *Bellarmine* and ſome others to one *Mark*, who lived under *Leo* the Emperour, in the Ninth Century: But *Photius* having made a very exact Extract of thoſe Treatiſes, it is impoſſible they ſhould be of a Man that lived ſince him; And therefore they muſt be aſcribed to that *Mark* who lived about the latter end of the Fourth Century. This is what he ſaith of it in the Two hundredth Volume. "I have read Eight "Books of *Mark* the Monk, whereof the Firſt is intituled, *Of the Spiritual Life*; it may be "profitable to thoſe who have undertaken to lead a Religious life, *i.e.* to be Monks as well as "the following; in which he ſhews, That they are deceived who think to be juſtified by their "Works; ſhewing, that this is a very dangerous Opinion. He adds to this Inſtruction whol-"ſome Precepts, that lead to a Spiritual life. The Third Book is of *Repentance*; his deſign here "is to ſhew, that this Vertue is of uſe at all times. This Book aims at the ſame end as the fore-"going, and the ſame uſe may be made of it. His Style is clear enough, becauſe he makes uſe "of common terms, and ſpeaks of things in general; but he wants the ſmoothneſs of Old *A-*"*thens*. If there be ſome darkneſs, it doth not proceed from the terms he uſeth, but from the "things he treateth of; which are of ſuch a nature, that it is eaſier to comprehend them by "practice than by diſcourſing. Wherefore you ſhall find the ſame obſcurity not only in the "Books now mentioned, but alſo in thoſe that follow, and in all the Books of thoſe that have "written of the Monaſtick life, and have diſcourſed of the Motions and Paſſions of the Soul, as "well as of the Actions which they produce; it being impoſſible to teach with Words thoſe things "that depend upon practice. The Fourth Book, by way of Queſtions and Anſwers, ſhews, "That by Baptiſm we have received not only the Pardon and Remiſſion of our Sins, but alſo

"the

" the Grace of the Holy Spirit; and many other Spiritual gifts. The Fifth is a kind of Con-
" ference of the Spirit with the Soul: whereby he proves, That we our selves are Authors of our
" Sins, and that we ought to accuse no body else upon that account. The Sixth is in the form
" of a Dialogue between *Mark* and an Advocate, who discourse of these following Subjects:
" That none is to seek revenge for an injury received, because the wrong we suffer is to be looked
" upon as a punishment for our Sins; he adds, that it is difficult to please Men, and that Prayer
" is to be preferred before any other labour. He concludes, by explaining wherein the Desires of
" the Flesh consist. He treats of Fasting in the Seventh Book, that is not written by way of
" Dialogue. The Eighth is directed to a Monk called *Nicolas*, treating of the ways of appea-
" sing of Anger, and of quenching of Lust. There is also a Ninth Book against the *Melchisede-*
" *chians*, wherein he spareth not his own Father who had been tainted with that Heresie. Those
that would read usefull Books, will not lose their time in reading of this. The Order of these Books is not the same in all Copies; In some those are found last which we have named first. This Observation of *Photius* is verified by the Latin Edition of these Eight Books, which were published by *Johannes Picus*, President of the Inquests in the Parliament of *Paris*, and inserted into the *Bibliotheca Patrum*. The Four first are there in *Photius*'s order; but the Fifth in his order is the last there; the Sixth is the last but one; and the Book concerning Fasting is immediately after that dedicated to *Nicolas* the Monk. That against the *Melchisedechians* is lost. This Author attributeth much to the Faith and Grace of Jesus Christ, and very little to the good Works and free Actions of Men, differing therein from most of the Ascetical Writers. He likewise ascribeth much to the vertue and efficacy of Baptism; and pretends, that it delivers us not only from Death, but also from Lust; and puts us in a condition of doing either good or evil: So that they who have received Baptism are as free either to good or evil as the first Man was. His Opinion is, That a perfect Christian is free from Temptations and from Passions; and maintains, that many of the Gospel-admonitions have the nature of Precepts; An ordinary excess of spiritual Men. In short, it cannot be denied that among many true Maxims, there may be some stretched, and contrary to Truth and right Reason: which is but too common in the most part of Books of a Spiritual Life, both Ancient and Modern. The Original Greek of these Homilies is not only among the MSS. of the King's Library, and in some others, as *Oudin* hath observed; but also in the First Volume of the Greek and Latin *Bibliotheca Patrum*, Printed at *Paris* 1624.

Mark.

I say nothing of another *Mark*, a Deacon of *Gaza* in *Palestine*, who is reckoned to be the Author of the Acts of S. *Porphyrius* of *Gaza*, related by *Metaphrastes* and by *Surius*; because I resolved not to ingage in writing any Account of the Acts of the Martyrs, being unwilling to lanch into a Sea where it is difficult to avoid being often Shipwrackt.

SIMPLICIANUS, *Bishop of* Milan.

SIMPLICIANUS, Bishop of *Milan*, Successor to S. *Ambrose*, exhorted S. *Austin* by his Letters to exercise his Parts, and apply himself to expound the Holy Scripture: So that he may be said to have been to S. *Austin*, what *Ambrose* was to *Origen*. We have several Expositions of hard places of Scripture which S. *Austin* dedicated to him. He also wrote a Letter, wherein he asked Questions, as if he had been to learn, and yet instructed by his questioning. This is what *Gennadius* observes of this Author. S. *Ambrose* writ several Letters to him; and we have two Letters of S. *Austin*, wherein he answered several Questions of *Simplicianus*, concerning some obscure Passages of the Holy Scripture. This Bishop held the See of *Milan* but a little while, for he died towards the latter end of the Year 400, or in the beginning of the Year 401.

Simplicianus, Bishop of *Milan*.

VIGILIUS *of* Trent.

THere were several of this Name *(a)*. He that we speak of is the Bishop of *Trent (b)*, who suffered Martyrdom under the Consulship of *Stilichon*, in the Year 400 or 405 of Jesus Christ, to whom S. *Ambrose* wrote a Letter, which is the 24th amongst his Letters. *Gennadius* affirmeth,

Vigilius of *Trent*.

(*a*) *There were several of this Name.*] This is the ancientest. There was another of *Africa*, who writ upon the *Revelations*, mention'd by *Cassiodorus* in the 9th. Chap. of his Institutions. *Gennadius*, Chap. 51. speaketh of a Deacon called *Vigilius*, who wrote a Rule for the Monks. *Vigilius*, Bishop of *Tapsus* in *Africa*, famous for his Writings against *Nestorius* and *Eutyches*, is a different Person from all these. There was one *Vigilius*, the Seventh Bishop of *Brescia* after *Philastrius*. One *Vigilius* a Bishop subscribed in the Council of *Agatha* or *Agde*. But these Names cannot be taken one for the other, without mistaking the Chronology and History.

(*b*) *Bishop of* Trent.] It is certain that *Vigilius*, Bishop of *Trent*, lived at the latter end of the 4th. Century, because the 24th Letter of S. *Ambrose* is directed to him. *Usuardus* saith, that he suffered Martyrdom under the Consulate of *Stilichon*, who was Consul in 400 and 405. There is more probability that it was in 400, because in that very Year *Sisinnius* suffered Martyrdom.

Vigilius of Trent.

firmeth, that this *Vigilius*, Biſhop of *Trent*, wrote a Letter or ſmall Book in commendation of Martyrs, dedicated to *Simplicianus*; which contained the Acts of thoſe who ſuffered Martyrdom in his time by the Cruelty of the *Barbarians*. *Surius* mentions this Letter, *May* 23. And it is believed that that *Simplicianus*, to whom it is dedicated, is the Succeſſor of S. *Ambroſe* in the Church of *Milan* (*c*). There he gives an Account of the Martyrdom of *Siſinnius* and his Companions.

(*c*) *'Tis believ'd that that* Simplicianus *to whom it is dedicated, is the Succeſſor to S.* Ambroſe *in the Church of* Milan.] This Conjecture of *Miræus* is indeed probable; this Letter is directed to one *Simplicianus* a Biſhop. He of *Milan* lived at that time; and *Paulinus* obſerves in the Life of S. *Ambroſe*, that the Reliques of *Siſinnius* were ſent to *Milan*. It is true that *Gennadius* having ſpoken of *Simplicianus* as of an Author and Biſhop known to him; and then, ſpeaking of *Vigilius* his Letter, he doth not ſay that it was directed to him, but only, *ad quemdam Simplicianum*, to one *Simplician*; which makes it doubtfull, Whether it was to the Biſhop of *Milan* that this Letter was directed. But perhaps *Gennadius* did not think upon it. However, *Vigilius*, Biſhop of *Trent*, both lived and wrote at the ſame time that *Simplicianus* was Biſhop of *Milan*.

PRUDENTIUS.

Prudentius.

Quintus Aurelius Prudentius Clemens was born in *Saragoſſa*, a City of *Spain*, in the Year 348 (*a*); and being called to the Bar, was afterwards made a Judge in two conſiderable Towns, and then promoted by *Honorius* the Emperor to a very honourable Office. But at the Age of 57 Years, he reſolved to mind the things of his Salvation, and to ſpend the reſt of his life in compoſing of Hymns to the praiſe of God, and the honour of the Saints; with ſome Poems againſt the Pagan Religion, and touching the Duties of Chriſtians. Theſe particulars of his Life are ſet forth by himſelf in a Preface to one of his Poems. The Catalogue of his Poetical Works, to the moſt whereof he gave Greek Titles, is as follows:

Pſychomachia, or *The Combat of the Soul.* There he deſcribes in Hexameter Verſe the Conflict of Vertue againſt Vice in the Soul of a Chriſtian; and particularly of Faith againſt Idolatry, of Chaſtity againſt Uncleanneſs, of Patience againſt Anger, of Humility againſt Pride, of Sobriety againſt Exceſs, of Liberality againſt Covetouſneſs, and of Concord againſt Diſſention.

Cathemerinon, or Poems *concerning each days Duty*; they contain ſeveral Odes or Songs about the moſt ordinary Exerciſes of Chriſtianity: As for example; Prayers and giving of Thanks at lying down and riſing up, before and after Meals, about Faſting, upon the Death of Kindred or Friends, of the Nativity of Chriſt, and upon the Epiphany.

After theſe Hymns come ſeveral others, entituled Περὶ στεφανῶν, or *of Crowns*, becauſe made in Commendation of Martyrs.

The following Poems regard ſeveral Points of the Chriſtian Religion, and are therefore entituled *Apotheoſis*, or Treatiſes upon the Divinity. In theſe he refuteth the Errors of the *Heathens*, of the *Jews*, *Sabellians*, *Arians*, and *Apollinarians*, and diſcourſes of the Nature of the Soul, of Original Sin, and of the Reſurrection.

Hamartigenia is a Treatiſe concerning the Original of Sin, againſt the Errors of *Marcion*.

The two Books againſt *Symmachus* oppoſe Idolatry. In the firſt is ſhewed the Original and Baſeneſs of falſe Deities; and there is an Account of the Converſion of the City of *Rome*. In the ſecond Petition which *Symmachus* preſented to the Emperors, to obtain the Re-eſtabliſhment of the Altar of Victory, and of the Service of the Gods, with the Ceremonies of the Pagan Religion, is anſwered.

The laſt of *Prudentius* his Works is an Abridgment of ſome Hiſtories of the Old and New Teſtament in Diſtichs. *Gennadius* ſpeaks of a Book written by *Prudentius*, called *Dittochæon*, i. e. *Double food*, wherein he had compriſed the Hiſtorical Part both of the Old and New Teſtament according to the Perſon's names. This Book is very like that we now ſpeak of, but only written in a looſer Style, and far from the beauty of his other Works. And whereas *Prudentius* calls the *Dittochæon* a conſiderable Book upon the Old and New Teſtament, this is a ſmall one

(*a*) *In the Year* 348.] He ſaith in the Preface to the *Cathemerinon*, that he was born under the Conſulſhip of *Salia*; for ſo we are to read and underſtand that place.

Oblitum veteris me Saliæ Conſulis arguens
Sub quo prima dies mihi.

Moſt Authors underſtood not the meaning of it; as, *Aldus*, *Sixtus Senenſis*, *Poſſevinus*, and even *Labbée*, who believed that he was Conſul in a City called *Meſſalia*, which is thought by *Labbée* to be *Marſeilles*; That's a miſtake: They took the Name of the Conſul *Salia*, who was Conſul with *Philippus* in the Year 348, for the Name of a Town; and ſo they aſcribed to *Prudentius* the Conſular Dignity that belonged to *Salia*, under whoſe Conſulſhip *Prudentius* came into the World. In the ſame place he ſays that he was 57 Years old when he began to write, which ſhews that it was in the Year 405.

upon

upon some places only; which makes me think that it is simply an Epitome of *Prudentius*'s whole Work (*b*). *Prudentius.*

However, *Gennadius* says, that *Prudentius* wrote a Commentary upon the *Hexameron* as far as to the Creation and Fall of the First Man: But that Book is lost.

Prudentius is no very good Poet, he often useth harsh Expressions not reconcilable to the Purity of *Augustus*'s Age.

Prudentius's Works were printed and published at *Rome*, by *Aldus Manutius*, in the Year 1501, in *Quarto*. This Edition was followed by those of *Germany*, and others which are conformable to them; where are added *Erasmus*'s Notes upon the Hymns upon *Christmas*, and the Epiphany, and those of *Sichardus* upon the *Psychomachia*. The Edition of *Antwerp* of 1540. in *Octavo*, contains the Annotations of *Antonius Nebrissensis* and *Sichardus*. That of 1564. was made after the Notes and Corrections of *Putmannus*, *Graffemburgius* and *Victor Giselinus*, who added his own Commentaries. Most of the late Editions, which are numerous, have been made after that. In 1613. *Prudentius* was printed at *Hanover* with *Weitzius*'s Notes; and in 1614. the two Books against *Symmachus* were printed at *Paris*, with the Commentaries of *Grangæus*: The last Edition of *Prudentius* was at *Amsterdam*, in 1667, in *Twelves*, with the Notes and Corrections of *Nicolaus Heinsius*.

(*b*) Prudentius *his whole Work.*] This Abridgement is ascribed by some to *Amœnus*; and *Georgius Fabricius* observeth, that it goes under his Name in a Manuscript belonging to one of *Strasburg*. It is also printed under the same Name in some Editions of the *Bibliotheca Patrum*. In all the Manuscripts, *Prudentius* is said to be the Author of it; and *Aldus* says, that he saw an Ancient one where the Title of it was *Dittochæon*, or *Dyrrochæon*: But it is not to be wonder'd at, if the Abridgement of *Prudentius*'s Works made by one *Amœnus*, should be taken for the very Work of *Prudentius*, and perhaps this is the Cause of its being lost.

DIADOCHUS.

IT is well known that *Diadochus* was Bishop of *Photice*, a City of *Epirus*, but the time wherein he lived is not known. *Bellarmine* and others that mention him, place him at the End of the Fourth Century, but without proof. However he is ancienter than *Maximus*, who quotes him in his Answers to *Thalassius*. *Photius* in the 201 Volume saith, That he had read a Book of that Bishop, which contained Ten Definitions and One Hundred Chapters, and observes that this Book is usefull for those who design to live a Spiritual Life. The Ten Definitions prefixed before the Hundred Chapters are not extant: These (as we learn by the Titles which *Photius* hath preserved of them) were properly Reflections upon the principal Perfections of a Spiritual Life. The hundred Chapters of the Spiritual Life were published by *Turrianus*; they contain several Maxims concerning a Religious and Spiritual Life; they are written with a plain Stile, as most Ascetical Treatises are. There are several false Thoughts, and such spiritual Notions, as will not be relished by every Body. *Diadochus.*

[*Spiritual* in the Ascetical Style is to be understood of those extraordinary Exercises and Mortifications, which the old Monks and Hermites obliged themselves to observe, over and above the ordinary Duties of the Christian Life, that every Christian was by his Profession, made at his Baptism, bound to practise.]

AUDENTIUS.

WHat *Gennadius* observeth of this Author, whom he mentions immediately after *Prudentius*, is this: "*Audentius* a Spanish Bishop wrote a Book against the *Manichees*, *Arians*, "and *Sabellians*, and chiefly against the *Photinians*, who are now called *Bonosiacks*; he intituled "this Book, *A Treatise of Faith against all Hereticks*. He there shews, that the Son of God "is co-eternal with the Father, and that he did not begin to be God when he made himself "Man, and that he was born of the Virgin *Mary*. *Audentius.*

SEVERUS ENDELECHIUS.

WE have a Bucolick, or Pastoral Poem, of one *Severus Endelechius*, about the End whereof there is a Discourse of the Efficacy of the Sign of the Cross, and of the Christian Religion, to the embracing of which *Tityrus* exhorts his Companion. This Author lived since *Constantine*, but the time is not known. His Poem is pretty well writ. It is likely he lived about the End of the Fourth, or the beginning of the Fifth Century. *Severus Endelechius.*

FLAVIANUS.

Flavianus.

FLAVIANUS Presbyter of *Antioch*, having governed that Church during the *Arian* Perſecutions, in the Abſence of *Meletius* his Biſhop, was after his Death, in the Year 380, choſen by the oriental Biſhops to fill that See, which was not to be looked upon as vacant, ſince *Paulinus*, Collegue to *Meletius*, was yet alive. This Ordination renewed the Schiſm of the Church of *Antioch*. The Weſtern Biſhops, who of a long time favoured *Paulinus*, could not endure that a Biſhop ſhould be ordained while he lived, againſt the Agreement made with *Meletius*, That the Surviver ſhould remain ſole Biſhop. They complained lowdly of that Injuſtice; but thoſe who ſided with *Meletius* being the Major part, would not ſuffer *Paulinus*, and ſo nothing was enacted againſt *Flavianus*. The Death of *Paulinus* in the Year 389, did not put an End to the Diviſion of the Church of *Antioch*; his Party acknowledged *Evagrius* for their Biſhop, whom *Paulinus* ordained before his Death, and accuſed *Flavianus* before *Theodoſius*. This Emperour commanded him to go to *Rome*, there to be judged: But *Flavianus* excuſed himſelf becauſe of the Winter, promiſing to execute the Emperour's Orders in the Spring following. But the Synod of *Capua* in the Year 390, remitted this Buſineſs to *Theophilus* and the Biſhops of *Egypt*. The Emperour commanded *Flavianus* to repair to *Alexandria*, which he refuſed to do, and anſwered the Emperour, That if they found fault with his Doctrine he was willing to be judged even by his Enemies; but if the Queſtion was about his Biſhoprick, he would not diſpute the matter but readily quit it. The Emperour admiring his Conſtancy, ſent him back to *Antioch*, and ſuffered him to live quietly: His reſolution provoked St. *Ambroſe*, and the Weſtern Biſhops: But *Theophilus* endeavoured to appeaſe that Quarrel by a milder way than a determinate Sentence: *Evagrius* being dead, no other Biſhop was ordained in his room, and there were but few Chriſtians at *Antioch*, who owned not *Flavianus* for their Biſhop. But he did not communicate with the Weſtern Biſhops before the Year 398, when S. *Chryſoſtom* undertook to make his Peace with *Anaſtaſius* Biſhop of *Rome*, and with the Weſtern Biſhops. And thus was *Flavianus* acknowledged by all as the lawfull Biſhop of *Antioch*, and ended his Days in peace, in the Year 404. S. *Chryſoſtom* often commends him in his Sermons. He deſcribes his Journey to the Emperour's Court, to get a Pardon for the People of *Antioch*; and tells the particulars of the Speech he made. *Theodoret* alſo ſpeaks much to his Advantage, and obſerveth, *l.* 4. of his Hiſtory, *c.* 25. that *Diodorus* and he maintain'd the Faith of the Church againſt the Aſſaults of the *Arians*. He adds, that *Flavianus* did not then preach, but furniſhed *Diodorus* with Notions and Arguments from Scripture to uſe in his Sermons; but when he was Biſhop of *Antioch* he preached himſelf. *Theodoret* in his Dialogues quotes ſome places of this Father's Homilies touching the Incarnation; he quotes a Homily upon S. *John* Baptiſt, upon the *Theophany*, and a Homily upon *Eaſter*: An Homily upon *Judas*'s Treachery, a Homily upon S. *Luke*, and another upon theſe words. *The Spirit of the Lord is upon me.* None of theſe Homilies, nor any other of the Works of this holy Biſhop are extant, unleſs perhaps ſome of his Sermons are among thoſe that are attributed to S. *Chryſoſtom*.

[*Photius* cod. 52. of his *Bibliotheca* ſpeaks of a Letter written by *Flavianus* to the Biſhops of *Oſrhoëne*, and of another to an *Armenian* Biſhop.]

S. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM.

S. John Chryſoſtom.

SAint *JOHN*, Sir-named *CHRYSOSTOM*, becauſe of his Eloquence (*a*), was of *Antioch*; his Father's Name was *SECUNDUS*, and his Mother's *ANTHU-*

(*a*) *Sir-named* Chryſoſtom, *&c.*] It is not known when he was firſt called by that Name, ſo juſtly given him: Some ſay he had it in his Life-time, but neither S. *Jerom*, nor S. *Auguſtin*, nor *Theodoret*, nor any other among the Ancients, give him that Name, but call him onely *John* of *Conſtantinople*. *Sozomen* obſerves, that *Antiochus* Biſhop of *Ptolemais*, had this Name given him, but does not ſay, that it was common to him with our Saint. Many Authors have written his Life, but very few have done it faithfully. *Palladius* alone may be credited in this Caſe. *Bigotius* publiſhed the Original Greek of this Author, and with him may be joined *Socrates*, *Sozomen* and *Theodoret*, who have in their Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtories, given an Account of ſeveral Circumſtances of the Life of St. *Chryſoſtom*. *Theodoret* made ſome Speeches in his Commendation, the Extracts whereof are preſerved by *Photius*, in the 273 Volume. Little regard is to be had to the other Writers of his Life: for they have filled their Relations with Fables. The firſt of them is *George*, who is thought to have been Biſhop of *Alexandria*. Some think that part of his Relation was taken out of S. *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, but that is not probable. This Author lived about the Year of Chriſt 600. After him *Leo* the Emperour, *Simeon Metaphraſtes*, an Anonymus Author, S. *John Damaſcene*, *Coſmas Veſtitor*, *John Euchaïta*, the Patriarch *Philotheus*, and *Matthæus Camariota*, have written Lives and Panegyricks of our Saint; but very ill, and ſtuffed with many Fables.

S A (*b*). He loſt his Father when he was young (*c*), and his Mother took care to breed him up like a Chriſtian. He learned Rhetorick under *Libanius*, and Philoſophy under *Andragathius*, both very famous in their profeſſion. He firſt deſigned to follow the Law (*d*), but ſoon altered his Mind, and became a Church-man. He left *Libanius* his School to ſtudy the Scriptures, and had for his Tutors *Diodorus* and *Carterius* Superiors of the Monks, that were in the Suburbs of *Antioch*. He was afterwards baptized by *Meletius*, and choſen by this Biſhop to be Reader. He was ſo highly eſteemed, that he was mark'd out by an Aſſembly of Prelates to be made Biſhop, as well as *Baſil* his Friend (*e*). But knowing the Day when they were to ordain him, he hid himſelf, avoiding that Dignity with as much Care, as others ſought for it with earneſtneſs. About the Year 374, he retired to a Mountain near *Antioch*, where he lived with only one old Monk the Space of four Years; then he choſe to dwell in a Cave for two Years, after an auſtere manner. The ſeverity of a ſolitary Life, and continual Labour did much impair S. *Chryſoſtom*'s health, which obliged him to return to *Antioch*, about the Year 380. There the great *Meletius* ordained him a Deacon, and ſoon after he went to the Council of *Conſtantinople*, where he died. After his Death S. *Chryſoſtom* ſided with *Flavianus*, who made him Prieſt, and having received that Order he gave himſelf wholly to preaching, and therein got ſuch reputation, that after the Death of *Nectarius* Archbiſhop of *Conſtantinople*, he was with general Conſent choſen to fill up that See. The Emperour was obliged to uſe all his Authority to make him leave *Antioch*, and at laſt he was forced to take him away ſecretly. *Theophilus* Biſhop of *Alexandria*, whom the Emperour had ſent for to ordain S. *Chryſoſtom*, had more inclination for one *Iſidorus* a Presbyter; wherefore he ſecretly oppoſed the Ordination of S. *Chryſoſtom*. But *Eutropius* and other Officers of the Court upheld S. *Chryſoſtom* ſo far, that *Eutropius* (to oblige *Theophilus* to ordain him) ſhewed him a Memorial containing ſeveral Heads of an Accuſation formed againſt him, and put it to his choice, whether he would ordain St. *Chryſoſtom*, or prepare himſelf for his Trial upon thoſe Accuſations. *Theophilus* choſe the former, and ordained S. *Chryſoſtom* the firſt Day of *March* 398. This was the beginning of that hatred which *Theophilus* bore to St. *Chryſoſtom*, and which proceeded further than can well be believed, as we ſhall ſee afterwards. S. *John Chryſoſtom*.

S. *Chryſoſtom* being entred upon the Government of the Church of *Conſtantinople*, began with endeavouring to reform the manners of the Clergy, and then fell to reproving the Vices of the Court; and this got him the ill-will of many, for he was of a ſevere Temper not agreeable to men of the World; and his way of living was ſingular and retired. They found fault, that he always eat by himſelf, and would never appear at thoſe Feaſts where he was invited, which they looked upon as proceeding from Scorn and Contempt of others, though it was only an Effect of his Conſtitution and Weakneſs of Stomach, or of his great Sobriety. He diſcharged the Duties of his Office with wonderfull Exactneſs and Care, knowing that the Revenue of the Church is the Patrimony of the Poor; he cut off the ſuperfluous Expences of his Predeceſſours, to increaſe the Allowances of Hoſpitals for the Sick. And the Hoſpital at *Conſtantinople* not being large enough, by reaſon of the great Number of Sick and Strangers, he cauſed ſeveral others to be built, and for each of them he appointed two Prieſts to take care of the Sick and Strangers.

(*b*) *His Mother*'s Anthuſa.] There was another *John*, Son of *Publia*, mentioned by *Theodoret* in his Hiſtory, *l.* 3. *c.* 19. for in the firſt place all Hiſtorians aſſure us, that S. *John Chryſoſtom*'s Mother was called *Anthuſa*; as *Palladius* in his Life, *c.* 5. *Socrates* in his Hiſtory, *l.* 6. *c.* 3. Secondly, *Publia* was an old Woman in the Time of *Julian* the Emperour, in the Year 362. according to *Theodoret*, and S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Mother, was alive in 404, as appeareth by his own Letters, the 238th, and 239th, and ſhe was but 40 Years of Age in the Year 368. In ſhort, *John* the Son of *Publia* was an only Child; whereas S. *Chryſoſtom* had a Siſter older than himſelf, to whom he writ his 238th Letter.

(*c*) *He loſt his Father when he was young.*] St. *Chryſoſtom* ſays it in his firſt Book of *Prieſthood*, c 1. Some have affirmed that his Parents were Pagans, but he ſays himſelf in the firſt Homily againſt the *Anomæans*, that he was bred and brought up in the Church; and it is clear by the place we have quoted out of his Book of the *Prieſthood*, that his Mother was a Chriſtian when his Father died, which was ſoon after he was born.

(*d*) *He firſt deſigned to follow the Law.*] Some ſay, that he was called to the Bar, but *Palladius*, *Socrates* and *Sozomen*, only ſay, that when he was fit for it he quitted it. There is a Letter of *Libanius* to one *John* to congratulate him for a publick Pleading, wherein he had ſpoken much to the Praiſe of the Emperour and of his Children. But this *John* is not our S. *John Chryſoſtom*, who was then a Prieſt: For this was the Emperour *Theodoſius*, who left the Empire to his Sons about the Year 393. S. *Chryſoſtom* indeed confeſſeth in his firſt Book of the *Prieſthood*, that he did follow the Bar, but does not mention his Pleading. Such was his Eloquence, that *Libanius* at his Death ſaid, that he alone was worthy to ſucceed him, if the Chriſtians had not ſnatched him away.

(*e*) Baſil *his Friend.*] It is not certainly known who this *Baſil* was, nor Biſhop of what place; but it is certain, that he was not the great S. *Baſil*, Biſhop of *Cæſarea* in *Cappadocia*. *Socrates* and *Sozomen*, have improperly confounded them; for *Baſil Chryſoſtom*'s Friend was of his own Age, and inſtructed by the ſame Maſters, as appeareth by the beginning of S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Book of the *Prieſthood*; whereas S. *Baſil* was much older, and was Biſhop of the Church of *Cæſarea*, before St. *Chryſoſtom* was 25 Years old: *Photius* tells us, that *Baſil* S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Friend, was *Baſil* of *Seleucia*. This is yet a groſſer miſtake, becauſe this latter was not ordained Biſhop before the Year 431, and he lived till 458. *Baſil* S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Companion, was rather Biſhop of *Raphanea*, or another of the ſame Name Biſhop of *Biblos*, whoſe Names are found in the Subſcriptions of the Council of *Conſtantinople*.

gers.

S. *John Chryſoſtom.*

gers. He particularly provided for Virgins and Widows. He conſtantly preached to the People, exhorting them not to neglect the publick Service. And he is ſaid, firſt to have inſtituted ſolemn Proceſſions in *Conſtantinople*.

But his Paſtoral care was not reſtrained to his particular Church, but extended it ſelf alſo to the Churches of *Thracia*, *Pontus*, and *Aſia*. He pulled down ſome Temples of falſe Deities that were ſtill in *Phœnicia*. To the *Goths* that were infected with *Arianiſm*, he ſent Prieſts, Deacons and Readers that ſpake their Language, thereby to endeavour the Converſion of that People from their Error: He alſo ſent Miſſionaries to the *Scythians* that inhabited along the *Danube*. He wrote to the Biſhop of *Tyre* againſt the *Marcionites* of thoſe parts, offering him the Emperor's help: But he never did the Church a more ſignal Service, than when he re-united the Eaſt and Weſt, by reconciling *Flavianus* with the Weſtern and Egyptian Biſhops.

He aſſembled at *Conſtantinople* a Synod of Two and twenty Biſhops about *September* in the Year 400. *Euſebius*, Biſhop of *Valentinople* in *Aſia*, came to it, and preſented to the Council a Petition containing Seven Articles againſt *Antoninus* Biſhop of *Epheſus*, the Metropolitan of *Aſia*. He was accuſed, *Firſt*, Of Melting the holy Veſſels, and converting them into Money, which he beſtowed upon his Son. 2*dly*. That he had taken a Marble Stone from the entrance of the Baptiſtery, to uſe in his own Bath. 3*dly*. That the Pillars which remained after the Building of the Church were uſed to ſupport the Roof of his own Hall. 4*thly*. That he kept a Servant who was guilty of Man-ſlaughter. 5*thly*. That he had ſold the Lands, which were left to the Church by *Baſilina*, Mother to *Julian* the Emperor, as if they had belonged to his own Eſtate. 6*thly*. That he had again taken his Wife, whom he had put away, and had two Children by her. 7*thly*. That a Cuſtom was introduced by him, ſo as to become almoſt a Law, to take Money for the Ordination of Biſhops, proportionably to the value of their Biſhopricks. *Antoninus* appear'd at the Council that was called by S. *Chryſoſtom*, where theſe Accuſations were brought againſt him by *Euſebius*. They inſiſted particularly upon the laſt, as being the moſt important. *Antoninus* denied all; and could not be convicted, becauſe there were no Witneſſes; Wherefore the Council deputed three Biſhops to go into *Aſia*, and hear the Witneſſes that were to be produced by the Accuſer. One of theſe three Biſhops being *Antoninus* his friend, feigned himſelf ſick, that he might not inform againſt his friend. The two others went to *Hypæpæ*, a City in *Aſia*, where they waited to no purpoſe for Witneſſes, becauſe the Accuſer was agreed with the accuſed, either through fear of his Power, or becauſe he had no ſufficient Proofs. The Deputies, weary of waiting, went away, having written a Letter, in which they Excommunicated *Euſebius* as an Impoſtor for making default. Sometime after *Antoninus* died, and his Death cauſed new Troubles in the Churches of *Aſia*. In this juncture of time the Clergy of *Epheſus* and the Biſhops of that Province made application to S. *Chryſoſtom*, and prayed him to come into their Countrey, to eſtabliſh ſome Order in the Church of *Epheſus*. He came thither in the end of Winter, of the Year 401, and aſſembled a Synod of Seventy Biſhops, wherein Six Biſhops were depoſed, who were convicted of giving *Antoninus* Money for their Ordination. The Heirs of that Biſhop were enjoyned to return them the Money he had received: and they Ordained *Heraclides* a Deacon, Biſhop of *Epheſus*. What concerned the Church of *Epheſus* being thus regulated, S. *Chryſoſtom* returned through *Nicomedia*, where he turned out *Gerontius*, who was formerly S. *Ambroſe*'s Deacon, but went to the Eaſt and was ordained Biſhop of *Nicomedia*: He ſettled in his room *Panſophius*; and going on in his Journey, in every place, he took from the *Novatians* and *Quartodecimani* the Churches which they were in poſſeſſion of.

While S. *Chryſoſtom* was doing theſe things in *Aſia*, *Severinus*, Biſhop of *Gabala*, a famous Preacher, (to whom, at his going away, he had committed the care of his Church) did all he could to get the applauſe both of the Nobility and People. This begot ſome jealouſie in S. *Chryſoſtom*, who expelled him out of *Conſtantinople* after he returned; and this he did by the Sollicitation of a Deacon of his, named *Serapion*. But the Empreſs cauſed him to come again, having reconciled them, though with much difficulty.

This Reconciliation was followed by another quarrel with *Theophilus* Biſhop of *Alexandria*, an old enemy to S. *Chryſoſtom*. The Hiſtorians repreſent that Biſhop as an ambitious Man, paſſionate, fierce, covetous, and cunning; who would never yield, but compaſs every thing he undertook; who eaſily provoked Men to be his Enemies, and ſooner or later would undoe them: He was no friend to S. *Chryſoſtom*, becauſe he was obliged to ordain him againſt his will: but the hatred he bore to him broke out upon the account of three Egyptian Monks, *Dioſcorus*, *Ammonius*, and *Euthymius*, Sir-named the *Long-brethren*. *Theophilus* was very angry with them, becauſe they reproved his Conduct, and received *Iſidore* that was become his enemy: He condemned them in a Synod of *Alexandria*, aſſembled in 399, becauſe they would not ſubſcribe the Condemnation of *Origen*. After this Condemnation he went himſelf with Souldiers to drive them away, with all the Monks that lived under their Rule. Theſe poor Monks not knowing whither to go, becauſe *Theophilus* perſecuted them every-where, came to *Conſtantinople*, and repreſented to S. *John*, the Violences of their Biſhop, beſeeching him to have compaſſion on them. S. *Chryſoſtom* gave them leave to ſay their Prayers in a Church he aſſigned for them, but did not admit them to the Communion of the Euchariſt. He only writ to *Theophilus* to re-eſtabliſh them. On the contrary, *Theophilus* ſent Men to *Conſtantinople*, who delivered to the Emperor a form of Accuſation againſt theſe Monks; who in their own defence, accuſed their Biſhop alſo. S. *John Chryſoſtom*

Chrysostom gave *Theophilus* notice of it, who answered him fiercely: *That he ought to have known, that by the Canons of the Council of* Nice, *a Bishop is forbidden to judge of Causes that are out of the limits of his own Jurisdiction: That he had no right to receive Accusations against him; and that if he must be judged, the Judgment belong'd to the Bishops of* Egypt, *and not to the Bishop of* Constantinople. S. *Chrysostom* having received this Letter, exhorted both the one and the other to Peace; but neither were disposed towards it. The Monks accused by *Theophilus*, and some of their Brethren, perswaded of their innocence, continually Petition'd the Emperor; who yielding to their Supplications, at last appointed Judges; who after examination of the Accusations against the *Long-brethren*, found them to be Calumnies, and so gave Judgment against some of the Monks that were the Authors of them. All this happened in the Year 401. S. *John Chrysostom.*

In the Year 402, S. *Epiphanius*, Bishop in *Cyprus*, (who held with *Theophilus*, because he was a great enemy to *Origen*) came to *Constantinople*. S. *Chrysostom* invited him to take a lodging in his House; but *Epiphanius*, pre-ingaged by *Theophilus*, writing to him, gave him this answer; That he was so far from lodging in his House, he would not so much as enter into it, nor joyn in the publick Prayers whilst he was there, unless S. *Chrysostom* first banish'd the *Long-brethren*, and condemn'd *Origen*. S. *John* having refused to doe it, S. *Epiphanius* designed to go himself into the Apostle's Church on the Lord's-day, and there publickly condemn *Origen*'s Books, and excommunicate the *Long-brethren* with their Adherents. But as he was going, he met with *Serapion* the Deacon, who told him from S. *Chrysostom*, that he undertook things against Order, and against the Canons: That he had ordained a Deacon out of his own Diocess, and celebrated the Eucharist, without permission from the Ordinary; and that he was about a thing that was neither just nor reasonable, and dangerous for himself, for he had to doe with a populace which would soon be up; and that S. *Chrysostom* would not answer for what might happen. This discourse made *Epiphanius* withdraw, and desist from his enterprise. The *Long-brethren* after this went to him, and complained that he condemned them before hearing, and without conviction; they shewed, that they had not dealt so with him, having every-where defended both his Works and his Person. *Epiphanius* reflecting upon this Remonstrance, and considering what Troubles *Theophilus* had engaged him in, returned towards *Cyprus*. At his going away he told the Bishops, *I leave you the Town, the Palace, and the Theater.* He died before he got to his own Country.

After the departure of S. *Epiphanius*, S. *Chrysostom* made a Speech against the Disorders of Women: The Empress *Eudoxia* supposing that it was meant of her, complained to the Emperor, and urged *Theophilus* to come to *Constantinople*. This Bishop, who waited for an opportunity to destroy S. *Chrysostom*, came immediately about the beginning of the Year 403, and brought with him several *Egyptian* Bishops. Those of *Asia* that were deposed by S. *Chrysostom*, or were not satisfied with his behaviour, repaired likewise to *Constantinople*. *Theophilus* had his Apartment in one of the Empress's Houses; from whence he sent the Accusers of *John* to the Emperor, who commanded that both they and *Chrysostom* should appear before *Theophilus* his Synod, to be judged there. S. *Chrysostom* denied them to be his Judges; affirming, That it appertained to the Bishops of his, and of the adjacent Provinces, and not to Strangers, to take cognizance of that matter. Notwithstanding this reason, which *Theophilus* himself had alledged to avoid being judged by S. *Chrysostom*, he held a Synod of Six and Thirty Bishops, in the Suburbs of *Chalcedon*, to condemn S. *Chrysostom*. One *John* exhibited Nine and Twenty Articles against him.

S. *Chrysostom* was cited to the Synod to answer those Accusations, but he sent three Bishops and two Presbyters, who in his behalf declared to *Theophilus* and his Synod, That he was ready to submit to any that might be his Judges, but not to *Theophilus* his professed Enemy, nor to the *Egyptian* Bishops, who could not regularly judge the Bishops of *Thrace*. S. *Chrysostom* objected in writing, particularly against *Theophilus*; because when he came out of *Alexandria*, he said, *I am going to depose* John: Against *Acacius* of *Berœa*, because he threatned him long before: Against *Severianus* and *Antiochus*, because of the quarrels betwixt them, which were publick and notorious. He so much depended upon his innocency, that he promised to appear at the Synod, if these four Bishops would retire: They did not hearken to this Proposition, but cited him to the Synod three times. He answered still, That he would justifie himself before a more numerous Synod; but he had reason to reject a Council, where his Enemies were to be his principal Judges. However, his Process was brought before the Council. *Theophilus* was present, and received the Memorials of Accusation which himself had made. One *Isaac* a Monk, whom S. *Chrysostom* had reproved, for going abroad oftener than Monks ought to doe, exhibited a Bill against him with Nine Articles: After examination of some of them, *Paul* of *Heraclea*, President of the Council, required the Bishops to give their Opinions: They all declared that S. *Chrysostom* ought to be deposed; and having delivered their Opinions, they wrote a Letter to the Emperor, and another to the Clergy of *Constantinople*, giving notice of the Judgment they had given against S. *John Chrysostom*. After this, three Bishops of *Asia*, deposed by S. *Chrysostom*, Petitioned the Council for their Restauration; and it is probable that it was granted them. And, on the contrary, *Heraclides*, who had been ordained Bishop of *Ephesus*, was deposed. This is what *Theophilus* his Caballing obtained of the Council: the Acts whereof were extant in *Photius*'s time, who gives an Epitome of them in the 59th. Volume of his *Bibliotheca*. They were divided into Thirteen Acts or Sessions.

S. *John Chryſoſtom.*

The news of S. *Chryſoſtom*'s depoſition ſtirred up a great Sedition at *Conſtantinople*; the Emperor commanded that he ſhould be baniſhed, and the People reſolved to keep him by force: But three days after he went out of the Church of his own accord, to ſurrender himſelf to them that had order to ſeize him, and was conveyed to a ſmall Town of *Bithynia*. His going away increaſed the tumult of the People, who both with Prayers and Threatnings addreſſed to the Emperor to call him back; which ſo amazed *Eudoxia*, that ſhe became Petitioner for his return, and ſent one of her own Officers to fetch him. When he was come back, he would not perform the Epiſcopal Functions till he was reſtored by a more numerous Synod than that which depoſed him; he beſought the Emperor to call one, and in the mean time withdrew to a place without the City: But the People, impatient of delays, led him into the Church, and he was reſtored by Thirty Biſhops, and *Theophilus* was obliged to depart.

After this, it ſeemed that S. *Chryſoſtom* had nothing to fear; but of a ſudden a new Storm aroſe againſt him. Towards the end of the Year 403, the Empreſs *Eudoxia* cauſed her Statue to be ſet up near the Church: The People, in honour to the Empreſs, celebrated ſome publick Games by that Statue. S. *Chryſoſtom* looking upon theſe as indecent things, preached againſt them: This provoked the Empreſs, who ſtill preſerved a grudge againſt him, and reſolved to have a new Aſſembly of Biſhops, to drive him out of the Church of *Conſtantinople*. It is ſaid that the Saint hearing of it, provoked her yet more, by beginning a Sermon with theſe words: *Now* Herodias *is in a fury again; now ſhe demands the Head of* John *in a Charger once again:* However, at the end of that Year, *Theophilus* being afraid to go to *Conſtantinople*, ſent thither three Biſhops from *Egypt*; who being aſſembled with them that were then at Court, and ſome others come from *Syria*, *Pontus* and *Phrygia*, they undertook to judge S. *Chryſoſtom*. He went to them, and deſired to ſee his Accuſation, or to know his Accuſers, that he might make his defence about the Crimes laid to his charge: But theſe Biſhops declared, that it was not neceſſary to examine, whether the things alledged againſt him were true or falſe; It was enough for his Condemnation, that he returned to his Biſhoprick when depoſed by a Council, and was not abſolved by another Council; becauſe it was provided in the Fourth Canon of the Council of *Antioch*, That whoſoever was guilty of this, could never hope to be reſtored, nor ſo much as be admitted to plead for himſelf. *Elpidius* and *Tranquillus*, who defended S. *Chryſoſtom*; anſwered, That this Canon was made by *Arians*; and that he was reſtored by thoſe Biſhops that communicated with him. The Biſhops of the Council denied that the Canon was made by *Arians*; and inſiſted upon this, That the Number of thoſe who depoſed S. *Chryſoſtom*, was greater than of thoſe that communicated with him at his return to his Church. On this ground they confirmed the Sentence of Depoſition, which the firſt Council pronounced againſt S. *Chryſoſtom*.

By virtue of this Judgment, the Emperor, at the beginning of *Lent*, 404, forbad him to go to the Church: He obey'd, and left the Clergy alone to perform Divine Service. But he was not ſuffered to be long at reſt, for upon Holy Saturday, *Lucius*, Captain of the Guards, came with Souldiers into the great Church in the Evening, and drove away forty Biſhops that communicated with S. *Chryſoſtom*, all the Clergy, and part of the People: Then he placed armed Men about the Sanctuary, entred into the Baptiſtery, and miſuſed thoſe that were there. Some Souldiers that were not yet baptized, went to the Altar, and ſpilt upon their Cloaths the conſecrated Elements that were in the holy Veſſels. This Violence was followed by the Prince's Edicts againſt S. *Chryſoſtom*, and againſt thoſe that communicated with him. The next day the People met together in the publick Baths, and were driven out by force: So that ſuch as were for S. *Chryſoſtom* were obliged to meet in ſeveral places of the Town; and were afterwards called by their Enemies *Joannites*. They did not yet dare to meddle with the Perſon of S. *Chryſoſtom*, who was ſo much beloved of the People, that they were ready to take up Arms to prevent his being taken away. This Saint, unwilling to be the cauſe of a Civil War, got away from thoſe Guards that the People ſet about him, and put himſelf into the hands of thoſe that were to take him. He was led to *Nice*; and the ſame day that he went, which was the 20th. of *June*, there happened a Fire in the great Church, which burnt it to the ground, with the Palace joyning to it. Seven days after one *Arſacius*, an old Man of Eighty years of Age, Brother to *Nectarius*, was ordained in the room of S. *Chryſoſtom*. This *Arſacius* furiouſly perſecuted S. *Chryſoſtom*'s friends. This Saint tarried not long at *Nice*, but left it on the 13th. of *July* to go to *Cucuſus*, the place of his Exile, where he arrived in *September*. He endured much by the way, but was kindly received by *Dioſcorus* Biſhop of the place. In the mean time Laws were publiſhed at *Conſtantinople* againſt thoſe that adhered to S. *Chryſoſtom*; Three of them are in the *Theodoſian* Code. The Firſt of the Firſt of *September*, *l.* 16. *tit.* 2. *c.* 3. It is againſt Foreign Clerks, who kept Meetings in private places. The Second of the Tenth of the ſame Month, is *tit.* 4. *c.* 5. of the ſame Book: By this Law thoſe are to be Fined who ſuffered their Slaves to go to private Meetings. The Third in the ſame place, *c.* 6. forbids all the Meetings of thoſe that did not communicate with *Arſacius* Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, *Theophilus* Biſhop of *Alexandria*, and *Porphyrius* who was choſen Biſhop of *Antioch* in the place of *Flavianus*. All theſe Laws are againſt them that took *John*'s part, and held private Meetings, and refuſed to communicate with thoſe Three Patriarchs. About the latter end of that Year a ſhower of Hail of extraordinary bigneſs did much miſchief in *Conſtantinople*; and the Empreſs died ſoon after: *John*'s friends look'd upon both theſe accidents as Judgments from God for the injurious uſage of S. *Chryſoſtom*.

The

The Patriarchs of the *Eaſt* having declared againſt S. *Chryſoſtom*, he could expect no relief, but from the *Weſtern* Biſhops, and particularly from the See of *Rome*, which had always been the refuge of Biſhops that were unjuſtly perſecuted in their own Country. To prevent Pope *Innocent*, *Theophilus* ſent him a Letter by one of his Readers, acquainting him with S. *Chryſoſtom*'s depoſition. This being publickly known in *Rome*, *Euſebius*, Deacon of *Conſtantinople*, petition'd the Pope that he would ſuſpend his Judgment, till he were rightly informed of the matter. Three days after came four Biſhops, ſent by S. *Chryſoſtom*, who delivered to the Pope a Letter from him, imploring his ſuccour, and that of the Biſhops of the *Weſt*; with another Letter from Forty Biſhops and the Clergy of *Conſtantinople*; which declared, That S. *John Chryſoſtom* was condemned unjuſtly, and without being heard. S. *Innocent* being perſuaded that *Theophilus* had not proceeded regularly, ſent Letters of Communion to S. *Chryſoſtom*, as well as to the Biſhops that condemned him; and declared, that it was requiſite to call an unexceptionable Council both of *Eaſtern* and *Weſtern* Biſhops. *Theophilus* afterwards ſent to *Rome* the Acts of the Council held againſt S. *Chryſoſtom*; but this altered not the Pope's reſolution; who declared, that he could not refuſe Communion with S. *Chryſoſtom* before a new Council had condemned him. Soon after *Theoctenus* brought a Letter from Five and twenty Biſhops, ſignifying to the Pope, that S. *Chryſoſtom* had been expelled out of *Conſtantinople*, and ſent into Exile; the ſame was afterwards confirmed by another Letter of Fifteen Biſhops, brought by the Biſhop of *Apamea*; and by the Teſtimony of *Palladius* of *Helenopolis*, who was forced to flee to *Rome*; and by Letters from the Clergy of *Conſtantinople*, which gave an Account of the Violences exerciſed againſt their Biſhop, and the whole Church of *Conſtantinople*. The Pope, moved with theſe things, writ to S. *Chryſoſtom* and to his Clergy thoſe Letters which are preſerved by *Sozomen* in his Hiſtory, *l.*8. *c.* 26.

S. *John Chryſoſtom*.

S. *Chryſoſtom*'s friends every-where publiſhed theſe Letters, and wrought ſo far with *Innocent*, that he obtained of *Honorius*, Emperor of the *Weſt*, a Letter to his Brother *Arcadius*, in the behalf of S. *Chryſoſtom*; by the which he requeſted of his Brother, that a Council might be aſſembled at *Theſſalonica*, where *Theophilus* ſhould appear as one accuſed. Three Biſhops, Two Presbyters, and Two Deacons, were deputed to carry this Letter, with the Letters of ſeveral *Weſtern* Biſhops, written in favour of S. *Chryſoſtom*. But theſe Deputies were ſtopt at *Athens* by the Governour, and ſent by Sea with a Guard to *Conſtantinople*. They were not permitted to enter into the Town, but were convey'd to a Caſtle in *Thrace*, where they were ſhut up. A Counſellor of State, called *Patricius*, went thither to ask for the Letters; they anſwered, That their Order was not to deliver them to any but the Emperor, and the Biſhops to whom they were directed. *Patricius* withdrawing after this Anſwer, another Officer, named *Valerius*, was ſent to take them by force. The next day Money was proffered them, to admit to their Communion *Atticus*, who ſucceeded *Arſacius* in the See of *Conſtantinople*. They refuſed it, and demanded to be ſent back. When they could not be made to comply, they were put into an old Veſſel with Twenty Souldiers, that carried them to *Lampſacus*, where they ſhifted their Veſſel, and arrived at *Otranto*, a Port of *Calabria*, Twenty Days after their Embarquing, and Four Months from their departure out of *Italy*. This Deputation was dated in the Year 404.

In the mean time S. *Chryſoſtom* being unhealthy in the place of his Exile, was obliged often to ſhift his Quarters, as appeareth by his 131ſt. Letter. But notwithſtanding his baniſhment and infirmities, he ſtill ſent Prieſts and Monks to preach the Goſpel among the *Goths* and *Perſians*, and to take care of the Churches of *Armenia* and *Phœnicia*; as appears by his 14th. 123d. 126th. 203d. 204th. 206th. and 207th. Letters. But his Enemies would not let him be quiet, but perſuaded the Emperour to ſend him further to *Pityus*, a Town upon the *Euxine* Sea: Immediately Souldiers were ſent to convey him thither; The uſage which he endured, and the fatigue of the Journey ſo weakned him, that he fell ſick of a violent Fever, which carried him off in a few hours. In the place where he died, there was a Church of S. *Baſiliſcus* Martyr, where he was buried the 4th. of *November*, 407, having been Three Years, Three Months, and Four and Twenty Days in baniſhment: Aged Sixty Years, and Ten Years Ordained Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*. After his Death, the Eaſt and the Weſt were divided for ſome time upon his account, becauſe thoſe of the Weſt reverenced his Memory; and the others on the contrary look'd upon him as a condemn'd Biſhop, whoſe Name they refuſed to inſert into the *Diptychs*; That is to ſay, in the Regiſters of thoſe that were to be mentioned with Honour at the Celebration of the Euchariſt. One would have thought that the Emperour *Arcadius* his Death happening Five Months after, ſhould have removed the greateſt obſtacle, which hindered the Biſhops of the Eaſt from doing juſtice to the Memory of S. *Chryſoſtom*: but *Theophilus* exerciſed his hatred againſt him, even after his death: He wrote againſt him a book full of Invectives, and reproachfull Railings; and prevented, while he lived, any honour to be done to the Memory of S. *Chryſoſtom* in the Eaſt.

When *Theophilus* was dead, the Spirits of the Eaſtern Biſhops began to relent, and they began to be more favourable to the Memory of that Saint. *Alexander* Succeſſour to *Porphyrius* in the See of *Antioch*, was the Firſt, who in the Year 413, inſerted the Name of S. *Chryſoſtom* into the *Diptychs*, and who by that means was re-admitted to communicate with Pope *Innocent*. *Acacius* of *Berœa* likewiſe received Letters of Communion from the Pope, upon condition that he ſhould not ſhew any hatred againſt S. *Chryſoſtom* afterwards.

About

S. John Chryſoſtom.

About the Year 428. *Atticus* Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, inſerted the Name of S. *Chryſoſtom* into the *Diptychs*, and exhorted S. *Cyril* of *Alexandria* to do the ſame. This Biſhop ſcrupled it at firſt: But at laſt S. *Iſiodore Peluſiota* perſuaded him to do it. Thus all the Churches did right to the Memory of S. *Chryſoſtom*, and Peace was reſtored.

The Number of S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Works is ſo great, that the Ancient Criticks durſt not pretend to make a Catalogue of them: S. *Iſiodore* and *Suidas*, look'd upon it as almoſt impoſſible. *George* and *Nicephorus* ſay, that he compoſed above a Thouſand Volumes. *Suidas* and *Caſſiodorus* affirm, that he wrote Commentaries upon the whole Bible: From all which it is evident, that how many ſoever of S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Works are yet extant, they are fewer than they have been, and ſo much the rather; becauſe among thoſe that we have, ſome are none of his, though they bear his Name.

The 65 Homilies upon *Geneſis*, are the Firſt of S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Commentaries of the Bible, according to the Order of the ſacred Books; the Thirty two firſt were preached in Lent, in the third Year of his being Biſhop. This Subject was interrupted by the Feſtivals; for he was to preach upon the Paſſion of Jeſus Chriſt. After *Eaſter*, he undertook to expound the *Acts* of the Apoſtles, and was near a Year about that Work: Afterwards he betook himſelf to his former Task, and finiſhed his Expoſition of *Geneſis*, in Thirty four Homilies. Theſe Homilies are Commentaries upon *Geneſis*, rather than Sermons. And he applies himſelf particularly to explain the Text of Scripture literally. The Examples of Vertues or Vices ſpoken of in the Text, which he expounds, are commonly the Subject of his Homilies. The Style is plain, and without thoſe Figures and Ornaments which are to be found in his other Sermons.

The Nine Sermons of S. *Chryſoſtom* upon ſingle paſſages of *Geneſis*, are more florid, and contain more moral Thoughts. The Firſt is, upon the firſt Words of *Geneſis*. *In the Beginning God created the Heavens and the Earth:* in it he treats of Faſting and Alms-deeds.

The Second is upon theſe Words of the firſt Chapter, *v.* 26. *Let us make Man after our own Image:* There he gives the reaſon why *Moſes* ſpeaking of the Creation of Man, uſes the Expreſſion, *God ſaid, Let us make*; whereas he ſaid of the Creation of other things, *God ſaid, Let them be:* And there he ſhews wherein this Reſemblance with God conſiſts.

In the Third he makes ſome further Reflexions upon Man being like God, and upon the Dominion given to him over other Creatures; and there he anſwers the Queſtion, Why Beaſts fall upon and kill Man; and confeſſes that it is, becauſe Man by Sin has loſt the Empire he had over them. S. *Auſtin* quotes this Homily in his Firſt Book againſt *Julian*, and produces a paſſage out of it to prove Original ſin.

In the Fourth the three kinds of ſervitude which Mankind is fallen into by ſin are diſcourſed of, which are, the Subjection of the Wife to her Husband, that of one Man to another, and that of Subjects to their Princes. He inſiſts much upon this laſt, and occaſionally ſpeaks of the Attention Men ought to give to Sermons.

In the Fifth he ſhews, that thoſe who live well purchaſe their Liberty; and declaims againſt thoſe that refuſe to aſſiſt the Poor.

The Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth, are concerning the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil. In the Firſt he ſhews, that *Adam* knew Good and Evil before he taſted the Fruit of that Tree. In the Second he ſays, that it is ſo called, becauſe Evil is more perfectly known after Commiſſion; there he alſo explains thoſe Words of our Saviour to the good Thief: *This Day ſhalt thou be with me in Paradiſe.* The Third is about God's forbidding Man to eat of the Fruit of the Tree.

The Ninth is upon the Names of *Abraham* and *Noah*, where he diſcourſes of brotherly Correction.

The Tenth Homily upon *Geneſis* in the Engliſh Edition is not genuine; it has the ſame Preface with the Third Homily upon *David* and *Saul*; it is written in a ſwelling Style, and full of Metaphors, and quite different from the firſt Part.

The following Sermons are upon the Hiſtory of *Hannah*, *Samuel*'s Mother, in the firſt Book of *Samuel*; but it treats of ſeveral Subjects.

The Preface to the Firſt is upon the Faſt of the laſt Lent, and upon the Sermons which he had made ſince againſt the *Gentiles*; and after *Flavianus* his return upon the Feaſts of the Martyrs, and againſt ſwearing. After this he reſumes the Subject of Providence, which he was entred upon: he demonſtrates, That it is God who gave unto Man the knowledge of the things which he ought to know; That ſickneſs and death have their uſe: He takes notice that the Love which Parents have for their Children is an effect of Providence, and that Mothers are not leſs concerned in the Education of their Children than Fathers: And upon occaſion of this laſt Reflection, he relates the Hiſtory of *Hannah*, and he ſpeaks of it in the following Sermon, and thereupon he Diſcourſes of Moderation, of Modeſty, and the Reverence due to Prieſts, and of Grace before and after Meat.

In the Third, he ſpeaks of the Obligation which lies upon Men, to give their Children good Education.

In the Fourth, upon the ſecond Part of *Hannah*'s Song, he reproves thoſe who neglect Divine Service to go to Plays and publick Shows, and diſcourſes of the uſefulneſs of Prayer.

In the Fifth he ſhews their Errour, who go to Church only upon great Feſtival Days. He expounds the reſt of *Hannah*'s Hymns, and he ſpeaks of the Advantage of Wealth above Poverty.

Theſe

S. *John Chryſoſtom.*

Theſe five Diſcourſes were preached by S. *Chryſoſtom* in *Antioch*, about *Whitſuntide*, after *Flavianus* his Return. In this laſt Sermon, he mentions a Diſcourſe upon the firſt Part of *Hannah*'s Hymn not extant.

There are three Sermons about *David* and *Saul*. In the firſt, after a Declamation againſt thoſe that frequent Plays to the neglect of Holy Worſhip, and a Declaration that they ſhould be excommunicated, he treats of patience, and forgiving of Enemies; propoſing for an Example *David*'s Action, who would not kill *Saul*, though God had delivered him into his Hands.

In the ſecond, that Action is commended, and preferred before all the other great Actions of that King. He proſecutes the ſame Argument in the third Diſcourſe, where he alſo complains of thoſe that were given to Plays: He obſerves, that it is as great an Act of Vertue to bear an Injury patiently, as to give Alms.

At the End of theſe there is another Sermon againſt Idleneſs, which hath no relation to the Reſt.

The Homilies upon the *Pſalms*, are Commentaries rather than Sermons: S. *Chryſoſtom* does not inlarge ſo much upon Moral Topicks, as to give the ſence and underſtanding of the Text. He follows the Verſion of the LXX, but he often hath recourſe to the differences of the Ancient Greek Verſions, and quotes even the Hebrew Text in ſome places to clear difficulties: There are ſome *Pſalms* upon which we have no Homilies of S. *Chryſoſtom*, as the firſt and ſecond; but there are upon the third, and following to the 13th; upon the 41ſt and 43d, and ſo on to the 117th; and from the 119th to the laſt; which make in all ſixty Homilies, which certainly are S. *Chryſoſtom*'s. To theſe may be added, the Homily upon the thirteenth *Pſalm*, and two others upon the fiftieth, which have likewiſe S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Style. Thoſe upon the 51ſt, 95th, and 100th, are more doubtfull; yet I ſee no reaſon that we ſhould reject them. It is not ſo of the Commentaries upon the 101ſt *Pſalm*, and upon the ſix that follow, which are *Theodoret*'s. The Commentary upon the 119th, belongs to ſome modern Greek, that ſpeaks againſt the *Iconoclaſts*, and takes out of *Theodoret*'s Commentaries part of what he writes. There are alſo four Sermons upon particular paſſages of the *Pſalms*, but they muſt not be joined to the reſt; becauſe they are not Explications of the Text of the *Pſalms*, but Sermons upon diſtinct Subjects.

Theſe are a Diſcourſe upon theſe words of the 44th *Pſalm*: *The Queen ſtandeth at thy right hand*, preached in *Conſtantinople* ſome Days after *Eutropius* his Diſgrace, who had retired into the Church, but was gone out again. He ſpeaks in his Preface, of the Advantage of reading the Holy Scripture. He deſcribes afterwards how the Church was beſet, when *Eutropius* had taken Sanctuary there. He relates what he had done to help him, and with what ſincerity he had ſpoken, without fearing the Threatnings uttered againſt him. He obſerves that he was taken by his own fault, for the Church had not forſaken him, but he had quitted it: But yet it was no wonder that he reaped no greater benefit from that Sanctuary, becauſe he entred not into it with a Chriſtian heart; That when any Man flies into the Church to take ſanctuary there, he ought to go in with his Mind as well as with his Body; becauſe the Church is not made up of Walls, but of an Holy Union among the Members of Jeſus Chriſt. Upon occaſion of this Eunuch's Diſgrace, he ſhews how little Solidity there is in the goods of this World, and draws a fine Picture of the Inſtability of Riches, and then concludes with an excellent Deſcription of the Church. " Nothing, ſays he to his Auditors, is ſtronger than the Church; Let it be " your Hope, your Haven and Refuge: It is higher than the Heavens, of a larger extent than " the Earth: She never waxeth old, but ſtill retaineth her ſtrength and vigour, for this cauſe the " Scripture calleth her a Mountain, to ſhew her ſtability; a Virgin, becauſe ſhe cannot be cor- " rupted; a Queen, becauſe of her Magnificence and Splendour; and it gives her the Name of " Daughter, by reaſon of her Union with God, *&c.*

Both the Sermons upon theſe words of the 48th Pſalm, *Be not thou afraid when one is made rich*, were likewiſe preached in *Conſtantinople*. In them he recommends Alms-deeds and Hoſpitality; and he toucheth upon the Neceſſity of being preſent at Divine Service.

The Homily on theſe words of the 145th Pſalm, *My Soul, bleſs thou the Lord*, is a Sermon for the Holy Week, called then *the great Week*. The reaſon of that Name S. *Chryſoſtom* gives in the beginning of his Diſcourſe, which is this. " This Week, ſays he, is called *the great Week*, " becauſe Jeſus Chriſt wrought great Myſteries at this Time: He delivered Man from the Ty- " ranny of the Devil, he overcame Death, bound the ſtrong armed Man, blotted out Sin. But " as this Week is *the great Week*, becauſe it is the firſt of Weeks; for the ſame reaſon Saturday " is called the great Day: and for this cauſe many of the faithfull do upon this Day double " their Exerciſes; ſome faſt with greater Auſterity, others watch continually, others beſtow " much on the poor: ſome apply themſelves with greater Zeal, to the Practice of good Works, " and by their Piety bear witneſs to the Mercy of God: Emperours themſelves honour this " Week, they grant a Vacation to all Magiſtrates, that ſo being freed from worldly Care, they " may ſpend theſe Days in the Worſhip of God: They give honour alſo to this Day, by " ſending Letters every where to command the Priſon doors to be opened. Let us alſo have " regard to theſe Days, and inſtead of Palm-branches, let us offer him our Hearts. Then he " explains the Pſalm, *My Soul, praiſe thou the Lord.* The royal Prophet, ſays he, cries out " *Praiſe the Lord, O my Soul*; why does he direct his Diſcourſe to the Soul? to teach us that

S. *John Chryſoſtom.*

" the Soul ſhould apply her ſelf to the words that are uttered: For if he that prayeth doth not " underſtand his own words, how would he have God to give ear to him? God often doth not " grant our Petitions, but that is for our good; he deferrs ſome time, not to deceive us with " vain hopes, but to make us more zealous and diligent, for the fervency of Prayer commonly " ceaſeth when we have what we deſired: ſo that to keep up our Devotion, God is pleaſed to " with-hold his Gifts. He obſerves in this Sermon, that the Righteous after Death, live with " us, pray with us, and are amongſt us, *&c.*

S. *Chryſoſtom* writ a Commentary upon *Iſaiah*: but we have only part of it from the beginning, to the eleventh Verſe of the eighth Chapter. Both the hiſtorical and ſpiritual Sence is ſet forth with much ſolidity and clearneſs.

There are alſo five Homilies of his upon theſe words of *Iſaiah*, ch. 6. *I ſaw the Lord upon an high Throne*, and one concerning the *Seraphim* ſpoken of in the ſame place; they are moral Diſcourſes upon various Subjects, and eſpecially of the reverence due to ſacred things, and of the dignity of the Prieſthood; there is a very remarkable paſſage concerning the Eccleſiaſtical and the Civil Power. " *Uzziah*, ſaith he, went himſelf into the Holy of Holies to offer Incenſe: being King " he would uſurp the Prieſthood: I will, ſaid he, burn Incenſe, for I am worthy to do it. Oye " Princes keep within the Limits of your own Power: The bounds of Eccleſiaſtical power " differ from thoſe of ſecular Government. The King rules over earthly things, the Churches " Juriſdiction relates to heavenly goods. God hath committed to Kings the things of the Earth, " and to me thoſe of Heaven: when I ſay, to me, I mean to Prieſts. So that, though a Prieſt " prove unworthy of his Office, yet for all that, you ought not to deſpiſe the dignity of the " Prieſthood. God hath made the Body ſubject to Kings, and the Soul to Prieſts. The King " pardons corporal Offences, but the Prieſt remits Sins. The one compels, the other " exhorts; the one impoſes a law, the other gives counſel; one uſes ſpiritual Weapons, the " other ſenſible Arms; one wages War againſt *Barbarians*, and the other againſt Devils. But " the Eccleſiaſtical power is the nobler of the two, wherefore the King receives the Prieſt's bleſſing, and in the old Law the Prieſts anointed the Kings. But this King would go beyond his " bounds, and extend his Power too far, and enter the Temple by force, to offer Incenſe: but what " did the Prieſt ſay to this? Sir, you are not permitted to offer Incenſe. Behold this is a generous " liberty; here was a Soul that could not flatter baſely. You are not, ſays he, to go into the " Sanctuary, nor to offer Incenſe to the Lord, that's reſerved for me to do. King *Uzziah* " could not bear this reproof, but tranſported with pride, he opens the Sanctuary and burns Incenſe. The Prieſt is deſpiſed, the ſacerdotal Function is ſet at nought: The Prieſt is without " power: for the Prieſt's right is only to reprove freely, and to admoniſh judiciouſly. Having " then adviſed the King with that boldneſs which became him, and the King refuſing to yield, " but on the contrary preparing Arms to aſſert his Authority; the Prieſt crieth out, I have " done what my duty commanded me to do, I have no power to go further, O Lord defend " the Prieſthood which is deſpiſed; thy Laws are violated, and Juſtice is overthrown, undertake " for them. This is the Account which S. *Chryſoſtom* gives of the High-prieſt's Conſtancy in the fourth Homily. In the fifth he ſpeaks of his Meekneſs. " I have ſhewed you the firmneſs of " the High-prieſt; now take notice of his lenity, for we have need not of Courage only, but " much more of Meekneſs, becauſe Sinners hate to be reproved, and ſeek all occaſions to avoid " admonition: and ſo muſt be drawn and reſtrained with Mildneſs and Charity.

In the Homily concerning the Seraphim he ſpeaks of that Celeſtial Hymn, *Holy, Holy, Holy*: He ſays, that formerly that Hymn was ſung only in Heaven, but ſince the Lord appeared upon Earth, we are allowed the benefit of that divine Conſort. " Wherefore, ſays he, when the " Prieſt is by the holy Table to offer the Euchariſt, he does not utter that Hymn, but after he " has named the Cherubim and Seraphim, and the Congregation have lifted up their Hearts to " God. This paſſage diſcovers the Antiquity of this Preface to the Office of the Euchariſt.

To theſe Homilies ſhould be joined the Sermon upon *Iſaiah*, ch. 45. v. 7. *I am the Lord, I form the Light and create Darkneſs, I make Peace and create Evil.*

There is no Commentary of S. *Chryſoſtom*'s upon *Jeremiah* (*f*); but only one Homily upon *Ch.* 10. *v.* 23. of that Prophet, where he proves the freedom of man's Will.

To theſe Homilies upon the Prophets muſt be added two Sermons of the obſcurity of Prophecies, wherein he gives reaſons why prophecies are dark. He tells us in the firſt, that the Prophets ſpake obſcurely of the Evils which were to come upon the *Jews*; becauſe that had they ſpoke plainly, they might have been ill uſed, and perhaps killed by the *Jews*. This he proves by an infinite Number of Examples of Prophets killed by them, for telling the truth. It is added, that Prophecies were dark, that the *Jews* might not underſtand them, till they were to comprehend them. In the ſecond, he ſays, that the Event has cleared the Prophecies, that the Veil which covered them was taken off in the New Teſtament, and ſo the obſcurity wherein they were wrapt up has been diſſipated. At laſt he obſerves, that the Old Teſtament having

(*f*) *There is no Commentary of S.* Chryſoſtom's *upon* Jeremiah.] There was a Manuſcript in ſome Libraries that went under S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Name; but it was ſo pitifull a buſineſs, that it was not judged worth publiſhing: no more than ſome *Scholia* upon the Goſpels of S. *Matthew*, S. *Mark*, and S. *Luke*.

been

been written in Hebrew, is the leſs clear, becauſe Verſions commonly make the Sence more obſcure.

S. *John Chryſoſtom.*

This Father's Commentaries upon the New Teſtament are more full and entire.

S. *Matthew*'s whole Goſpel is expounded in fourſcore and ten Homilies (*g*), and that of S. *John* in eighty ſeven. There are four and fifty Homilies upon the *Acts*, and thirty two upon the Epiſtle to the *Romans*; forty four upon the firſt Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*; thirty upon the ſecond; a Commentary upon the Epiſtle to the *Galatians*; four and twenty Homilies upon that to the *Epheſians*; fifteen upon the Epiſtle to the *Philippians*; twelve upon that to the *Coloſſians*; eleven upon the firſt to the *Theſſalonians*; five upon the ſecond: Eighteen upon the firſt to *Timothy*; ten upon the ſecond; ſix on the Epiſtle to *Titus*; three upon that to *Philemon*; and thirty four upon the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*. It is ſaid, that theſe laſt were collected after the Death of S. *Chryſoſtom*, by a Prieſt called *Conſtantine* who had been his Diſciple: but there is no proof of this; and it is more likely that he writ them himſelf. Part of theſe Homilies were preached at *Antioch*, and the other at *Conſtantinople* (*h*).

Theſe Homilies conſiſt of two parts: The firſt contains a Commentary upon the Goſpel, the other a moral Exhortation to the People. In the Commentary he gives a reaſon of the Contents of the Goſpel, examines all the circumſtances thereof, weighs the words, and diſcovers in thoſe places which ſeem moſt plain, great Numbers of fine things, to which no attention would have been given, had he not taken notice of them. He keeps ſtill to the literal Sence, and of all Explications he always chuſes, not the moſt ſubtle, but the moſt natural. He ſeeks for no allegorical or figurative Sence. He uſeth no far fetched notions to prove his opinions; avoids all intangled and hard Queſtions, contenting himſelf to make clear and uſefull Obſervations upon the Hiſtory and upon the Text of St. *Paul*. He gives a perfect light to all the places of this Apoſtle's Epiſtles, which ſeem moſt difficult, and particularly to thoſe, which are thought to ſpeak of Predeſtination and of Grace. His expoſitions remove all that which at the firſt view makes them appear terrible and fearfull. Every-where God is repreſented as a good and mercifull Being, and willing to ſave all Men, and who affords them all neceſſary means of Salvation, Men are exhorted to anſwer that Call of God; ſince it is their own fault if they be not ſaved; for thoſe that are damned damn themſelves. He tells them often, that God requireth no impoſſible thing of them: That with God's help they may keep the Commandments, and practice Vertue. S. *Chryſoſtom* finds theſe comfortable Thoughts in the paſſages of S. *Paul*, which ſeem moſt terrifying; and endeavours to prove, that they are not contrary to the mind of

(*g*) S. Matthew's *whole Goſpel is expounded in* 90 *Homilies.*] In the Tranſlation there are 91, but the 29th is divided into two, though it is but one in the Greek Original; and ſo the Tranſlation ought to be mended in the Number of the Homilies upon S. *Matthew*, and the Greek Text to be corrected in the Number of the Homilies upon S. *John*; for though it diſtinguiſhes 88 Homilies, yet there are but 87, becauſe the Preface is not to be reckoned one of them.

(*h*) *Part of theſe Homilies were preached at* Antioch, *and the other at* Conſtantinople.] *Photius* obſerves, that it is eaſie to know which Homilies St. *Chryſoſtom* preached at *Antioch*; becauſe they are more elaborate than thoſe that were preached at *Conſtantinople*. But though this general Rule may ſerve to diſtinguiſh them, yet ſome particulars in the Homilies themſelves are remarkable, to determine where they were preached. It is evident, that the Homilies upon *Geneſis*, were preached at *Conſtantinople*, as we obſerved before after *Photius*, for he ſpeaks poſitively in the 33d Homily upon *Geneſis*, which is the 28th according to *Photius*, who reckoneth but 61 Homilies upon *Geneſis*. *Eraſmus* believed, that the 54 Homilies upon the *Acts* were not S. *Chryſoſtom*'s; and Sir *Henry Savil* ſeems to have doubted of it: but without ground, for they are written in his ſtyle, and in ſeveral places he diſcovers himſelf. The ſtyle of the Homilies upon the *Pſalms*, ſhews that they were preached at *Antioch*, not to mention the Authority of *George* of *Alexandria*, and ſome other modern Greeks that confirm the ſame. It cannot be known when he made the Commentary upon *Iſaiah*. The ſeventh Homily upon S. *Matthew*, ſhews plainly, that it was preach'd at *Antioch*; for he ſays there, that they, to whom he ſpake, boaſted of being Inhabitants of that City, where the Name of Chriſtians took its beginning. That Town is again pointed at in the 68th Homily, according to the Latin, and the 67th according to the Greek: Whereby it is manifeſt, that theſe Homilies were preached at *Antioch*. In the 21ſt Homily upon the Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*, he plainly ſays, that he was preaching at *Antioch*. In the 3d Homily upon the Epiſtle to *Titus*, he makes mention of *Daphne*, a Suburb of *Antioch*, as belonging to the Town where he preached. The Sermons upon the Epiſtle to the *Coloſſians* were preached at *Conſtantinople*; for in the 3d Homily he ſpeaks with Epiſcopal Authority, threatning Sinners to deny them the Peace of the Church; he alſo mentions the Epiſcopal Throne whereon he was ſitting, and calls himſelf Biſhop. Of the ſame time are the Homilies upon the Epiſtles to the *Theſſalonians*: In the eleventh upon the firſt Epiſtle he ſays, that he preſided over them that heard him. The ſame is to be taken notice of in the 4th Homily upon the ſecond Epiſtle. In the 4th upon the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, he threatens to put thoſe out of the Church, who ſhould hire Mourners at the Funerals of their Relations, which juſtifies his being Biſhop. In the 26th Homily upon the ſecond Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*, there are theſe words, *That the Son of* Conſtantine *cauſed his Father to be buried in this City.* As to the reſt, there is no certain proof from what he ſays, to tell us where they were preached: but the ſtyle of the Homilies upon the Epiſtles to the *Romans*, and to the *Galatians*, being ſmoother and more poliſhed; whereas that of the Homilies upon the Epiſtles to the *Epheſians*, *Philippians*, and *Philemon*, being careleſs and without Art; we may believe, according to *Photius* his Rule, that the former were preached at *Antioch*, and the latter at *Conſtantinople*.

this

S. *John Chryſoſtom.*

this Apoſtle. The Expoſition he gives of the moſt difficult places, is no ways forced; yea, it ſeemeth very often to be the moſt ſimple and natural. *However, to my thinking, it is always the moſt profitable and edifying, and the fitteſt to be preached to the People, which are much edified by ſuch Remonſtrances as tend to practice, but can reap little or no fruit from Speculations about God's eternal Decrees, and other abſtracted matters, that have but little Relation to the Government of Life and Manners.*

All the Exhortations that conclude S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Homilies, are ordinarily about ſome points of Morality; as about the fear that men ought to ſtand in of God's Judgments, the Neceſſity of Repentance, the Contempt of Riches, forgiving of Enemies, Humility, Abſtraction of the Heart from worldly things, diligent Meditation upon the Holy Scriptures, and God's Laws; an Abhorrency of Plays and Shows, Charity towards the Poor, Alms, and Hoſpitality; brotherly Reproof, the Duties of Husbands to their Wives, of Parents to their Children, of Maſters to their Servants, of Lay-men towards their Paſtours, Patience in Afflictions, that Holineſs wherewith Men ſhould come to the Sacraments; the Benefit of Prayer, and the Conditions required therein, of Faſting, and the Advantages of a monaſtical and ſolitary Life, Aſſiduity in divine Offices, Attention to preaching, Sobriety, Purity, Modeſty, Meekneſs, Clemency, Contempt of Death, and many other like Subjects, which he handleth with ſuch familiar, and yet ſuch ſolid and convincing Reaſons, that there are no Diſcourſes more capable of inſpiring Notions of Piety and Vertue. He does not go about, as moſt Preachers do, to ſet forth ſtudied Notions, which divert the Underſtanding, but do not touch the Heart. He goes to the bottom of things, ſearches the ſecret folds of Man's Heart; and not contented to have diſcovered and deſcribed Vice, he begets an horrour of it; He ſets forth the moſt powerfull Motives to deter Chriſtians from it, and the moſt proper means to correct it, and to practice true and ſolid Vertue. He ſtretches nothing too far, but diſtinguiſhes exactly the matter of a precept from the Advice therein contained: He is neither too meek nor too ſevere: He is neither too familiar, nor keeps too much diſtance; never complies beyond what is meet, nor terrifies to diſcouragement: In a word, his Exhortations are an excellent pattern of preaching to the People.

The Sermons in the Fifth Volume upon ſeveral Texts of the New Teſtament, are not Commentaries, but moral Inſtructions, or Homilies upon different Subjects.

The Firſt is of Forgiveneſs of our Enemies, upon the parable of that Debtour, to whom his Maſter remitted Ten thouſand Talents, and yet afterwards exacted the hundred Pence from him that owed them to him. He ſpeaks of the exact Account that Men muſt render to God. "Rich Men, ſaith he, muſt give account for the uſe of their Riches; poor Men of their pati-
"ence; Judges of the Diſcharge of their Office; but above all, Church-men ſhall account for
"their Miniſtery; they ſhall be more ſtrictly examined. It ſhall be asked of him to whom the
"Word of God was committed, whether out of Idleneſs or Flattery, he omitted none of thoſe
"neceſſary things which his Miniſtery obliged him to ſpeak; if he explained all and concealed
"no truth. A Biſhop charged with the direction of a Dioceſs, hath yet a far greater Account to
"give: his Examination will be not only about his Doctrine, and his helping of the Poor, but
"eſpecially about the Orders which he ſhall have conferred, and a Thouſand other obligations
"of the Prieſthood. S. *Chryſoſtom* ſpeaking of S. *Peter* in that Homily, calleth him the Head of
"the Body of the Apoſtles, the Mouth of the Diſciples, the Firmament of the Faith, the Foun-
"dation of Confeſſion, and the Fiſherman of the whole Earth.

The Second Sermon of this Volume is againſt Dancing and Luxury; there he ſhews, that Preachers are bound to reprove Vice, and that they ought never to forbear, though their preaching ſeems to be without Fruit: Then he begins to explain the Parable of *Dives* and *Lazarus*, making ſeveral moral Reflexions on the particulars of that Parable in the four following Sermons. The laſt is quoted by *Photius* in the 277th Volume of his *Bibliotheca*, where he ſpeaks of an Earth-quake at *Antioch*, where he preached theſe Sermons. He obſerves in the Fourth, that God does not permit any to return from the Dead, and gives the reaſon of it.

The Seventh Sermon is an Expoſition of the Parable of the Man that was ſick of the Palſie; he uſes Jeſus Chriſt's Words, concerning that ſick Man, and his Cure, to prove the Divinity of Jeſus Chriſt.

The Eighth is upon theſe Words of Jeſus Chriſt in S. *Matthew*, Chap. 26. v. 39. *Father, if it be poſſible, let this Cup paſs*, &c. There he explains the Myſtery of Chriſt's Incarnation, and in what ſence he feared Death, and would have avoided it.

The Ninth on theſe words of S. *Matthew*, *Enter in at the ſtrait Gate*, is againſt publick Shews: At the latter End of it the caſe of *Dives* is compared with that of *Lazarus*.

The Tenth contains an Expoſition of the Lord's Prayer: This Prayer is not written in S. *Chryſoſtom*'s ſtyle.

The Eleventh is upon the Reſurrection of *Lazarus*. That Diſcourſe is none of S. *Chryſoſtom*'s, the ſtyle, elocution, and the very thoughts, are quite different from his.

The Twelfth is upon the Title of the *Acts* of the Apoſtles: where after a Diſcourſe, concerning the Eſtabliſhment and Perpetuity of the Church, which could neither be ſhaken nor ruined by the ſevereſt Perſecutions; he ſhews, that a Chriſtian Life, and good Works, are more to be valued, than the Gift of working Miracles; he ends with a Commendation of the Biſhop of *Antioch*, whom he calls the Succeſſor of S. *Peter*. *For, ſaith he, it is one of the Prerogatives of our City*

City is to have had for our Maſter S. Peter *the firſt of the Apoſtles. It was juſt, that that City, which had the advantage of bearing firſt the Name of a Chriſtian City, ſhould have for her Biſhop the firſt of the Apoſtles: But having enjoy'd that happineſs, we would not ingroſs it to our ſelves, but conſented he ſhould go to* Rome, *the Imperial City: Yet in giving, we have not loſt him, we have him ſtill; we have not his Body, but his Faith; and having S.* Peter's *Faith, we may truly ſay, we have S.* Peter *himſelf.* S. John Chryſoſtom.

He juſtifies himſelf in the Thirteenth for the length of his Prefaces; he ſhews there the Uſefulneſs of Reproof, and treats of the Converſion of S. *Paul*, and of the changing of his Name, and reproves them that neglect to labour in their own converſion, under pretence that God will convert them. *God*, ſaith he, *forceth no man; he draweth only them that are willing to go to him; he is willing to ſave us; but that is, if we be willing to be ſaved.*

The Fourteenth is upon theſe words of S. *Paul*, *Rom.* c. 5. v. 3. *Rejoycing in tribulations.* Here he ſhews what is the fruit of afflictions, and of perſecutions.

The ſame Subject is handled in the following diſcourſe, upon theſe words of the ſame Apoſtle: *All things work together for good to them that love God.*

The Preface of the Sixteenth is againſt ſuch as frequent not the Aſſemblies of the Faithfull in Churches; and then he expounds theſe words of the Apoſtle, *If thine enemy hunger, feed him*; exhorting Men to forgive injuries.

In the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Sermons he makes many very uſefull reflections upon theſe words of S. *Paul*, *Salute Aquila and Priſcilla.* In theſe diſcourſes we have an example, juſtifying how many Moral Thoughts may be ſuggeſted by a ſubject which of it ſelf ſeems dry and barren. For what is there more ſimple in appearance, and of leſs inſtruction, than this Salutation of S. *Paul?* Yet by a wonderfull Art S. *Chryſoſtom* makes uſe of it for the explanation of many important inſtructions. As about the reſpect we ought to have for the Poor, Charity towards our Brethren, the ſmall regard that is to be had to Nobility, the profit of working with our own hands, and the reverence due to Church-men, *&c.*

The Nineteenth and Twentieth Sermons are about what S. *Paul* ſaith of Marriage in 1 *Cor.* c. 7. from which he takes occaſion to ſpeak againſt Dancing, Feaſting, and other profane Pomps of Weddings. He teaches what ought to be the end of Marriage among Chriſtians, and how it is to be uſed. " *Marriage*, ſaith he, *is a remedy againſt Fornication, let us not therefore diſhonour* " *it by filthy Pomps.* Chriſtians ought to baniſh from their Weddings deviliſh Pomps, filthy " Songs, laſcivious Conſorts, undecent Dancings, obſcene Words, Riots, exceſſive Laughter; and " they ought to introduce the Servants of Jeſus Chriſt, and his Prieſts; to have Jeſus Chriſt in " Perſon in the midſt of them, as of the Marriage in *Cana*. Let no man tell me it is the cuſtom; " do not tell me of a cuſtom, if it is ſinfull. If the thing be Evil in it ſelf, how old ſoever the " uſe of it be, retrench it: If it be Good, and not uſual, bring it in. But know that this cuſtom " is not ancient, but an Innovation. Remember the Marriage of *Iſaac* with *Rebecca*, of *Rachel* " with *Jacob*; the Scripture tells us how thoſe Weddings were kept; it ſhews indeed, that there " was a Feaſt more ſplendid than ordinary; that the Relations and Neighbours were invited, " but there were no Fiddles, no Dancing, nor any other ſhamefull Exceſſes of our Age. Now " at Weddings ſuch laſcivious Songs are ſung, as teach Adultery, and inſpire fooliſh Love; the " Gueſts full of Wine do attend the Bride with impure Diſcourſes. With what reaſon can you " pretend to require Chaſtity in a Woman, whom you have taught from the very Firſt day to " be impudent, and before whom you ſuffer that to be ſaid and done, which your Foot-men " would bluſh to doe or hear? To what purpoſe do ye bring in a Prieſt to crave a bleſſing, and " the next day your ſelves commit baſe actions? In the ſame Homily there are a great many Exhortations of the ſame nature againſt ſuch diſorders, which are not leſs frequent in our days, than they were in the time of this Biſhop. Afterwards he adviſeth both Men and Women to behave themſelves holily in Marriage; and not only to avoid Adultery, but not ſo much as give an occaſion of ſuſpicion: He proves that Second Marriages are not forbidden, though it is better to forbear, and concludes with a ſenſible Declamation againſt Adultery and Fornication.

The Twenty-firſt is upon theſe words, 1 *Cor.* c. 10. *Our Fathers were all under the cloud*, &c. After a large Expoſition of which words, he ſpeaks of Alms-deeds, and of the neceſſary Diſpoſitions to communicate worthily.

The Twenty-ſecond is upon theſe words of S. *Paul. There muſt be Hereſies.* He commends the Old *Agapæ*, or Feaſts of Charity.

The Twenty-third is of Alms-deeds, and the care which Men ought to have of ſuch as are in want. This ſhould be placed among the Sermons of Morality.

The Twenty-fourth is upon theſe words, 2 *Cor.* c. 4. *Having the ſame Spirit of Faith*, &c. He gives great Praiſes to Virginity, and to a Monaſtick life; which he deſcribes in theſe words: " Doe you not take notice of thoſe Monks who live privately, and dwell upon the tops of Moun- " tains? What Auſterities and Mortifications doe they not practiſe? They are covered with Aſhes, " cloathed with Sackcloth, loaden with Chains and Irons, ſhut up in little Cells, ſtruggling con- " tinually with Hunger, they ſpend their time in Watchings to blot out part of their Sins. He obſerves alſo, that though Virginity is a ſuper-natural Gift, yet it is unprofitable if it be not accompanied with Charity and Meekneſs.

S. *John Chryſoſtom.*

The Twenty-fifth is upon the ſame Text; he oppoſes the *Manichees*, and exhorts them to give Alms.

The Twenty-ſixth upon the ſame words, preſſes the Duty of Alms-giving.

The Twenty-ſeventh is upon theſe words, 2 *Cor. Bear a little with my folly.* He lays down Rules very judicious, both at what time and upon what occaſions a Man may commend himſelf.

The Twenty-eighth reproves them who abuſe what S. *Paul* ſaith, *Phil.* c. 1. v. 18. *What matters it how Chriſt is preached?* His Diſcourſe is about Prayer and Humility.

In the Twenty-ninth he treats of the Marriage of Chriſtians, and of the Duties of thoſe that are Married.

The Thirtieth is upon theſe words, 1 *Theſſ.* c. 4. v. 13. *But I would not have you to be ignorant, Brethren, concerning them which are aſleep, that ye ſorrow not even as others which have no hope.* He diſcourſes of the way how Chriſtians ſhould bear with the Death of Relations, and confirms what he ſays by the Examples of *Job* and of *Iſaac*.

The Thirty-firſt is concerning the Duty of Widows, on theſe words, 1 *Tim.* c. 5. v. 9. *Let not a Widow be choſen of leſs than Sixty years.* He there diſcourſes of Children's Education.

The following Sermons have leſs relation to Texts of Scripture, being, for the moſt part, upon ſolemn Feſtival-days.

The Thirty-ſecond is about *Judas*'s Treaſon, where he ſpeaks of the neceſſary Diſpoſitions to communicate worthily.

The Thirty-third concerns the Feſtival of *Chriſtmas*, which was celebrated for Ten years before in the *Eaſt* upon the 25th of *December*, as it had been before at *Rome*. S. *Chryſoſtom* proves by ſeveral reaſons, that this was exactly the day of Jeſus Chriſt's Nativity.

The Thirty-fourth and Thirty-fifth are upon the Paſſion of Jeſus Chriſt: In the latter he ſpeaks of forgiving Enemies upon occaſion of the good Thief.

The Thirty-ſixth is upon the Reſurrection from the Dead.

The Thirty-ſeventh is a Sermon upon the Reſurrection of Jeſus Chriſt, preached upon *Eaſter*-day.

The Thirty-eighth upon the Aſcenſion, was preached in a Church of Martyrs.

The Thirty-ninth and Fortieth Sermons are upon *Whit-ſunday*. In the former he anſwers that curious Queſtion, *Why Miracles are not wrought now, as they were in the time of the Apoſtles?*

The Forty-firſt is of the Dignity of the Euchariſt, and the reſpect we ought to ſhew to the holy Myſteries. This diſcourſe ſeems to me to be neither of the Style nor the Order of S. *Chryſoſtom.*

The Seven following Sermons being Panegyricks upon S. *Paul*, were tranſlated by *Anianus*, who lived in *Athalaricus* his time.

The Forty-ninth is of Meekneſs.

The Fiftieth upon the Converſion of S. *Paul*, was preached at *Antioch* after that upon the Title of the *Acts*.

The Fifty-firſt is upon the Inſcription in the Temple of *Athens*, *To the unknown God*, ſpoken of *Acts*, c. 17. v. 17.

The Fifty-ſecond is upon the beginning of the Firſt Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*: *Paul called an Apoſtle*, &c.

The Fifty-third ſhews the Profitableneſs of Reading the holy Scripture. It is dedicated to perſons newly baptized; there he extolls the Quality of an Apoſtle. It is one of the Four upon the beginning of the *Acts*, preached at *Antioch* before *Flavianus*.

The Fifty-fourth of Chriſt's Prayers and Qualities, is the Firſt Sermon upon the Incarnation.

The Fifty-fifth is againſt thoſe that Faſt at *Eaſter*.

The Fifty-ſixth againſt ſuch as obſerve the Jewiſh Faſts.

In the Fifty-ſeventh he ſpeaks of Alms-deeds, upon occaſion of the Hoſpitality practiſed towards the Prophet *Elijah*, who was reliev'd by the Widow of *Sarepta*.

The Fifty-eighth of the Pleaſures of the Life to come, and of the Vanity of this World's goods.

The Fifty-ninth is againſt thoſe that deſpair, when they receive not what they ask of God, or who petition for unjuſt things; he there occaſionally ſpeaks of the Duty of Husbands towards their Wives.

In the Sixtieth he compares Riches with Poverty; treats of the manner how Sinners are to be reproved, and blames thoſe who call upon God againſt their Enemies.

The Sixty-firſt begins with an Exclamation againſt thoſe that communicate unworthily: He ſhews that a Preacher is not to preach God's Word with complaiſance, but to reprove Vice with fervency, becauſe this is profitable for Sinners to make them know and confeſs their Sins.

The Sixty-ſecond concerns Martyrs; there he proves, That the beſt way of honouring Martyrs, is to imitate their Vertues.

The Sixty-third is againſt thoſe who teach, That *Daemons* govern the affairs of this World, and againſt ſuch as doe not endure with patience the Chaſtenings of God; and, laſtly, againſt thoſe who are ſcandalized at the proſperity of the Wicked, and the misfortune of the Righteous.

In

In the Sixty-fourth he treats of S. *Paul*'s action in reſiſting S. *Peter*; and endeavours to prove, that both did it by agreement for the inſtruction of the Faithfull.

S. *John Chryſoſtom.*

The Sixty-fifth is a Diſcourſe, or rather a Treatiſe againſt *Jews* and *Gentiles*, to prove the Divinity of Jeſus Chriſt.

The Sixty-ſixth is another Treatiſe againſt thoſe who were offended, becauſe of the miſchiefs that happened to the City, and the perſecution of the Prieſts, and of the Faithfull. It is an excellent Explanation of that hard Queſtion, *Why there is ſo much evil in the World, if the Providence of God governs it?* Both theſe Pieces ſhould be put among S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Treatiſes.

The Sixty-ſeventh is an Homily concerning the Two Paralyticks of the Goſpel: There he proves the Divinity of the Son of God.

The Preface to the Sixty-ſeventh is about the Uſe that Men are to make of Sermons preached in the Church. He gives a reaſon why the Acts of the Apoſtles are read in the Church at *Whitſuntide*. Laſtly, he ſhews that the Miracles of the Apoſtles proved the Certainty of Chriſt's Reſurrection, and rendred it more famous. This Sermon follows that which he made upon the Title of the Acts.

In the Sixty-eighth, having reproved thoſe who complained that his Sermons were either too long or too ſhort, he gives a reaſon of altering S. *Paul*'s Name, and that of *Abraham*, and of the Signification of that of *Adam*.

The Sixty-ninth Sermon was preached at *Antioch*, in the abſence of the Biſhop. He commends the Martyrs, and treats of Contrition of Heart, and of Alms-deeds.

The Seventieth is upon the Feaſt of S. *Baſſus* Biſhop and Martyr, upon an Earthquake that happened at *Antioch*, and upon the Words of Jeſus Chriſt, *Matthew*, c. 11. v. 29. *Learn of me, for I am meek and lowly of heart.*

The Seventy-firſt is a Panegyrick upon S. *Droſis*.

The Seventy-ſecond is a Sermon of Penance, mention'd in the Ninth Homily of Penance.

All theſe Sermons now mention'd were preached at *Antioch* by S. *Chryſoſtom*, when he was Prieſt of that Church. There are but two more in this Volume preached at *Conſtantinople*; the firſt was after the expulſion of *Gainas* from the City; and the other was after S. *Chryſoſtom*'s return from his firſt Exile.

At the latter end of the Fourth Volume there are Three Sermons of the ſame. The Firſt was preached at *Antioch* by S. *Chryſoſtom* immediately after his being made Prieſt. This Sermon is a Panegyrick upon *Flavianus*, who Ordained him. It is the Firſt that S. *Chryſoſtom* ever preached. The Two others in the ſame place were preached towards the latter end of his Life: The Firſt at the time when they contrived his Depoſition and former Baniſhment; the Second after he was recalled: In it there is an excellent Compariſon of *Sarah* ſeized upon by the King of *Egypt*, and of the Church of *Conſtantinople*, deprived of his preſence, by the Caballings of *Theophilus* an *Egyptian* Biſhop; and a dextrous Commendation of the Empreſs *Endoxia*.

The firſt Volume contains ſeveral other Sermons, preached for the moſt part at *Antioch*: The firſt Twenty-one are called *Sermons of Statues*; becauſe they were preached at the time, and upon the occaſion of a ſedition in *Antioch*, in the beginning of the Year 388, wherein the People had thrown down and dragged about Streets the Statues of *Theodoſius*, and of the Empreſs *Flaccilla*.

The firſt Sermon is upon theſe words of S. *Paul* to *Timothy*; *Uſe a little Wine for thy Stomach's ſake, and often Infirmities*, wherein he alledgeth ſeveral reaſons, why God permits his Saints to be afflicted; he preached it ſometime before that Tumult, which obliged him to diſcontinue his preaching. But the heat of that ſedition was no ſooner over, and the People of *Antioch*, aſtoniſhed with the fearfull Threatnings of the Emperour, had acknowledged their fault, and turned their fury into Mourning; but he reſumed the Chair for the comfort of that deſolate People: And *Flavianus* their Biſhop as a good Father, went to the Emperour to aſſwage his Anger.

The firſt Sermon of S. *Chryſoſtom* upon this Subject, is that which is called the ſecond *of Statues*: There he bewails the Unhappineſs of that City, exhorting the Inhabitants to implore the Mercy of God by fervent Prayers, and turn away his Wrath by good Works, to prevent the Danger that threatned them. This Diſcourſe is very eloquent: Here are ſome Fragments whereby one may judge of the reſt. "What ſhall I ſay? What ſhall I ſpeak of? Our preſent Con-
"dition calls for Tears rather than Words, Lamentations rather than Diſcourſes, and Prayers
"rather than Sermons. The blackneſs of our Action is ſo great, the Wound we have given to
"our ſelves is ſo deep, and ſo hard to be cured, that we have need to apply our ſelves to an Al-
"mighty Phyſician. Then having compared the Miſery of that City to that of *Job*, he adds,
"Seven Days have I kept ſilence, as formerly did *Job*'s Friends: Give me leave to open my
"Mouth, and bewail our Miſery. —I groan, I weep, not for the ſeverity of the Threatnings,
"but for the exceſs of our Folly: For though the Emperour were not angry with us, and
"ſhould forbear to puniſh us, how ſhould we ſuffer the ſhame of our Action? After this, he deſcribes very elegantly the Happineſs which that City enjoyed before that Mutiny, and the Miſery it was now reduced to; and concludes this Deſcription with theſe Words. "The great City
"of *Antioch* is in danger of being utterly deſtroyed; ſhe that lately had an infinite Number of
"Inhabitants, will ſhortly prove a Wilderneſs; none in this World can help her: For the of-

"fended

S. *John Chryſoſtom.*

" ſended Emperour hath no equal upon Earth, he is the Sovereign and the Maſter of all Men. " All we can do is to make our Application to the King of Heaven; let us addreſs our ſelves to " him, and call upon him for help. If we obtain not Mercy from Heaven, we have no re- " miſſion to hope for. He obſerves, that God permitted that Miſchief, to puniſh the People for their Blaſphemies, and teaches rich Men what uſe they are to make of their Riches.

The next Sermon was preached when *Flavianus* was gone to Court to ſollicite the Buſineſs of the City of *Antioch:* There he repreſents the Charity of *Flavianus*, who would undertake that Journey: He tells them the things that the Biſhop was to repreſent to the Emperour, and bids them hope that theſe Remonſtrances will be heard, affirming that he is confident of all through God's Mercy. " God, ſays he, will ſtand betwixt the petitioning Biſhop, and the Emperour " addreſſed to; he will ſoften the King's Heart, and put in the Biſhop's Mouth the Words which " he ſhould ſpeak. He intreats the People to pray earneſtly, that God would mollifie the Spirit of the Emperour. He ſpeaks of faſting in *Lent*, affirming that right faſting is to abſtain from Sin. At laſt he adviſes the People to avoid three Vices, *Evil ſpeaking*, *hatred of their Neighbour*, and *Blaſphemy*.

He goes on to inſtruct and comfort the People of *Antioch*, in the following Sermons. In the 4th he praiſes God, that the Chriſtian's Affliction in the City of *Antioch*, had put them upon thoughts of their Salvation, and exhorts them to Patience: And in the laſt place, inveigheth againſt Swearing, and promiſes to ſpeak of it all the Week. This Sermon was preached upon *Munday* of the Firſt week in *Lent*.

Next day he continued the ſame Subject, encouraging the People of *Antioch* to bear with Conſtancy and Generoſity all the Threatnings againſt them, and not to fear either Death or Sufferings. He ſhews, that Sin is the only thing that Chriſtians ought to fear, and he ſpeaks again eagerly againſt Swearing.

The 6th Sermon was preached the next Day after, for the Conſolation of the People that were intimidated by the Magiſtrate. He giveth God thanks that *Flavianus* was arrived before thoſe that carried the News of the Mutiny. He tells the reaſons that the Biſhop was to uſe to the Emperour, and explains a Law, that was to be urged: He tells them, That Sin only was to be feared, and that Swearing ought to be avoided.

The 7th and 8th were preached upon *Thurſday* and *Friday* of the ſame Week: He comforts the People, and explains the beginning of *Geneſis*, which was then begun to be read in the Churches in *Lent*. He diſcourſes againſt Swearing, and reminds them, that it was the ſixth Day, that he had preached againſt that Sin, and that it ſhould be the laſt time: Which ſhews, that the 15th Sermon followeth this, for there he tells them, that though he had reſolved the Day before to ſpeak no more of God's Command not to ſwear, becauſe he had ſufficiently diſcourſed on that Subject the Days before, yet he found himſelf obliged to inſiſt upon it, till he ſaw them reformed.

The 16th Homily was preached upon *Saturday*, in the ſecond Week in *Lent:* Becauſe, he ſays, at the latter End, behold we have paſſed the ſecond faſting Week. He ſpeaks of the foregoing Sermon, as of his laſt, though it had been preached ſome Days before.

It is very likely, that the 9th and 10th Sermons follow this, and that they were preached before the Judges, ſent by the Emperour, had frighted the People; for S. *Chryſoſtom* ſays nothing there concerning the Deſolation of the City, but handleth ſome Points of Morality, particularly againſt Swearing, and againſt thoſe that refuſed to hear Sermons after Dinner.

The Officers of the Emperour having erected a Chamber of Juſtice at *Antioch*, to puniſh the Town for their ſedition, and to condemn thoſe that were moſt guilty; dreadfull was the Conſternation of the People, which made them think of nothing elſe, but how they might appeaſe the Judges, and mitigate the ſeverity of the Judgment. S. *Chryſoſtom* deſcribes the Day of that Judgment, as the moſt dreadfull thing in the World: He ſays, that all the People expected nothing but Death, ſome fled, others hid themſelves, the Streets were empty; that the reſt of the Inhabitants aſſembled near the Palace-gate, waiting there for their Condemnation: That within the Palace, all was full of Men put to the Torture, or ſentenced to Death: That Mothers wept for their Children, and Siſters for their Brethren: In one word, That the whole City was in a fearfull Deſolation, in expectation of all manner of miſchief. In this ſad Conjuncture of Affairs, the Hermites left their ſolitude to come to *Antioch*, to ſollicite the Judges in behalf of the People; The Clergy alſo attended to move them to Clemency: And every one did his endeavour to work upon them, by all the Tokens of regret and ſubmiſſion, that can be given in ſuch occaſions. The Judges moved with theſe things, and touched eſpecially by the Remonſtrances of the Monks, inclined to Mercy, and contented themſelves to take from *Antioch*, the Quality of *Metropolis* of the *Eaſt*, and to forbid the acting of publick Spectacles for the recreation of the People: Having in the mean time ſent to priſon ſome of the Magiſtrates, and Chief men of the City, till they ſhould know the reſolution of the Emperour. This Judgment was no ſooner pronounced, but S. *Chryſoſtom* opened his Mouth to return God thanks for the Succeſs, as he doth in the 10th, 11th, 12th, and 13th Homilies, which were preached one after another, thoſe ſucceſſive Days after the Judgment. But ſome having again ſtruck a new Terrour into the People, S. *Chryſoſtom* endeavours to ſettle them in the 14th Homily.

The 18th Homily was preached by S. *Chryſoſtom*, after *Mid-Lent*, as he ſaith in the beginning, complaining of ſome who rejoyced, that half the time of faſting was over, and of the Impati-

ence

ence which the Inhabitants of *Antioch* ſhew'd, becauſe they were deprived of their bathings and pleaſures. He takes notice, that they had not been deprived of them above 20 Days.

S. *Chryſoſtom* being fallen ſick, appeared not in ten Days, but was no ſooner able to go abroad, but he began again, and preached the 19th and 21ſt Sermons, that are particularly directed to the People come out of the Country to *Antioch*, about the Feaſt of *Eaſter*.

S. *John Chryſoſtom.*

The 22d was preached towards the end of Lent. He diſcourſeth there of the neceſſary qualifications, to communicate worthily at *Eaſter*; affirming, that it is abſolutely needfull to forget injuries, and to be reconciled; from whence he takes occaſion to ſpeak againſt Enmities and reſentments; he adds threatnings againſt ſuch as had not yet left their Cuſtom of Swearing, notwithſtanding his manifold Exhortations to this purpoſe in the time of Lent.

The laſt Sermon upon the ſame ſubject is the 20th, about the Return of *Flavianus*, who came back to *Antioch* before *Eaſter*, having obtained of the Emperour's Clemency, pardon for the City of *Antioch*. In this Diſcourſe S. *Chryſoſtom* eloquently deſcribes the wonderfull Conduct of *Flavianus*, the Diſcourſe he had with the Emperour, the Anſwers of that Prince, and the rejoycing of the People at *Antioch*, when they received the welcome News of the pardon granted them. This is the true Order of thoſe 22 Sermons of S. *Chryſoſtom*, which is much perverted in the Editions.

The other Homilies in this Volume, are either Sermons upon ſome points of Doctrine, or of morals, or panegyricks upon Saints. The Sermons of the former kind are theſe: ſix Homilies *of the incomprehenſible Nature of God* againſt the *Anomæans*, the laſt whereof was preached at *Conſtantinople*; a Diſcourſe *of the Conſubſtantiality* againſt the *Arians*, quoted by *Theodoret* in the ſixth Council. A Diſcourſe *of the Judgment*, which follows immediately after the laſt. One *againſt thoſe who like the* Pagans, *kept the firſt Days of the Months*, preached upon New-years-day: A Sermon *of Jeſus Chriſt's Baptiſm*; a Diſcourſe *about the Devil's Temptations*; ſix Sermons *againſt the Jews:* The Homilies *of Penance*, which formerly were more in Number, and are now to be reduced into the following Order. The firſt beareth that Title in the firſt Volume; the ſecond and third are loſt, the fourth and fifth are alſo right ſet down in the firſt Volume: We have neither the ſixth nor the ſeventh, except that which is in the 4th Volume be one of theſe two, for it is falſly intituled, *The third Homily of Penitence*, ſeeing he ſays in the beginning, that he had been ſome Days without preaching; whereas it is evident by the beginning of the 4th Homily *of Penance*, that he had preached the four firſt Homilies *of Penance* one after another without interruption. The 9th is the 65 Sermon of the 5th Volume of Penance, and of the ſorrow of King *Ahab*. The 10th Homily is the 9th in the firſt Volume, and the laſt is the eleventh.

The Diſcourſe againſt the *Gentiles*, is not a Sermon, but a Treatiſe which is to be placed amongſt S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Treatiſes: But the Diſcourſe *of Baptiſm*, is a Homily directed to the *Catechumens*.

The Diſcourſe *of Anathema's* is S. *Chryſoſtom*'s, though ſome Criticks have doubted it. It is his Style, and therein he ſpeaks of the Homilies *of the incomprehenſible Nature of God*; and it was quoted near 400 Years ago by *Philotheus*, Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*; as written by S. *Chryſoſtom*. He proveth in that Homily, that an *Anathema* is not lightly to be pronounced againſt any, nor others raſhly to be condemned.

The two Treatiſes *of Prayer*, are probably written by S. *Chryſoſtom:* but the ſix Diſcourſes about Providence, which are in the ſame Volume are none of his, no more than the laſt *of Penance*, and *Continence*, which are ſuppoſed to belong to *John, the Faſter*, Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, who lived long after S. *Chryſoſtom*.

The Firſt of S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Panegyricks, is upon S. *Philogonius* Archbiſhop of *Antioch:* the Second upon S. *Babylas*, likewiſe Archbiſhop of *Antioch:* the Third upon *Maximus* and *Juventinus* Martyrs, who ſuffered Martyrdom under *Julian* the Apoſtate. Theſe two Sermons were preached one after the other upon the 24th, and the 26th of *January*, after the Three firſt Homilies of *Lazarus*, as is noted in the Fourth. The Third is of S. *Pelagia* a Virgin of *Antioch*, who threw her ſelf headlong rather than loſe her Virginity. The Fourth of S. *Ignatius* Biſhop of *Antioch*. The Fifth of S. *Romanus* Martyr of *Antioch*. The Sixth is a Diſcourſe to the Praiſe of the Seven *Macchabees*. The Seventh is a Panegyrick upon S. *Meletius*. The Eighth of S. *Lucianus* Martyr of *Antioch*, preached the next Day after the Feaſt of Chriſt's Baptiſm. The Ninth upon S. *Julianus*. The Tenth is a ſecond Diſcourſe upon S. *Romanus* the Martyr. The Eleventh is a ſecond Diſcourſe of the *Macchabees*. The Twelfth is a third Diſcourſe upon the ſame Subject. The Thirteenth is of S. *Domnina*, and of her two Daughters, *Berenice* and *Proſdoce*, who choſe a voluntary Death before the Violation of their Virginity. The Fourteenth of S. *Euſtachius* Biſhop of *Antioch*. The Fifteenth is a Diſcourſe of *Helias* and S. *Peter*. The Sixteenth is of the *Egyptian* Martyrs. The Seventeenth upon S. *Barlaam* Martyr in *Caſarea* in *Cappadocia*. The Panegyrick upon the Martyr *Phocas*, and the Fragment of that of S. *Thecla*, which is in the ſame Volume, are not of S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Style: But the Diſcourſe upon all the holy Martyrs, is an excellent Sermon worthy of S. *Chryſoſtom*. Among the reſt, this is one of the fineſt Paſſages there. " The Devil, ſays he, has introduced Death into the World, and " God makes uſe of Death to introduce us into Heaven by Martyrdom. Martyrdom is a Com- " bat, the Martyrs are on the one Side, and Tyrants on the other: The Tyrants are armed, and

S. *John Chryſoſtom.*

" the Martyrs naked: Yet they that are naked get the Victory, and they that bear Arms are " vanquiſhed. What Wonder is this? He that is beaten proves Victor over him that beats him: " He that is bound overcomes him that is at liberty: He that is burnt tames him that burns " him; and he that dies ſurmounts him that puts him to Death. It is Grace that works theſe " Miracles, they are above the ſtrength of Nature.

The ſixth Volume of the Greek and Latin Edition of *Paris* contains ſeveral Sermons, which *Fronto Ducæus*, and other Criticks, have judged not to be of S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Style. *Fronto Ducæus* paſſes this Judgment upon it: " We have collected in this ſixth Volume ſome Sermons " which are not upon whole Books of Scripture, but upon ſome places, written in a Style " differing from that of S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Works; for theſe Diſcourſes are Dramatical and full of " *Proſopopœia's*, the Style is ſententious and conciſe, with frequent Allegories; and we find not " there thoſe Similitudes and other Beauties ſo frequent in S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Works; and yet the " Authors of theſe Sermons lived either in the Time of S. *Chryſoſtom*, or not long after him. " But we ought not to wonder, that ſome of theſe are quoted under S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Name, in " very ancient Councils; becauſe they were already publiſhed under his Name, and Councils " do not uſually examine narrowly into the Authors of thoſe Books which they quote: Being " contented to debate the Queſtions offered, and to oppoſe to Heretical Errours the Writings re- " ceived in the Church; as did the Apoſtles and other Fathers who quoted Apocryphal Books. That's the Judgment which this Learned Jeſuit makes of the Sermons contained in this Volume; but if we would know whether it is juſt, we muſt examine them ſtrictly one after another.

The Firſt Homily, (the Author whereof ſhews, that there is the ſame Law-giver both of the Old and New Teſtament,) is not S. *Chryſoſtom*'s, though *Photius* quotes it under his Name; for, 1. The Style is quite different from S. *Chryſoſtom*'s: 2. The order and diſpoſition of this Homily differs much from thoſe of S. *Chryſoſtom*. 3. It is full of Allegories, which are very rare in S. *Chryſoſtom*. 4. Moſt of the Thoughts are unworthy of him. 5. There is great Confuſion. 6. It both begins and ends in a different manner from the Homilies of S. *Chryſoſtom*. 7. It is obſerved at the End of that Diſcourſe, that it was written in a Time when the *Roman* Empire was under Oppreſſion. 8. The Bleſſed Virgin is there often called Θεοτόκος; ſo that it is plain, this was not done without Affectation.

The two following Homilies upon two Places of the Beginning of *Geneſis*, are unworthy of S. *Chryſoſtom* for the ſame Reaſons.

The Homily upon theſe Words of *Abraham* to his Servant, *Gen.* 24. v. 2. *Put thine hand under my Thigh*, &c. is more rational than the foregoing, as to its Notions, but the Style is too conciſe and cloſe, and comes not near the eaſineſs of S. *Chryſoſtom*. Yet this Diſcourſe is ancient and worth reading, and I am apt to believe that it may have been written by *Severianus* of *Gabala*, to whom the following Sermon of the brazen Serpent lifted up by *Moſes* in the Wilderneſs, is attributed in the Manuſcripts, and under whoſe Name it is quoted by S. *John Damaſcene*, in the three firſt Diſcourſes about Images, by Pope *Adrian* I. Ch. 26. and by the Aſſembly of Biſhops at *Paris*, in the Year 824. The Author treats of the Trinity, and of the Divinity of the Holy Ghoſt. It appears both by the Style, and by the Beginning, that it is written by the ſame Author as the foregoing.

The four Homilies upon *Job*, are Sermons written by a Monk of the latter Times, who having ſtudied *Iſocrates* his Oration to *Demonicus*, coldly imitates him in his four Diſcourſes, where there is neither Wit, nor Order, nor Eloquence, nor Thought, nor Reaſoning; yet he fooliſhly fanſies that he out-did S. *Chryſoſtom*, in Point of Eloquence, many Bars length.

The fifth Homily upon *Job*, is the 22d of thoſe Homilies, which *Simeon Logotheta* compoſed out of ſeveral Paſſages taken out of S. *Chryſoſtom*.

The Homily upon this Verſe of *Pſalm* 38. *Man diſquieteth himſelf in vain*, comes nearer to S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Style, and yet is not quite the ſame.

The Oration *of the Turtle-Dove*, or *of the Church*, is an impertinent Diſcourſe, like the Treatiſe, intituled, *the Supper*, falſly aſcribed to S. *Cyprian*, from which the Author of this hath taken ſome of his Impertinencies.

The Homily upon the Prophet *Elias* is more valuable, and yet ſeems not to me to be S. *Chryſoſtom*'s. I ſhould rather attribute it to *Severianus* of *Gabala*, as well as the three following, of *Joſeph*, *Suſanna*, and *the three Children in the fiery Furnace*.

The Homily of *Seals* written in the ſame Style with the foregoing, does certainly belong to *Severianus* of *Gabala*, being quoted under his Name by *Theodoret* in the third Dialogue, and by *Adrian* I. The ſame Character and Style may be found in the Sermons *of Faith*, and *of the Law of Nature*; in that *of the Holy Trinity*; in the Diſcourſe *of the Divinity of the Holy Ghoſt*, quoted by *Photius* under S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Name; in the Sermon upon *Pentecoſt*; in the Sermon preached before *Arcadius Theodoſius*'s Son, upon the words of the beginning of S. *John*, *In the beginning was the Word*, &c. in the Sermon *of Circumciſion*, that *of the Remembrance of Martyrs*, and upon Jeſus Chriſt's being Shepherd and Sheep; in that upon theſe words of S. *Paul*, *My grace is ſufficient for thee*; in that of the prodigal Son, of *Herodias*'s Daughters dancing; in that upon the Words of *Matth.* 13. *The Jews being aſſembled took counſel*; in the Sermon of *the Ten Virgins*, the Homily *of the Woman taken in Adultery*, and *of the Phariſees*; in that upon Good-Friday, of the Man that was born blind, and upon theſe words of Jeſus Chriſt, *Matth.* 6. *Take heed*

heed that you do not your Alms before Men to be ſeen of them; in the Sermon *againſt Hypocriſie*; in that *upon the beginning of the Year*; in the Homily *about the barren Fig-tree*; in the Sermon *of the Phariſee's Feaſt*; that *of Lazarus and Dives*; and in that upon the beginning of *Pſalm* 92, which is the 105th in the 5th Volume of S. *Chryſoſtom*, of the *Eton* Edition. The Author of theſe Homilies, writes in a ſhort, conciſe Style; enlarges much upon Dogmatical points, and very little upon Moral ones: What he ſays is intermixt with Allegories: In a word, if one compares theſe Homilies one with another, and with them that are certainly written by *Severianus*, he will find that they are very like. S. *John Chryſoſtom.*

The Homilies of the *Theophany*, and *the Marriage in Cana*, are two inconſiderable Diſcourſes unworthy of S. *Chryſoſtom*.

That *of the evil Woman*, is yet worſe. It was compoſed by ſome modern Greek, who having read in Hiſtory that S. *Chryſoſtom* had made a Diſcourſe againſt Women, made one to repreſent it: In which either he, or ſome body elſe, hath put theſe words in the beginning, that *Sozomen* relateth: Herodias *is mad again, and asketh for* S. John's *Head*. The reſt of this Diſcourſe is a continual Repetition of impertinent things.

The Homily *of the* Canaanitiſh *Woman*, is alſo in Latin among the Homilies upon ſeveral paſſages of the New Teſtament, aſcribed to *Origen*, and in the Collection of Homilies upon S. *Matthew*, Hom. 14th and 17th. But here it is in Greek, and larger. The Doctrine, and Thoughts of this Diſcourſe are rational enough, but the Style is very different from *S. Chryſoſtom*'s.

The Sermons upon *S.* John *the Fore-runner of Jeſus Chriſt*; upon the Apoſtles, *S. Peter and S. Paul*; upon *the Twelve Apoſtles*, *S.* Thomas *the Apoſtle*, and *S. Stephen*; are unworthy of *S. Chryſoſtom*, not only for the Subſtance, but alſo the Style. Yet the laſt of them is ſomething more rational than the foregoing. The Diſcourſe of *S. Thomas* is quoted under *S. Chryſoſtom*'s Name, in the ſixth Council, and in that of *Lateran*, under Pope *Martin* I.

The Homilies *of the Annunciation*, *Theophany*, and *the Reſurrection*, have no Relation to *S. Chryſoſtom*'s Style.

The Sermon *concerning the Woman of* Samaria, is a Diſcourſe, whoſe beginning is quite of another Style than *S. Chryſoſtom*'s: The latter End is taken word for word from the 31ſt. Homily of *S. Chryſoſtom*, upon the Goſpel of *S. John*.

The four Sermons of the Aſcenſion, publiſhed by *Voſſius*, are not unworthy of *S. Chryſoſtom*, though the Style is not altogether the ſame with that of this Father's Works: In all probability, they are part of thoſe Two and Twenty which *Photius* read, which he mentions in the 25th Volume, as well as the Sermon upon the ſame Subject, cited by *Facundus*, l. 11. c. 14.

The Homily which proves, that a Diſciple of Jeſus Chriſt ought never to be angry, does not come near to the Style, or the loftineſs of *S. Chryſoſtom*.

The Sermon of *the falſe Prophets*, is a Declamation made by ſome Greek, rather than a Diſcourſe really preached by *S. Chryſoſtom*, before his Death, as the Title proves.

The Homily *of the publick Games in the Cirque*, is a pitifull Diſcourſe, not worth reading.

The Sermon of Chriſt's Nativity, *Page* 493. is quoted by *S. Cyril*, as *S. Chryſoſtom*'s, in his Treatiſe to the Empreſſes, mentioned in the Council of *Epheſus*; there is no conſiderable difference of Style; which convinces me that it is *S. Chryſoſtom*'s, or at leaſt, that it was taken out of his Works.

The three following Sermons, the Firſt whereof, is upon the Words of *S. Luke*'s Goſpel, *ch.* 2. *Cæſar Auguſtus made a Decree, that all the World ſhould be taxed*, &c. the Second upon the Anſwer given to *Zachariah*, Ch. 1. of *S. Luke*, and the Third upon *S. John*'s Conception, are all written in the ſame Style, very different from *S. Chryſoſtom*'s; they contain abundance of inſipid Obſervations upon the Text of *S. Luke*, which one cannot read without Tediouſneſs and Trouble.

The Homily upon *the Parable of the Houſholder, that hired Work-men into his Vine-yard*, doth much reſemble *S. Chryſoſtom*'s Style; if it be not his, it belongs to ſome ancient eloquent Author, and ought to be placed among thoſe Diſcourſes, which though perhaps not genuine, yet are not to be deſpiſed. Some Fragments of them may be found amongſt the Homilies, which were collected out of the Works of *S. Chryſoſtom*.

I think the ſame Judgment ought to be made concerning the Sermon, or rather the Fragment of the Homily *upon the Publican*, and *the Phariſee*, and of that *about the blind Man*, and *Zacheus*, which are unworthy of *S. Chryſoſtom*.

A Diſcourſe made to prove, that Monks ought not to uſe rallery or freedom of Speech, is of the kind and ſtyle of *S. Chryſoſtom*; there is a digreſſion againſt thoſe that kept Women with them. The Authors of *S. Chryſoſtom*'s Life obſerve, that he wrote ſix Orations upon that Subject. This might perhaps be one of them.

The Panegyrick upon *S. John* the Evangeliſt, is not worth any thing, but is a pitifull Diſcourſe made up of obſolete and ſenſeleſs Words.

The ſecond Homily *of the Holy Croſs*, is written by the Monk *Pantaleon*, Deacon of *Conſtantinople*, who lived in the 13th Century: The firſt Diſcourſe upon the ſame Subject, does not belong to a better Author.

The beginning of the Homily *of S. Peter's Abjuration*, is likewiſe written by ſome modern Greek, who added at the latter End an Exhortation, taken out of *S. Chryſoſtom*'s Diſcourſe upon theſe words of *S. Paul*, *Having the ſame Spirit*, &c.

The

S. *John Chryſoſtom.*

The Homily *of Bread* and *of Alms*, is a Collection of ſeveral Notions of *S. Chryſoſtom*'s upon that Subject.

The Diſcourſe *of Eaſter*, is very like *S. Chryſoſtom*'s Style.

The Sermon about Jeſus Chriſt's ſecond Coming, is a Preface annexed to the moral Exhortations of the 25th, and 31ſt Homilies, upon the Epiſtle to the *Romans*.

There are ſeveral other Sermons in the Greek Edition of *S. Chryſoſtom*, printed at *Eton*, which were not inſerted into the Greek and Latin Edition of *Paris*, as not belonging to *S. Chryſoſtom*, or elſe but Collections out of this Father's Works.

In the 5th Volume, *page* 680, there is one upon theſe words *Pſal.* 92. *Dominus regnavit*, &c. and upon thoſe of *S. Paul*, *When Jeſus Chriſt ſhall have given up the Kingdom to the Father*, wherein he ſpeaks of Baptiſm.

Another in the ſame Volume, *page* 740. of thoſe Women that brought Spices to embalm the Body of Jeſus Chriſt: Wherein the Author proves, that the Evangeliſts do not contradict one another, upon the Subject of Chriſt's Reſurrection: Both theſe Homilies are well enough written, but they are not *S. John Chryſoſtom*'s.

There is a Third in the ſame Volume, *page* 789. upon theſe words of *S. Paul*, *The good that I would, I do not, but the Evil that I would not, I do.* The Author ſhews there, in what Sence *Jacob* was a Type of Chriſt, and declaims againſt publick Shews. This Diſcourſe is full of Allegories contrary to *S. Chryſoſtom*'s Cuſtom: It may be attributed to the Author of the following Diſcourſe on theſe ſame words of the ſame Apoſtle: *My Grace is ſufficient for thee.*

The 123d Homily in the ſame Volume, *pag.* 807. upon theſe words of the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, *When we ſin wilfully, there remains no more Oblation*, is a Collection out of the 20th, 15th, and 14th Homilies of *S. Chryſoſtom*, upon the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*.

The Homily upon the Nativity of Jeſus Chriſt in the ſame Volume, *pag.* 843. where the guardian Angels of Countrys and Provinces are diſcourſed of, is cited by *Photius* under *S. Chryſoſtom*'s Name: Yet the Style ſhews it not to be *S. Chryſoſtom*'s: It is more probable, that it belongs to *Severianus* of *Gabala*.

At the latter End of this Volume are ſeveral other Homilies, yet more unworthy of *S. Chryſoſtom*: *Viz.* the ſecond Panegyrick upon *S. Stephen*, the Homily upon *Palm-Sunday*, *upon the Thief*, *upon Judas his Treaſon*, and many Sermons upon *Eaſter*, &c.

The ſixth Volume is intermixt with ſeveral Homilies, which are only Fragments or Collections, taken out of the genuine Works of *S. Chryſoſtom*, ſuch as theſe following Sermons; *Of Charity*, pag. 742. Of Meekneſs, *pag.* 750. Sermons concerning Faſting, *pag.* 883. A Diſcourſe againſt thoſe that ſlept upon the *Saturday* before *Whitſunday*, pag. 857. That the Salvation of the Soul is to be preferred before the Welfare of the Body, *pag.* 893. That Prieſts ought not to be upbraided with living at Eaſe, *pag.* 896. Three Diſcourſes of Penance, *pag.* 903. That we ought not to weep for the Dead, *pag.* 943. Of Patience, *pag.* 949. Of the Soul's Salvation, *pag.* 961. Againſt thoſe that abuſed Virgins conſecrated to God, *pag.* 971. A Diſcourſe againſt Hereticks, *pag.* 979.

Laſtly, The 7th Volume from *pag.* 271, to 587. contains above a hundred Sermons upon all ſorts of Subjects, whereof ſome are not printed in the Greek and Latin Edition of *Paris*; namely, thoſe that are either unworthy of *S. Chryſoſtom*, impertinent and fooliſh, or diſcourſes of modern Authors, or Collections and Fragments taken out of *S. Chryſoſtom*. The Catalogue and Titles are in the Table of that Volume.

I believe, that moſt of *S. Chryſoſtom*'s Sermons, which *Photius* profeſſes to have read, and which are not, now extant, ought to be placed in the ſame rank. In the 25th Volume of his *Bibliotheca*, he ſpeaks of a Book bearing the Name of *S. Chryſoſtom*, intituled, *Remarks upon the Death of Jeſus Chriſt*: " Which, ſays he, contained two and twenty ſhort Sermons, upon the Death " of Jeſus Chriſt: There were beſides, as he adds, in the ſame Volume, two and twenty Diſcourſes " upon the Aſcenſion, and ſeventeen upon *Whitſunday*. *S. Chryſoſtom* did not uſe to make ſhort Sermons; his are generally long and full; he abounded in words and notions which he could not eaſily contract. Yet *Photius* hath taken no notice, that theſe Diſcourſes were not *S. Chryſoſtom*'s.

But he ſays, in the 274th Volume, *concerning three Diſcourſes of the beheading of S.* John *the Baptiſt*, that their Subject and Method were very different from the other Sermons of this Father, as well as their Style, which was flat, and far from the Elegancy of *S. Chryſoſtom*. The extracts in the ſame place, which he made out of a Diſcourſe, concerning the 40 Martyrs aſcribed to *S. Chryſoſtom*, do prove his Aſſertion.

Among thoſe Homilies, which he abridges in the 277th Vol. there are ſeveral which are rejected, as not being *S. Chryſoſtom*'s (*i*), but *Severianus*'s of *Gabala*, or of ſome other ancient Authors.

(*i*) *There are ſeveral which are rejected as not being S.* Chryſoſtom's.] There are Extracts, out of the Homily *of the Holy Ghoſt*, out of the Diſcourſe upon theſe Words, *Jeſus Chriſt is the laſt*, &c. of the Sermon upon the Incarnation, and the Guardian Angels; of the Treatiſe which proves, that both the Old and the New Teſtament have the ſame Law-giver; of the Diſcourſe upon theſe Words of *S. Paul*, *My Grace is ſufficient for thee*, &c. The Homily of the Holy Ghoſt is in the ſixth Volume of the *Paris* Edition: See the 221ſt, and 222d *page*. The Homily upon the Nativity, and of the Angels, are in the *Eton* Edition, Vol 5. pag. 843. That of the Law-giver in the Old and New Teſtament, is the firſt of the ſixth Volume of the *Paris* Edition: There is alſo in the ſame Volume the Diſcourſe upon thoſe Words of the Apoſtle, *My Grace is ſufficient for thee*; the Sermon upon theſe Words, 2 *Cor.* c. 11. *If any one be in Chriſt, let him be a new Creature*, &c.

But

But one ought not to paſs the ſame Judgment upon thoſe which *Theodoret* quotes in his Dialogues, which are certainly S. *Chryſoſtom*'s, and which are now extant, moſt of them (*k*) at leaſt. S. *John Chryſoſtom.*

Facundus l. 4. c. 2. quotes a Sermon of S. *Chryſoſtom*'s, in Commendation of *Diodorus*, this Diſcourſe was publiſhed both in Greek and Latin, by the Learned *Bigotius*, with the Life of S. *Chryſoſtom*, written by *Palladius:* It is a Thankſgiving of that Saint to *Diodorus* of *Tarſus*, who had publickly commended him. He there confeſſeth, that the Commendations given him by *Diodorus*, did put him to ſome trouble: " For, ſays he, with much humility, great praiſes do " not leſs check the Conſcience than Sins, when a Man finds not in himſelf thoſe Vertues which " are commended by others. After that, he returns upon *Diodorus* the Praiſes which he had given him; and as he was compared with S. *John* Baptiſt, becauſe of his Name; he ſhews that *Diodorus* deſerved that Name better than he, having all the Vertues of that holy Fore-runner of Jeſus Chriſt.

Laſtly, *Cotelierius* in the third Volume of *his Monuments*, hath publiſhed an Homily under S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Name, upon theſe words of *Matt.* 20. *By what Authority doſt thou theſe things?* This Diſcourſe is written by ſome ancient Author, but not S. *Chryſoſtom*; it has his Genius, the reflections are juſt, and the reaſons ſolid: But one does not find that over-flowing Eloquence, nor that abundant fruitfulneſs which was ſo peculiar to S. *Chryſoſtom*, though it is not unworthy of him. There the *Anomæans* are refuted; and he proves, that none ought to pretend to penetrate into Myſteries with humane reaſon; but that we ought to depend upon what the Scripture ſays, without ſearching further.

Theſe are almoſt all the Sermons that are attributed to S. *Chryſoſtom*, which were printed in Greek and Latin. There are ſeveral other Manuſcripts in Libraries, that falſly bear the Name of this great Saint, and which are not only unworthy of him, but alſo are not worth publiſhing. For in my opinion, it is equally prudent to ſuppreſs the ill pieces that are in Libraries, as to publiſh thoſe that are worth it. It is a kind of Theft, to keep in obſcurity from the publick thoſe Monuments that may be uſefull: But it is alſo a great impoſition upon the World, to ſet forth ſuch Books as ſerve for nothing elſe, but to weary the Readers, to increaſe the Number of bad Books, and to fill Libraries with unprofitable Volumes. I wiſh, that as Men prohibit the ſelling of bad Wares, ſo they would forbid publiſhing of bad Books, though they are under the Name of great Men. Had this Law been obſerved in the Common-wealth of Learning, from the beginning of Printing, the World would not have been over-whelmed with infinite Loads of bad Books, which cauſe ſo much Confuſion in all Arts and Sciences, and particularly in Divinity. This may be ſaid by the bye, upon occaſion of the vaſt Number of Sermons, which have been Printed under S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Name. But it is leſs to be wondered at, that the modern Greeks, to advance the worth of their own productions, which of themſelves were of very little value, would raiſe them, by the glorious Name of our Saint. That which is moſt ſurpriſing, is, that Men ſhould have the impudence to give Diſcourſes written by Latin Authors, the Name of a Greek Father. It may ſo happen, that the Original Greek of ſome Book might be loſt, and that nothing might remain but a Verſion, as upon the Sermon of S. *Joſeph*, and *Continency* quoted by S. *Auſtin*, which is in Latin, among the Works of S. *Chryſoſtom:* But it is impoſſible, that Sermons taken out of the Works of Latin Fathers, or which were viſibly compoſed at firſt in Latin, ſhould be written by a Greek Father. As for example, it were ridiculous to ſay, that the Diſcourſe *of Adam and Eve*, which is made up of ſeveral paſſages of S. *Auſtin*, and which contains the 31ſt, and 32d Chapters of *Gennadius* his Book *of Eccleſiaſtical Dogmes:* It were, I ſay, ridiculous to believe that this was ever written by S. *Chryſoſtom:* And that Man is little acquainted with the ſtyle of Authors, that cannot perceive, that the imperfect Commentary upon S. *Matthew*, is written by a Latin Author; and that moſt of the Homilies upon the Old and New Teſtament, whereof we have no Greek Originals, and which are found in the Latin Editions of S. *Chryſoſtom*, mixt with his own proper Works, were compoſed originally in Latin and not in Greek. Theſe are, the ſecond Homily upon *Geneſis*, and thoſe that follow, to the 16th, from *pag.* 206. of the laſt Edition, at *Lyons*, to *pag.* 222. Eight Sermons upon ſeveral Hiſtories of the Books of *Kings*, from *pag.* 243. to *pag.* 250. Five Homilies upon *Job*, pag. 261, *&c.*

(*k*) *But one ought not to paſs the ſame Judgment upon thoſe which* Theodoret *quotes in his Dialogues, which are certainly S.* Chryſoſtom's, *and which are now extant moſt of them.*] He quotes a Diſcourſe preached by S. *Chryſoſtom*, after the Speech of the *Gothick* Ambaſſidour, which is not found among S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Diſcourſes. The ſecond paſſage which he quotes in the firſt Dialogue, is taken out of the Homily of the Nativity, *Vol.* I. *pag.* 426. The Homily which *Theodoret* cites, under this Title, *Adogmatical Homily, ſhewing that which is ſaid of Jeſus Chriſt, ſeems unworthy of the Power, and of the Divinity*, is that which is entituled, *Of Conſubſtantiality*, which is in the firſt Volume, *pag.* 360. The place which he quotes out of the Commentary upon *Pſal.* 41. is not in that which is now extant: I have not found the Homily of the Confuſion of Languages, nor the Paſſage taken out of the Homily, preached in the great Church. The Homilies againſt thoſe who affirm, that *Dæmons* govern the things of this World, againſt thoſe that faſt upon *Eaſter-day*, and the Homily of Chriſt's Aſſumption, are among thoſe that we have; as well as the Paſſages taken out of *Theodoret*'s Commentaries upon the Epiſtle to the *Epheſians*, upon the Goſpel of S. *John*, and that of S. *Matthew*.

S. *John Chryſoſtom.*

Two other Homilies, *pag.* 267. Two Prefaces upon the *Pſalms*, pag. 269, and 270. A Diſcourſe upon the Uſefulneſs of the *Pſalms*, pag. 272. Homilies upon *Pſalms*, 9th, 14th, 22d, 24th, 25th, 26th, 29th, 33d, 37th, 38th, 39th, 40th, 42d, 68th, 71ſt, 84th, 90th, 93d, 95th, 96th, 121ſt, 122d. A Sermon upon theſe Words, *Wiſdom*, Chap. 3. *They ſeem dead in the Eyes of Fools, and of Men without Senſe.* Four Homilies upon four places of *Iſaiah*, pag. 598th, 613th, and 614th. An Homily upon *Jeremiah*, pag. 616th. A Sermon of the three Children, *pag.* 617th. One of *Suſanna*, ibid. and one upon *Zach.* Chap. 6. pag. 619. Almoſt all theſe Diſcourſes have the ſtyle of the Latin Preachers, they are full of Sentences, Antitheſes, Figures, and playing upon Words (*l*), which are uſual in Latin Authors. One neither meets with the Eloquence, nor the Copiouſneſs, nor Fruitfulneſs, nor Sublimity of the Expreſſions of S. *Chryſoſtom*, and the method is quite different from his (*m*): In a word, the matters there treated of are not ſuch as S. *Chryſoſtom* uſes to diſcourſe of (*n*).

We cannot judge otherwiſe of the greateſt part of thoſe Homilies upon ſeveral paſſages of the four Goſpels which are not in the Greek, *viz.* the 27 Homilies upon S. *Matthew*, in the ſecond Volume of the *Lyons* Edition, *pag.* 465, &c. to 502. Of the 14 Homilies upon S. *Mark*, from *pag.* 503, to *pag.* 519. Of ſix Homilies upon S. *Luke*, from *pag.* 519, to *pag.* 529. Of that upon *Zacchæus*, pag. 551. and of 13 Homilies upon S. *John*, from *pag.* 164, to *pag.* 172. All theſe Homilies are either Sermons of Latin Authors, whereof ſome are among thoſe of S. *Chryſologus* (*o*), or extracts from the imperfect Commentary upon S. *Matthew*, or Verſions of ſome paſſages of S. *Chryſoſtom*, collected and ſtitched up together.

The 59 laſt Homilies *upon the Statues*, which are in the fifth Volume of the Edition of *Lyons*, from *pag.* 75, to *pag.* 188. are of this laſt ſort as well as ſeveral other Homilies upon different Subjects, from *pag.* 287, to *pag.* 298, and from *pag.* 312, to *pag.* 335. Three Sermons of Penance and Confeſſion, and ſome Sermons of Faſting, and Alms-deeds, from *pag.* 361, to *pag.* 376. And laſtly, common places upon Providence, Riches, Blaſphemies, Debaucheries, and Pleaſures, and upon ſome other matters of Morality which are in the ſame Volume, from *pag.* 582, to *pag.* 601.

The imperfect Commentary upon S. *Matthew* (*p*), divided into 54 Homilies, is undoubtedly written by a Latin Author, who quotes the old Latin vulgar Verſion, and cites Apocryphal Books. There are alſo erroneous Notions, and contrary to S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Doctrine.

(*l*) *Almoſt all theſe Diſcourſes have the Style of the Latin Preachers*, &c.] They are full of alluſions to words, of rhiming Sentences, as *Pſal.* 33. *Eja fratres mei, hic modo reſpondere volo; quanti modo dicunt; nolo, qui jam dicebant, volo.* To this may be added, this fine Notion. *Oracula ſanctæ lectionis, quæ ſonant in auribus veſtris, nidum faciant in cordibus veſtris.* One may find alſo Explications of Latin and Greek Terms, as upon *Pſal.* 90. *Meridies dicitur, quia dividit diem; meros enim pars eſt diviſæ diei.* And upon *Pſal.* 118. *Veritas tres ſunt ſyllabæ & ſeptem literæ, quia in ſeptima die Deus requievit ab operibus ſuis.* There are ſeveral ſuch paſſages which juſtify their Author to be a Latin. The ſtyle is ſententious, conciſe, and full of Antitheſes, and ſtrokes of Wit, which are ordinary faults in the Latin Preachers, to which S. *Chryſoſtom* was never liable.

(*m*) *The method is quite different from his.*] St. *Chryſoſtom* divides his Diſcourſes into three Parts. The firſt is a Preface: The ſecond an Expoſition of one or more places of Scripture: And the third a moral Exhortation. This Diviſion may always be obſerved, in S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Sermons. Theſe have nothing like, they have neither Preface, nor moral Exhortation, neither do they conclude with the Doxology. The Author divides the Scripture into Verſes, and cites Latin Authors, as S. *Cyprian* and *Hippolytus*; which S. *Chryſoſtom* never did.

(*n*) *In a word, the matters treated of, are not ſuch as S.* Chryſoſtom *uſes to diſcourſe of.*] St. *Chryſoſtom* always handleth Points of Morality, or common Doctrine; he never inſiſts upon thorny and hard Queſtions, but avoiding them carefully, he expounds the Letter of the Scripture, and that in a plain way. The Author of theſe Sermons doth the quite contrary, he fills them with common places, upon Original Sin, Predeſtination, Grace, and hardning of the Heart, *&c.* Queſtions which S. *Chryſoſtom* never meddled with. This Author ſeeks for the allegorical and myſtical Sence, and takes little notice of the literal. In ſhort, nothing can be imagined more unlike to S. *Chryſoſtom*'s way of writing, than the Sermons here examined.

(*o*) *All theſe Homilies are either Sermons of Latin Authors, whereof ſome are among thoſe of* S. Chryſologus.] The 13th, and 16th, are amongſt thoſe attributed to S. *Chryſologus*: The 17th is among thoſe that are attributed to *Origen*; the 6th is taken out of the 15th Homily of S. *Chryſoſtom*, upon S. *Matthew*. The 21ſt and 22d, are part of the 32d and 33d Homilies of the imperfect Work upon S. *Matthew*: The 25th is taken out of the 37th Homily of the ſame. The 27th and 28th, out of the 40th Homily. The Commentary upon S. *Mark*, is written by ſome ignorant Monk.

(*p*) *The imperfect Commentary upon* S. Matthew, *&c.*] The Author of this Treatiſe cites the Scripture according to the vulgar Verſion, he quotes Apocryphal Books, as that of *Seth*, *Ezechias*, and the Itinerary of S. *Clement*. He has heretical Notions concerning the Trinity, as in the 49th Homily, where he calls the Catholicks *Homoouſian* Hereticks. In the 7th Homily, he rejects the Baptiſm of Hereticks. In the firſt Homily he ſpeaks ill of Marriage; and condemns ſecond Marriages, Homily 32d. *Sixtus Senenſis* pretends that theſe Errours, and eſpecially thoſe that concern the Trinity, have been added ſince, becauſe they are not in ſome ancient Manuſcripts, and alſo becauſe in ſome places, he teaches the Divinity of the Son. However, he confeſſes with all the Criticks, that it is not S. *Chryſoſtom*'s, but a Latin Authors: There are ſome ſhort Commentaries upon S. *Mark*, S. *Luke* and S. *Matthew* aſcribed to S. *Chryſoſtom*, and printed at *Paris* 1576. which bear S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Name, but are none of his.

The

The Latin Sermon ſuppoſed to have been preached by S. *Chryſoſtom*, after his Return from *Aſia*, is written by one that deſigned to exerciſe himſelf; as alſo the Diſcourſes of S. *Chryſoſtom*, and *Severianus* upon their reconciliation, which are at the latter End of the 7th Volume of the *Eton* Edition, and of the ſecond of that of *Paris*. They rather belong to ſome Rhetorician, who deſired to be thought eloquent, than Sermons written in earneſt. S. *John Chryſoſtom.*

And now we are come to the Books which S. *Chryſoſtom* writ in his Study, which are almoſt all collected in the 4th Volume. The firſt and moſt excellent are the ſix Books *of the Prieſthood*, which, according to *Suidas*'s Obſervation, exceed all the other Books of S. *Chryſoſtom*, both for Elevation of Style, Beauty of Elocution, and Sweetneſs and Elegance in the Choice of his Words: " S. *Iſiodore Peluſiota* obſerves, in the 156th Letter of his firſt Book, that " all thoſe that read that Book reap a conſiderable Advantage from it, ſeeing that on the one " ſide this Book repreſents the Prieſthood as an Eminent Dignity, not to be approached unto, " but with much reſpect: And on the other ſide, it teaches Men to enter into it with great " purity and innocence. It is compoſed with ſo much ſubtilty, diſcretion, and exactneſs, that " as they who perform as they ought the Duties of the Prieſthood, do find there a Picture of " their Vertues; ſo they who negligently go about the functions of their ſacred Miniſtry, can- " not but diſcover there the repreſentation of their Vices and Sins. And indeed there is not any one Book in all Antiquity, that ſpeaks more nobly concerning the Honour and Functions of the Prieſthood. It is in form of a Dialogue between his friend *Baſil*, and himſelf, and divided into ſix Books. The firſt is a kind of Preface, in which, having ſpoken firſt of the intimate Friendſhip that was betwixt S. *Baſil*, and him, and of the Deſign they had to embrace a retired Life; he relates, that when it was noiſed abroad, that they would make both *Baſil* and him Biſhops, he did not diſcover to *Baſil* his reſolution to retire, and that having hid himſelf at the time of the Election, *Baſil* was choſen and conſecrated Biſhop. On this occaſion, *Baſil* is introduced complaining of that Deceit, and accuſing him of refuſing the Biſhoprick out of Vanity.

S. *Chryſoſtom* juſtifies himſelf from the injury that *Baſil* pretended to have received of him, by ſhewing that there are innocent Cheats, which are cauſes of much good. He proves in the ſecond Book, that he had deceived him to his own advantage, by giving him an opportunity of exerciſing his love to Jeſus Chriſt after a moſt excellent manner, in feeding his Sheep. Afterwards he diſcourſes of the Vertue, and Wiſdom, which that Office required, proving how great the Charge of Paſtours is by the great difficulty of healing Souls fallen ſick, either by the Contagion of Vice, or by Errours in Faith. *Baſil* interrupting him there, and telling him, that therefore he was to blame, for avoiding the Cure of Souls, ſince it was the beſt way to juſtifie his love of Jeſus Chriſt; he anſwers, That he did it, becauſe he thought himſelf unworthy of it; but on the contrary, that *Baſil* was very capable of it. And then to excuſe himſelf towards thoſe, who thought, that by his refuſal he had offended them that had choſen him; he anſwers in the firſt place, That none ought to be afraid of offending Men, when they cannot any other ways avoid it, but by offending God: 2. He ſhews, that he was ſo far from diſgracing them by his Denial, that he pretended on the contrary, that he obliged them very much, by not expoſing them to the reproaches to which they might otherwiſe have been ſubject, and the falſe reports which might have been raiſed againſt them. " Is it not certain, ſays he, that had I accepted the " Biſhoprick, then thoſe that love to caluminate might have ſuſpected, and ſpoken many things, " not only of me, but alſo of my Electours? They would have ſaid, for example, that they " had reſpect to Riches, or were blinded with the Luſter of Birth, or won by my Flatteries. " I know not whether they would not have dared to ſay, that I had bribed them with Mo- " ney. But, thanks be to God, I took from them all theſe occaſions of Evil-ſpeaking, and " they can no more tax me with Flattery, than they can accuſe theſe good Men of being corrupted. " For why ſhould he, that beſtowed Money, or uſed Flattery to get an Office, ſuffer another " to take it when he might have it himſelf? Again, what might not have been ſaid, by de- " tracting Men after my coming to the Office? Could I have made Apologies ſufficient to an- " ſwer their Accuſations? Though all my Actions had been without reproach, had they found " no pretence to blacken me? But now they have none, for I have delivered thoſe that might " have choſen me from all imputations; No complaints will be made of them; It will not be " ſaid publickly, They have entruſted young Fools with the higheſt, and moſt conſiderable " Offices; they have expoſed God's Flock to all ſorts of Corruption; Chriſtianity is now made " a jeſt of, and they delight to render it ridiculous; Now the mouth of iniquity muſt be ſtop- " ped: For if Calumniatours do thus complain of You (addreſſing himſelf to *Baſil*) you will " let them ſee, that a man's Wiſdom is not to be judged of by the Number of his Years, nor " old Age meaſured with Gray-hairs; and that not young Men, but *Neophytes* are to be exclu- " ded from Eccleſiaſtical Dignities. Thus he concludes the ſecond Book.

To defend himſelf againſt ſuch as accuſed him of refuſing the Biſhoprick out of pride, he ſays, that it is not to be preſumed, that any Man could refuſe ſo eminent a Dignity out of Vanity, and that ſuch as are of that opinion muſt needs be deſpiſers of that high Office. To undeceive them, he ſpeaks of the Prieſthood in theſe Terms. " Though the Prieſthood is exerciſed upon Earth, " yet it ought to be reckoned amongſt heavenly Goods, ſince neither Man, nor Angel, nor " Archangel, nor any created Power, but the Holy Ghoſt himſelf, eſtabliſhed that ſacred Order,

" and

S. *John Chryſoſtom.*

" and made men think, that they exerciſed a Miniſtry of Angels in a mortal Body. Wherefore " whoſoever is raiſed up to the Prieſthood, ought to be as pure as if he were already in Heaven, " among thoſe bleſſed Spirits. When you ſee our Lord placed, and offered upon the Altar, The " Biſhop celebrating the Sacrifice, and praying for the whole People dyed, and made red with " his precious Blood, do you think that you are amongſt Men, and upon Earth? Do you " not believe your ſelves to be taken up into Heaven for that moment? And do you not put " off the thoughts of the fleſh? Do you not behold heavenly things with a pure Spirit, and a " naked Soul? O Miracle! O Bounty of God! He that is above with his Father, ſuffers him- " ſelf to be touched by the hands of all in this moment, and gives himſelf to be held and " embraced by thoſe that deſire it. Afterwards he compares the Divine Myſteries to *Elias* his Sacrifice, which cauſed Fire to come down from Heaven to conſume the Victims. He ſaith, that the Biſhop in like manner cauſeth by his Prayers, not Fire from Heaven, but the Holy Ghoſt to deſcend upon the Altar. Having thus exalted the Dignity of the Prieſthood, becauſe of the Power which they have to conſecrate the Body and Blood of Jeſus Chriſt, he diſcourſes of their Power of binding and looſing Sinners, which is not leſs honourable, nor leſs uſefull to the Salvation of Men. " For, ſaith he, living as yet upon the Earth, they diſpoſe of the things of " Heaven, and they have received a Power which God would give neither to Angels, nor to " Archangels; having ſaid unto Men, and not to them, *What you ſhall bind on Earth, ſhall be* " *bound in Heaven; and whatſoever ye ſhall looſe on Earth, ſhall be looſed in Heaven.* Temporal " Princes have a power to bind, but that is the Body only, whereas Epiſcopal Power bindeth " the Soul, and reacheth unto Heaven, becauſe God ratifieth above, what the Biſhops do here " below, and the Maſter confirmeth the Sentence of his Servants. This Power is as much above " the Temporal, as Heaven is nobler than the Earth, and the Soul than the Body. It were " madneſs to deſpiſe a Power, without which we could hope for no Salvation, nor the poſſeſſion " of the promiſed Goods: For if none can enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, unleſs he be firſt " regenerated with Water, and the Holy Ghoſt: And if he that eateth not the Fleſh of the Lord, " and drinketh not his Blood, is deprived of Eternal Life: And if it be theſe holy Hands, I mean " by the hands of Biſhops, that all theſe things are done: How can either the Fire of Hell be " avoided, or the Crowns prepared for us in Heaven, be obtained without their help? They and " only they, are intruſted by God with theſe ſpiritual Births, and that regeneration which is " wrought by Baptiſm: By them we put on Chriſt, we are united to the Son of God, and be- " come Members of his ſacred Body. Biſhops do not judge of the Leproſie of the Body, as the Prieſts " did under the old Law; they judge of that of the Soul, and they do not onely enquire whether " Souls be purified, but they have power alſo to purify them: Wherefore thoſe that deſpiſe them, " commit a much greater Crime, and are worthy of a much ſeverer Chaſtiſement than *Dathan*, " and his Companions.

Having thus exalted the Dignity of the Prieſthood, he diſcovers the Dangers that attend this Office on all ſides: He compares a Biſhop that has the Care of a Dioceſs, with a Pilot that hath the Charge of a Ship. " But a Biſhop, ſaith he, is more agitated with Cares, than the Sea with " Winds and Storms: The firſt Rock he meets with, is vain Glory, Anger, Peeviſhneſs, Envy, " Quarrelling, Calumnies, Accuſations, Lying, Hypocriſies, Treachery, and precipitate Violence " againſt the Innocent; joy to ſee thoſe that ſerve the Church, neglect their Duty; and ſorrow " to ſee them diſcharge it worthily; love of Praiſe, deſire of Honour, which is one of the moſt " pernicious paſſions of the Soul; Diſcourſes where pleaſure is more looked after, than the profit " of the Hearers, ſervile Flatteries, baſe Complacency, Contempt of the Poor, degenerate Ci- " vilities towards rich men without reaſon, favours ill-beſtowed, which prove hurtfull both to " the giver and to the receiver; guilty fear, baſhfulneſs in ſpeaking, falſe modeſty, ſilence, cow- " ardice and fear of reproving great Men. There is no ſlavery equal to ours, which makes us " do even ſhamefull things to pleaſe Women. They have got ſuch Power, that they give and " take away Biſhopricks, even to whom, and from whom they pleaſe: Hence it is, that all " things are turned upſide down: Thoſe that ſhould obey, will be Directours of thoſe that are " to command. Yet I pretend not to tax all Biſhops with the Crimes now mentioned, there " being many; I ſay many, who have not been caught in theſe ſnares, and who far exceed thoſe " in number, that are unhappily fallen into them. Neither will I ſay, that the Epiſcopal Dig- " nity is the cauſe of theſe Evils, I am not ſo extravagant as to have any ſuch thought. The " Sword is not the cauſe of Murder, nor Wine of Drunkenneſs, *&c.* All wiſe Men accuſe and " puniſh ſuch as abuſe God's Gifts, as the true Authors of thoſe Abuſes: And the Epiſcopal Dig- " nity is ſo far from being guilty of theſe Evils, that it may rather complain, that Men do not " exerciſe it well: We are thoſe whom it may upbraid. Since we diſhonour it as much as in " us lies, when we admit the firſt that comes, who having not examined their own ſtrength, " nor conſidered the greatneſs and importance of that Office, receive it readily, as ſoon as it is " offered. And when they are obliged to act, being blinded with Darkneſs, they engage their " People in a thouſand Diſorders. For, from whence think you, do ſo many Troubles ariſe in " the Church? I ſee no other Spring of them beſides the want of Circumſpection, and Choice in " the Election of Biſhops.

He Diſcourſes afterwards of the neceſſary qualities in a Biſhop, and affirms, that the firſt is to have no deſire to that Dignity, which ought to be looked upon with reſpect, and ſuch a moderation

moderation as may inspire Men with a Desire to avoid so important and difficult an Office: And also, that when a Man engages in it, he should not stay for the Judgment of others, to quit it, but having committed faults unworthy of the same, he should depose himself. " Perhaps, says he, it will be objected to me, that I contradict the Words of S. *Paul*, That he that " desireth to be a Bishop, desireth a good work, but I am so far from opposing, that I do only " follow them, since it is the desire of the Power and not of the Work which I condemn. The second quality noted by S. *Chrysostom* as requisite in a Bishop, is to be clear-sighted and vigilant, because he lives not for himself, but for a great People. The Third, according to his Opinion, is Meekness; he observes, That a Bishop ought not to be Peevish, Violent or Angry; and that whatsoever his other Vertues be, if these be in him, he is not worthy to be a Bishop. He saith further, That the Vices of a Bishop are of worse consequence than those of a private Man, because, when they are once discovered, they cause a general Scandal, and draw others by their example; and besides, the least faults of a Bishop, being magnified by envious Men, will utterly ruine his Reputation. In the next place, he gives an account of the Disputes and Dissentions which commonly attend the Election of a Bishop, and that the reason of it is, because they do not all agree in the only design which they ought to have, which is to chuse the Wisest and most Vertuous. " They, says he, have all different Pretences of promoting a Man to an Office; " one will have this Man because he is of a Noble Family; another votes for the other, because " he is rich, and a third endeavours to advance his Friend, or his Kinsman: This last goes by Ca- " balling and getting of Favour: No Man chooses the most worthy; no Man hath respect either " to Vertue or Merit. Then he concludes this Book by a Description of the three main duties of a Bishop, *viz.* The care of Widows, of Virgins consecrated to God, and their obligation to do Justice to the People, and to help them in their necessities.

S. *John Chrysostom.*

S. *Chrysostom* having ended this Discourse, *Basil* told him, That had he sued for that Dignity, his fear might have been rational, but having been chosen when he sought it not, he ought to think himself secure in accepting it. S. *Chrysostom* answers, That not only those that seek for Ecclesiastical Promotions thro' Ambition, but also those that do not discharge them well shall be severely punished, because they should have refus'd them, knowing that they were above their Capacity; and that even those shall be without excuse, who through insufficiency do not perform their Functions in the Church as they ought, under pretence that they were forced to accept of them; neither shall they be acquitted before God, who chuse Insufficient Men, by saying that they were deceived, and that they knew them not. This ought to oblige those that are to chuse, to consider well what choice they make? and those that are chosen, to examine themselves, Whether they are capable of the Dignity to which they are to be promoted. He discourses afterwards of a Bishop's Learning, that being to preach God's word with Strength and Knowledge, to refute Pagans, Jews and Hereticks, and to instruct the Faithful, he hath great need of Learning, of Prudence and Eloquence.

He goes on in the next Book to speak of the Conditions which are necessary to exercise the Ministry of God's Word, as we ought: He observes, That Commendation is not to be regarded, and that Envy and Malice is to be despised; but that a good Reputation is to be maintain'd by constant labour: That a good Bishop ought not to be proud for being praised, nor dejected when he is blamed; and that his only aim in his Discourses should be to please God. " This, saith " he, is the only Rule, and the only Object which they ought to propose to themselves in this " excellent Ministry, and not to be applauded and praised. If Men do commend them, let " them not reject their Commendations; if they do not, let them not desire it, nor be concerned " at the omission: This is sufficient comfort for him in his Labour; yea, the greatest he can have, " if he knows in his Conscience, that he hath studied his Discourses for no other end, than that " they might be acceptable to God only; adding, that he cannot be envious against, nor jealous " of those who have more talents than himself.

In the last Book he proves, That Bishops have need of a higher degree of Vertue than Monks, because they are exposed to many more dangers; and that it is easier to live well in a Solitude than as a Bishop; yea, that whatsoever Vertues Monks may have, yet they are not fit to be Bishops, because the accidents of a Bishop's life may easily excite those Vices and Infirmities which were hid in Solitude. Lastly, he declares, That the trouble he was in, when they spake of making him Bishop, made him resolve to hide himself. He sets forth this trouble by two Comparisons; the one by describing the vexation which a Princess, incomparable both for Beauty and Vertue, might be in, who being passionately beloved by a Prince, should be forced to marry a mean and contemptible Man; the other, by describing the astonishment of a Clown, that was forced to take upon him the Conduct of both a great Land-Army, and of a Navy that was ready to give Battel to a dreadful Enemy. He concludes by comforting *Basil*, who was afflicted to see himself ingaged in so hard an Employment, and loaded with so heavy a Burden.

Some say, that he writ these excellent Books when he was very young, which is not likely. Others think with *Socrates*, That he composed them while he was a Deacon; but it seems rather, that he made them in his Retirement, before he was ordained Deacon, about the Year 376.

S. *John Chryſoſtom.*

The three Books in *defence of a Monaſtical Life*, againſt thoſe that blamed that ſtate, were the firſt fruits of S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Retreat. In the firſt he argues for a Monaſtical way of life, becauſe of the uſefulneſs and neceſſity of ſeparating from the World. In the Second he anſwers the *Gentiles*, who complained that their Children forſook them to retire into deſart places; and then he comforts the Chriſtians who were troubled to ſee themſelves bereaved of their Children that embraced a Solitary Life, to dwell in Wilderneſſes. He affirms in theſe Books, That a Monk is more glorious, more powerful and richer than a Man of the World; repreſenting the great difficulty of ſaving our ſelves in the World, and how hard it is to bring up Children to Chriſtianity; and comparing the condition of a Monk with that of Saints and Angels.

The ſhort Diſcourſe upon *the compariſon of a Monk with a Prince*, is upon the ſame Subject. He ſhews, That Men are miſtaken, who preferr the condition of Kings before that of Monks and retired Men. *Firſt*, Becauſe the greatneſs of Kings ends with them, whereas the advantages of a retired Life continues after death. 2. Becauſe the advantages of Retirement are much more conſiderable than the Fortune of Great Men. 3. Becauſe it is more glorious for a Man to command his Paſſions, than to rule whole Nations. 4. Becauſe the War of a Monk is nobler than that of a great Captain, and his Victory more certain; the one fights againſt inviſible Powers, and the other againſt mortal Men; the one engages for the defence of Piety, and the honour of God, the other for his own Intereſt or Glory. 5. Becauſe a Prince is a charge to himſelf and to others by reaſon of thoſe many things which he needs; whereas a Monk wants nothing, does good to all, and by his Prayers obtains thoſe Graces, which the moſt powerful Princes cannot give. 6. Becauſe the loſs of Piety may ſooner be repaired than the loſs of a Kingdom. *Laſtly*, Becauſe, after death, a Monk goeth in ſplendor to meet Jeſus Chriſt, and entreth immediately into Heaven; whereas, tho' a King ſeems to have ruled his Kingdom with Juſtice and Equity (a thing very rare) yet they ſhall be leſs glorious and not ſo happy, there being a great difference in point of Holineſs, between a good King, and a holy Monk, who hath beſtowed all his time and care upon praiſing God: But if this King hath lived ill, who can expreſs the greatneſs of thoſe puniſhments that attend him? He concludeth in theſe words; "Let us not "admire their Riches, nor preferr their happineſs before that of theſe poor Monks. Let us never "ſay, that this rich Man is happy, becauſe he is cloathed with ſumptuous Apparel, carried in "a fine Coach, and followed by many Footmen: Theſe Riches and great Pomps laſt but for a "time, and all the Felicity that attends them ends with the Life, whereas the Happineſs of "Monks endures for ever.

It was likewiſe in his Solitude that he writ the two Books *of Compunction of Heart*, whereof the firſt is dedicated to *Demetrius*, and the ſecond to *Stelechius*. In theſe Books he diſcourſes of the neceſſity and conditions of a true and ſincere Repentance; affirming, That Chriſtians ought to have their ſins always in view, to abhorr them with all their Heart, to lament, and continually beg of God the forgiveneſs of them: That this ſorrow ought to be a motion of that Charity which the Holy Ghoſt inſpireth into our Hearts, and to be animated with the fire of a Divine Love, which conſumeth ſin, and is accompanied with a Spirit of Mortification and Diſintereſtedneſs from the Goods of this World, with an eſteem of the Treaſures of Heaven, and of Spiritual Vertues. He ſaith in the firſt Book, *That it is not Grace only which makes us do good, ſince we ought our ſelves to contribute on our part, all that depends upon our Wills and Strength*; *wherefore*, ſaith he, *God's Grace is given to every one of us, but it abideth only in the Hearts of them that keep the Commandments, and departeth from them that correſpond not with it*; *neither doth it enter into their Souls, who begin not to turn to the Lord. When God converted S.* Paul, *he foreſaw his good Will before he gave him his Grace.*

The Three Books of Providence were compoſed by S. *Chryſoſtom*, when he came out of his Solitude, and returned to *Antioch*. There he comforteth a Friend of his, one *Stagirius*, who having quitted the World, was ſo tormented with an Evil Spirit, that he was ready to fall into Deſpair; exhorting him to look upon that affliction as a Grace of God rather than a Puniſhment; for as much as it appears by the moſt notable Examples both of the old and of the new Law; that from *Adam* to S. *Paul*, Troubles and Afflictions have commonly been the lot of the Saints and Righteous Men: For this reaſon theſe Books are intituled, *Of Providence*, becauſe they clear that great Queſtion which ſo much perplexed the learned *Gentiles*, *Why the Righteous are afflicted and perſecuted if there be a Providence over-ruling the things of the World*? He ſheweth there, that this Queſtion hath no difficulty, if Men believe, that there is another Life, a Heaven and a Hell: *For*, ſaith he, *ſince every one is puniſhed or rewarded in another World, to what end are we concerned at what happens in this*? If wicked Men only were perſecuted here, we ſhould eaſily believe, that out of this World there is neither Puniſhments nor Rewards; and were there none but good Men in affliction, Vertue might be looked upon as the cauſe of Adverſity, and Crimes the reaſon of Proſperity. Of neceſſity therefore there muſt be in this World righteous and wicked Men, ſome happy and others unhappy. He adds, That by God's permiſſion the Righteous are afflicted, to expiate their ſins, and to correct them for their faults. He ſaith further, That God makes uſe of the Righteous Man's Fear, to oblige others to look to themſelves, and to mind their own Salvation. But why doth it happen, That ſuch as lived well before they were tempted by Afflictions ſhould fall into ſin, when Temptation cometh? S. *Chryſoſtom* anſwereth, *Firſt*, That many ſeem to be Righteous before Men, who are great Criminals before God,

God, that ſearcheth the Hearts. *Secondly*, That God permits the moſt righteous to fall into ſin; to humble them, to keep them from Pride, and from an Opinion of their own Merit; and to put them in mind, that if they have any thing that is good, it is not of themſelves, but of the Grace of Jeſus Chriſt. *S. John Chryſoſtom.*

The Book of *Virginity* is written with much Prudence and Wiſdom: For, whereas moſt of the Authors that have written of Virginity, could not forbear, whilſt they commended this Vertue, to condemn marriage, or at leaſt, to ſpeak ſlightingly of it. On the contrary, S. *Chryſoſtom* anſwereth, at firſt, thoſe Hereticks that condemned Matrimony; and proveth, that their Virginity will not only be unprofitable, but alſo pernicious; adding withall, that as many as condemn Marriage, are Deſpiſers of Virginity: It being a greater advantage to be what it is, a good thing, a nobler and more excellent than another good thing, than ſimply a Vertue in oppoſition to Vice. " I commend Matrimony, ſaith he, it is the Haven of Continency for thoſe that " will uſe it well; but there are excellent perſons, who have no need of that help, and are able " to quench the Fire of Luſt by praying, watching, and lying upon the Ground. Theſe I ex- " hort to Virginity, but forbid them not to marry: If they follow not my Advice, I condemn " them not; I excommunicate thoſe that commit Adultery and Fornication, but commend " thoſe who make an holy uſe of Matrimony. Marriage is good, that's my Opinon, but Virgini- " ty is better. This I own, and if you will have my Sence, It is as much above Matrimony as " Heaven is above the Earth, and makes Men like to Angels.

Afterwards he makes an Objection to himſelf againſt Virginity, which ſeems natural enough: If it be better to live unmarried, why did God inſtitute Marriage? why did he make Women? and ſhould all Men embrace Virginity, how ſhould Mankind be propagated? To anſwer theſe Queſtions, S. *Chryſoſtom* goeth back as far as the creation of the firſt Man, and takes notice, That while he was in the earthly Paradiſe with Eve, he was taken up with a Converſation with God, that he was then freed from Luſt and the deſires of the Fleſh, and lived in a perfect Virginity, and the whole World was at that time a vaſt Solitude. But Man having diſobey'd God's Commands, and becoming mortal and corruptible, with that happy Life which he enjoyed, he loſt alſo the glory of Virginity; ſo that Sin being the cauſe of Death, became at the ſame time the cauſe of Marriage. It is probable, that tho' there had been no Marriage, yet the World might have been peopled, and that God had created other Men as he had done the firſt: adding, That it is not the frequent uſe of Marriage that multiplieth Mankind, but God's Bleſſing; and he believes, that Marriage is more neceſſary to the World at preſent, for a remedy againſt Incontinency, than for the preſervation of Mankind; he grants, That it is neceſſary for the weak, but that Virginity is far more honourable and profitable too. He pretendeth, That whatſoever S. *Paul* ſaid of Marriage ought to induce Men to embrace Virginity; and at laſt he deſcribes the troubles and inconveniencies of a married life, and oppoſes to them the quiet, liberty, ſweetneſs, pleaſure, and other advantages of a ſingle one, and then concludes with this noble Sentence; " Here below we are ſeriouſly to work out our Salvation; let him that has a Wife live as if he " had none; and he that hath not ſhould endeavour with Virginity to get all other Vertues, " that ſo in the next World he may not lament the diſorders that he committed whilſt he was " in this. This Treatiſe of Virginity is quoted in the 19th Homily upon the firſt Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*, preached at *Antioch*. It was by conſequence compoſed in that Town, S. *Chryſoſtom* being a Deacon, or newly ordain'd Prieſt.

The two Treatiſes *againſt the cohabitation of Clerks and Women*, were compoſed, if *Palladius* may be believed, at *Conſtantinople*, againſt the abuſe of thoſe Churchmen, who lodged devout Women with them, or themſelves lodged in the Women's Houſes.

Againſt theſe Diſorders S. *Chryſoſtom* wrote two Books, whereof the firſt reproveth the Virgins that dwelt with Churchmen; and the ſecond admoniſheth Churchmen who admitted Women into their Lodgings, and ſhews, That ſuch mixt-habitation is an occaſion of ſcandal, and cannot be wholly free from ſin.

In the Diſcourſe *to a young Widow*, he both comforts and exhorts her, To continue in her Widowhood. He made another little Book on purpoſe to ſhew, That ſhe ought not to marry again; where he proves, That tho' ſecond marriages be not abſolutely forbidden, yet it is much better to continue in Widowhood.

The ſmall Treatiſe upon this Paradox, *That no Man is offended but by himſelf*, was written by S. *Chryſoſtom* in his Exile. It is upon a Subject very proper to adminiſter Comfort to a Man in Perſecution, for he proveth there by ſeveral Examples out of Holy Scripture, That Perſecutions and Vexations are ſo far from doing any harm to thoſe that are tormented wrongfully, that they make them more happy and glorious, and that nothing but Sin can make Men truly miſerable.

In the firſt Exhortation to *Theodorus*, who is thought to be the Perſon who afterwards was made Biſhop of *Mopſueſta*; he adviſeth him to do Penance for quitting a retired life to return into the World; ſhewing him, That how great ſoever his fault might be, yet he might hope for Pardon from God's Mercy, becauſe he always granteth it to thoſe that truly and earneſtly repent; which Penance is not to be judged of according to the length of Time, but by the diſpoſition of the Heart, and which conſiſts in a change of life. Afterwards he repreſents Heaven, Hell and Judgment, whereof he maketh an excellent Deſcription, to oblige him to do Penance, and then he

S. *John Chryſoſtom.*

he comforts him, by the hope that his Repentance will recover, not only his former Innocence, but alſo an higher degree of Holineſs and Perfection.

Among the Examples which he mentions to confirm this Truth, he citeth the Hiſtory of that famous Thief who was converted by S. *John*, which *Euſebius* takes out of *Clemens Alexandrinus*.

The ſecond Diſcourſe to *Theodorus* containeth ſome milder Motives, to oblige him to forſake a Secular life; where he repreſents the Labours and Cares of the World, to make him out of love with it. This laſt Exhortation ought to be placed firſt: Theſe Treatiſes were written at *Antioch*.

All S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Letters were written during his Baniſhment.

The firſt is a Circular Letter to *Innocent* Biſhop of *Rome*, *Venerius* Biſhop of *Milan*, and *Chromatius* Biſhop of *Aquileia*, in which, having deſcribed the attempts of *Theophilus*; the Injuries which he receiv'd from him; the Injuſtice and Violence exerciſed towards him; and the Diſturbance in the Churches of the Eaſt, upon his account, very eloquently, he entreats them to write to the Eaſt to tell them, That what was done againſt him, was to be look'd upon as of no force, as being done againſt the Laws, in his abſence by his Enemies, and to the prejudice of thoſe proffers which he had made to appear before lawful Judges; and conſequently, that ſuch as acted ſo Uncanonically were to be puniſhed according to the ſeverity of Eccleſiaſtical Laws; declaring, That he was ready to juſtifie his Innocence, and to convince his Accuſers of Impoſture and Violence before uncorrupt Judges.

There is another Letter to Pope *Innocent*, wherein he thanks him for the good Offices which he had endeavoured to do him; but it was written long after the former, in the third Year of S. *Chryſoſtom*'s baniſhment.

The Letter to the Biſhops and Prieſts that were put in Priſon for defending his Innocence, and refuſing to communicate with *Arſacius*, was written in the firſt Year of his Exile. There he commends the Conſtancy and Courage of theſe generous defenders of Juſtice, whom he ſcruples not to call Martyrs.

The ſeventeen following Epiſtles are directed to the Widow *Olympias*, who was united to him by the bonds of an intimate Friendſhip; he comforteth her for the Perſecutions ſhe had endured, the Affliction ſhe was in, and for the Sickneſs ſhe lay under.

Theſe are ſome of the Maxims which he lays down to comfort her and himſelf. "Nothing is to be feared but ſin, all other accidents of this life are but a Fable and a Comedy; Afflictions, Perſecutions, Sickneſſes and Death it ſelf ſhould not move us; theſe are to be born with patience for God's ſake, no other Bleſſing is to be compared with Patience. We are neither to deſire Death, nor to neglect Sickneſs; not the Perſecuted but Perſecutors are Objects of pity; and the latter are ſo much the more to be lamented, becauſe, like Men in a Frenzie, they feel not their Diſtemper. This preſent life is but a paſſage, all the Goods of this World are but Duſt and Smoak. Such Chriſtian thoughts as theſe employ'd the Spirit of S. *Chryſoſtom* in his Exile, and furniſh'd him with matter for the Letters he writ to his Friends: He thanked them likewiſe in his Epiſtles, for the care they had of him, and for the generous Methods which they followed to juſtifie him; with other Letters to oblige his Friends to continue ſtedfaſt to him, to let them hear of him, to let them know what they might do for him, and to pray them, That they would write to him. Theſe are the ſubjects of the greateſt part of 225 Letters written to his Friends. Some are concerning the Affairs of the Church in *Phœnicia*, the Converſion of the *Goths*, and the helping of the Poor; which ſhew, That tho' he was baniſhed and deprived of his Biſhoprick, yet he preſerved an Epiſcopal Spirit, and Paſtoral Watchfulneſs.

The Judgment which the learned *Photius* makes of theſe Letters, is this: (*Vol.* 36. of his *Bibliotheca*) "I have read, ſaith he, the Letters which S. *Chryſoſtom* writ to ſeveral perſons in "the time of his Baniſhment; the moſt uſefull are thoſe ſeventeen to *Olympias*, and that to *Innocent* Biſhop of *Rome*; wherein he gives an account of the Perſecutions which he ſuffered, "as much as the extent of a Letter could permit. The Stile of theſe Letters is not very diſferent from that of his other Works, for it is clear and lofty, florid, pleaſant and perſuading. "The Letters to *Olympias* are not ſo artleſs as the others, becauſe he could not ſuit an Epiſtolary Stile, with the Matter he was to write, which, if we may ſo ſay, has done Violence to "the Laws of the art of Writing.

This Reflection of *Photius* is particularly to be apply'd to the Letter directed to Pope *Innocent*, and the other Weſtern Biſhops, wherein he deſcribeth the Perſecutions which he endur'd with great force of Eloquence. There is not among theſe Letters That directed to *Cæſarius* the Monk: *Peter Martyr* was the firſt that quoted it in theſe latter times; and ſince he did not tell whence he took it, and that the words ſeem'd contrary to the Doctrine of the Church, and of S. *Chryſoſtom* upon the Euchariſt, thoſe of the Church of *Rome* did long ſuſpect *Peter Martyr* as guilty of Impoſture, and look'd upon the fragment of that Letter as a piece of his own Invention. But ſince that time, *Bigotius* having found an ancient Manuſcript of the Verſion of that Letter in the *Dominican*'s Library at *Florence*, it was no longer doubted, but that *Peter Martyr* took from thence the fragment which he quoted, and I think we ought not to reject it as unworthy of S. *Chryſoſtom*: For tho' the Greek Original is not extant entire, yet, ſome-

ſomething of S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Eloquence appears in that Verſion: and this Letter is mentioned by ſeveral Greek Authors (*q*), who have taken ſeveral Quotations that are Printed with the ancient Verſion. S. *John Chryſoſtom.*

By this Letter it appears, that *Cæſarius* to whom it was written, admired a certain Book, wherein it was averred, That in Jeſus Chriſt there was ſuch an Union, or mixture of Humanity with Divinity, that they made but one Nature: S. *Chryſoſtom* tells him, that this was the Errour of *Apollinarius*, *Arius*, *Sabellius*, and *Manichæus*, about the Incarnation of Jeſus Chriſt. And to inform him better, he bids him take notice, that there were two Natures in Chriſt; and each of them doth preſerve its Properties, without mixture, and without confuſion, tho' united together in the ſame Perſon: to explain this truth, he alledges the Example of the Euchariſt, and ſaith, † *That as Bread is called Bread before the Sanctification, but that after the Divine Grace hath hallowed it by means of the Prieſt, it ought no longer to be called Bread, but to bear the Name of Chriſt's Body, tho' it remains in the ſame nature of Bread, and that Men do not ſay, that they are two Bodies, but One onely Body of Jeſus Chriſt; ſo we ought to ſay, that the Divine Nature being united with the Humane, makes but one Chriſt, and one Perſon. And yet it muſt be acknowledged, that each of theſe Natures continueth perfect and intire, without mixture, and without confuſion; for if there remained but one Nature, how could it be ſaid that there is Union?* Theſe words of S. *Chryſoſtom*, inſtead of deſtroying the real-Preſence of Jeſus Chriſt in the Euchariſt, do ſuppoſe and prove it invincibly: for otherwiſe how could he affirm, that the Body of Jeſus Chriſt is as truly in the Euchariſt, as the Divine Nature is in the Perſon of Jeſus Chriſt? He ſaith indeed, that the Bread remains *in its own Nature*. Which ſeemeth to be againſt Tranſubſtantiation: but we may underſtand by Nature, the conſiſtency and appearance of Bread. In a word, this paſſage is not harder to be underſtood, than thoſe of *Theodoret* and of *Gelaſius*, who uſe the ſame Compariſon: Nay it is much eaſier, becauſe S. *Chryſoſtom* in ſeveral places explaineth his Opinion very clearly upon the real Change of the Bread, and Wine into the Body and Blood of Jeſus Chriſt.

[† The words in the Original are theſe, *Sicut enim antequam ſanctificetur PANIS, PANEM nominamus, Divinâ autem illum ſanctificante Gratiâ, mediante Sacerdote, Liberatus eſt quidem* Appellatione *panis, dignus autem habitus eſt* DOMINICI CORPORIS *appellatione, etiamſi natura Panis in eo permanſit, & non duo corpora, ſed unum corpus filii prædicatur: Sic & hic Divinâ ἐνὶ προσώπου, id eſt, inſidente corporis Naturâ unum filium, unam Perſonam, utraque hæc fecerunt: Agnoſcendum, tamen inconfuſam & Indiviſibilem rationem, non in unâ ſolum Naturâ, ſed in duabus perfectis:* Thus tranſlated into Engliſh, by the Learned Defender of the Expoſition of the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, againſt the Biſhop of *Meaux*. " For as [in the Euchariſt] before the *Bread* is " Conſecrated, we call it *Bread*, but when the Grace of God by the Prieſt has Conſecrated it, it is no longer " called *Bread*, but *is eſteem'd worthy to be called the Lord's Body*, altho' *the Nature of Bread ſtill remains in it*; and " we do not ſay there be two Bodies, but one Body of the Son; ſo here the Divine Nature, being joyn'd with " the [Humane] Body, they both together make up but one Son, one Perſon. But yet they muſt be Confeſſed " to remain without confuſion, after an indiviſible manner, not *in one Nature*, but *in two perfect Natures*.

Now if we ſuppoſe that S. *Chryſoſtom* deſigned his Compariſon to be juſt, or believed that it was ſo, it will not be eaſie to find other words more expreſſive of the Sence of the Church of *England* in this matter, than thoſe here made uſe of: and there is no Diſpute, but thoſe who took ſo much Pains to conceal this Teſtimony, believed that the greateſt force that could be put upon this Paſſage, could never perſuade unconcerned Readers, that the Perſon who wrote it believ'd that Doctrine of the Euchariſt, which is at preſent taught in the Church of *Rome*.]

This Letter ends with an Expoſition of his Doctrine, about the Myſtery of the Incarnation of Jeſus Chriſt, in theſe words. " It muſt be Confeſſed, that the ſame Jeſus Chriſt who is " Mortal, hath two complete Natures, the Divine, and the Humane, and yet he is one and the " ſame only Son, not diviſible into two, who comprehends in himſelf the Properties of both " Natures, without any Alteration. They are not two Perſons, but the ſame God, Lord, and " Saviour, Word of God, who hath put on our Fleſh, but animated Fleſh, not Fleſh without " Soul, as the impious *Apollinarius* maintains. To this we are to hold; let us avoid thoſe that " ſeparate the two Natures, for tho' there are two Natures in Jeſus Chriſt, yet their Union is indiſſo- " luble and inſeparable. We ought to acknowledge that this Union is made in one and the ſame " Perſon, and Hypoſtaſis of the Son. Neither let us hear thoſe who affirm, That after this " Union there is but one Nature in Chriſt; ſince they are obliged by their own Hypotheſis, to " aſcribe Sufferings to the Divine Nature, which is impaſſible. The Verſion of this Letter which *Bigotius* could not get Printed at *Paris*, *for ſome particular Conſiderations* ‖, was Printed after the Latin Copy, by Mr. *le Moyne*, at the end of the firſt Volume of his *Varia Sacra*, at *Amſterdam*, annexed it to his Edition of *Palladius*'s Life of S. *Chryſoſtom*, which was Printed at *Paris*, 1680. In his Preface, he Vindicated its Authority againſt thoſe Exceptions, which had before been made to it: and being afraid that the Licenſers might ſuppreſs it, he reſerved ſome few entire Printed Copies of the Book, before it came into their hands. His fears proved very Reaſonable, for ſome of the Doctors of the *Sorbonne*, whereof Mr. *Grandin*, and Mr. *Favre* were charged as Principal, ſuppreſſed the Letter it ſelf, and cut out ſo much of the Preface of Mr. *Bigotius*, as related to it, without taking care to fill up the Blank. The Learned Vindicator of the Expoſition of the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, againſt M. *de Meaux*, tells the Story, and Prints that part of *Bigotius*'s Preface which was eraſed, with S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Letter to *Cæſarius*, at the end of his Vindication, in *London*, 1688. And this explains Mr. *Du Pin*'s *particular Conſiderations*, leaving every Body to gueſs at the true Reaſon.]

[‖ The matter of Fact was in ſhort this; *Bigotius* having brought a Copy of this Letter from *Florence*,

(*q*) *By ſeveral Greek Authors.*] Theſe Authors are *Anaſtaſius* in the MS. Collections of the Library of *Clermont*, *Nicephorus* Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, in two MSS. in Mr. *Colbert*'s Library, an Author that wrote againſt the *Severians*, publiſhed by *Turrianus*; S. *John Damaſcen*, *Tom.* 4. *Var. Lect. Caniſii* p. 211. [*Theorianus* in *Legatione ad Armenios*, p. 74.]theſe Fragments are in the *Rotterdam* [and *London*] Editions.

dam, 1685. and with the Greek Fragments in the Margin at *Rotterdam*, by *Achers*, 1687. This Edition was publickly ſold at *Paris*, which ſhews, that tho' it was not ſuffered to be Printed in *France*, before it was more exactly examined, yet they never deſign'd to ſuppreſs it. And indeed the moſt Skilful Criticks having well conſidered it, do confeſs that it was written by an ancient Author, and is not unworthy of S. *Chryſoſtom*: and the Learnedeſt Divines of the Church of *Rome* agree, that the Doctrine ſet forth in this Letter, is agreeable to that of this Father, and do not find it a difficult thing to expound that paſſage concerning the Euchariſt.

S. *John Chryſoſtom.*

The Liturgy attributed to S. *Chryſoſtom* now Extant, in all probability is not written by him: It is a Liturgy of the Church of *Conſtantinople*, made or altered at leaſt ſince S. *Chryſoſtom*, to which his Name was given, becauſe it was for the uſe of the Church of *Conſtantinople* [and to give it more Authority.] We do not find there the Prayers and Ceremonies, which S. *Chryſoſtom* mentions in his Homilies, as in uſe in his time, in the Celebration of the Euchariſt; and there were ſome things which do not ſuit with the Cuſtoms of that Age. The Manuſcripts of this Book are very different; in ſome there are the Names of S. *Chryſoſtom*, of Pope *Nicholas* II. and of the Emperor *Alexius Comnenus*, who lived long after S. *Chryſoſtom*. Theſe paſſages indeed are not found in that which was tranſlated by *Eraſmus*, but for all that, there is enough to prove that that Liturgy is not of the time of S. *Chryſoſtom*.

This Father is one of the moſt Eloquent Chriſtian Orators, and his Eloquence is the more to be eſteemed, becauſe it is without Affectation and Conſtraint: Fruitfulneſs of thought, and abundance of Words and Notions is natural to him; tho' he did not tye up himſelf as S. *Gregory Nazianzen*, and S. *Baſil* did, to an Attick purity; yet there is a lofty Greatneſs in his Stile; His Style is pure and pleaſant; His Diſcourſe is beautifyed with a wonderful Variety of Conceptions and Figures; He extendeth his Matters, by an infinite Variety of Expreſſions; He is very ingenious in finding out Similitudes between things, abundant in Examples and Compariſons; His Eloquence is popular, and very proper for Preaching; His Style is natural, eaſie and grave; He equally avoideth Negligence, and Affectation; He is neither too plain, nor too florid; He is ſmooth yet not effeminate; He uſeth all the Figures that are uſual to good Orators very properly, without employing falſe ſtrokes of Wit, and he never introduces into his Diſcourſes, any Notions of Poets or prophane Authors, neither does he divert his Auditory with Jeſts; His Compoſition is Noble, his Expreſſions Elegant, his Method Juſt, and his Thoughts Sublime; He ſpeaks like a good Father, and a good Paſtor; He often directs his words to the People, and expreſſes them with a Tenderneſs and Charity becoming an holy Biſhop; He teacheth the principal Truths of Chriſtianity, with wonderful Clearneſs, and diverts with a marvellous Art, and an agreeable way of ranging his Notions, and perſuades by the ſtrength and ſolidity of his Reaſons; His Inſtructions are eaſie; His Deſcriptions and Relations pleaſant; His Inducements ſo meek and inſinuating, that one is pleaſed to be ſo perſuaded; His Diſcourſes how long ſoever are not tedious, there are ſtill ſome new things which keep the Reader awake, and yet he hath no falſe Beauties, nor uſeleſs Figures; His only Aim is to convert his Auditors, or to inſtruct them in neceſſary Truths; He neglects all Reflections, that have more ſubtilty than profit; He never buſies himſelf to reſolve hard Queſtions, nor to give myſtical Sences, to make a ſhew of his Wit, or Eloquence; He ſearcheth not into Myſteries, neither endeavours to comprehend them; He is contented to propoſe, after an eaſie way, palpable and ſenſible Truths, which none can be ignorant of, without danger of failing of Salvation; He particularly applies himſelf to moral Heads, and very ſeldom handleth ſpeculative Truths; He affects not to appear Learned, and never boaſts of his Erudition; and yet whatever the Subject be, he ſpeaks with Terms ſo ſtrong, ſo proper, and ſo well choſen, that one may eaſily perceive he had a profound Knowledge of all ſorts of Matters, and particularly of true Divinity.

He proveth the truth of the Chriſtian Religion, by the ſtrongeſt, the moſt probable, and ſenſible Reaſons; He urgeth Miracles, Prophecies, and other Proofs of the truth of Religion; but particularly inſiſts upon the miraculous Eſtabliſhment of the Church, and in this Argument he triumphs; He ſhews that it is impoſſible, that the Doctrine of Jeſus Chriſt could have been received, and believed all the world over, notwithſtanding the oppoſition of Secular Powers, the Contradictions of the Wiſe men in the World, and the endeavours of Devils, had it not been ſupported by the power of God himſelf: "For, ſays he, there is need of more than humane Ability, "to produce ſuch wonderful Effects, both in the Earth, and upon the Sea, and to oblige Men already prejudiced by extravagant Opinions, and prepoſſeſſed with prodigious Malice to ſuch Actions; yet Jeſus Chriſt delivered all mankind, not only *Romans*, but *Perſians* alſo, and all other barbarous Nations from their Calamities: And to bring about theſe Wonders, he made uſe of no Arms, and was at no expence; raiſed no Armies, and fought no Battles; but by eleven Men, who at firſt were unknown, deſpicable, ignorant, Ideots, poor, naked, and without Arms; He perſuaded different Nations, and made them embrace an high Philoſophy, not only relating to the Government of this preſent Life, but alſo to things to come, and Eternity ſelf; His power over all minkind was ſuch, as that it made them aboliſh the Laws of their Fathers, renounce their ancient Cuſtoms, and follow new ones; He ſpoiled them even of the love of thoſe things they were moſt fond of to faſten their Affections, upon ſuch things as are moſt difficult and painful. But the Promulgation of the Goſpel, and the ſetling of the Church, are not the only Proofs of the truth of our Religion, the Stedfaſtneſs and perpetuity of the Church,

In lib. Quod Chriſtus ſit Deus: In Orat. de S. Babyla: contra Gentes: In expoſit. Pſ. xliv. *Hom. contra Judæos: Hom. 4. in illud*, Vid. Dominum *lib. Quod unus Chriſtus ſit Deus.*

Church is alſo in S.* *Chryſoſtom*'s Opinion an invincible Argument of it. " For he addeth, that " it is not only a thing worthy of Admiration, that Jeſus Chriſt ſhould ſettle his Church over " all the Earth, but alſo that he ſhould render it invincible againſt ſo great numbers of Enemies as " aſſaulted it on every ſide. The Gates of Hell that cannot prevail againſt it, are the Dangers " which ſeem to hurry it to the very Gates of Hell. Doe you not perceive the truth of that " prediction of Jeſus Chriſt..... Tho' Tyrants took up Arms againſt it, tho' Soldiers conſpired " her Deſtruction, tho' the People raged furiouſly, tho' a contrary Cuſtom oppoſed it ſelf, tho' " Preachers, Philoſophers, Magiſtrates, and rich Men ſtood up to deſtroy it; The Divine word " breaking with greater force than fire it ſelf, conſumed theſe Thorns, cleanſed theſe Fields, and " diſſeminated the Seed of preaching over the whole Earth. And though ſuch as believed the " Goſpel were ſhut up in Priſons, ſent into Baniſhment, ſpoiled of their Goods, thrown into " the Fire, caſt into the Sea, and expoſed to all manner of Torments, Reproaches, and Perſecu- " tions, and tho' they were treated every where, as publick Enemies; yet they multiplyed daily; " their being perſecuted increaſed their Zeal..... Thoſe Rivers of Blood cauſed by the Maſſa- " cres of the Faithful, before their Eyes excited their Piety, and the Pains they endured inflamed " their Zeal.

S. *John Chryſoſtom* *In Pſ. xliv.*

This ſame Saint obſerves in another place, that Chriſtians are never ſo diſorderly in their Behaviour, and ſo cold in their Devotion, as when he that ſits on the Throne is of their Religion. " Which, ſaith he, juſtifies that this Religion is not eſtabliſhed by the Powers of the World, " and is not upheld and preſerved by Earthly force.

Orat. contra Gentiles, de S. Babyla.

S. *Chryſoſtom*'s way of dealing with Hereticks is not leſs rational, than that which he uſeth towards Heathens and Jews. He expoundeth the Myſteries very plainly, and proveth them by Teſtimonies of Holy Scripture, and the Authority of the Church, not pretending to penetrate, or give the Reaſons of them, and to anſwer thoſe Difficulties, which have no other Foundation but humane Reaſonings. He confeſſes, that he does not underſtand the Reaſons of what he believes. " I know, ſaith he, that God is every where, and entire in every part of the World, but I know " not how this can be. I doubt not, but that God is without beginning, but I conceive not how " that is, for humane Reaſon cannot comprehend a thing that hath no beginning. I know that " the Son is begotten of God the Father, but I cannot imagine how that was done. He believes that the Divine Nature is ſo high and unſearchable, that it is not poſſible to comprehend it; and purſues this Reaſoning ſo far, that he ſticketh not to ſay, that Seraphims and Angels themſelves do not ſee the Subſtance of God, but only an Emanation of his Divine Light. This paſſage hath made ſome modern Greeks ſuppoſe, that the Saints do not ſee the Subſtance of God, but only a Corporeal Light, ſuch as (they ſay) appeared upon Mount *Tabor*. This alſo hath exerciſed the Subtilty of our Divines, who conſtitute Happineſs in the Viſion of the Subſtance of God: And yet S. *Chryſoſtom* hath reſpect in this paſſage, neither to that *Light* of the Modern Greeks, not to the Diſputes of the Schoolmen; his only deſign is to ſhew againſt *Aetius*, that the Divine Nature is not to be comprehended, and that evident Reaſons of the Myſteries are not to be given.

Orat. 1. de incompreh. Homil. 24. in Joannem.

Ib. Orat. 1.

It is not neceſſary to inlarge upon the Opinions of S. *Chryſoſtom*, concerning the Myſtery of the Trinity; it is certain, that he maintained the Faith of the Council of *Nice*, and that he proved the Divinity both of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt; yet it ought to be obſerved, that he was of *Meletius*'s opinion, concerning the Signification of the word *Hypoſtaſis*, and that he owned Three *Hypoſtaſes*, and one Nature in God.

As to the Myſtery of the Incarnation, tho' he was equally contrary to the Error of thoſe who diſtinguiſhed two Perſons in Chriſt, and that of thoſe who confounded the two Natures, and their Properties; yet he in ſeveral paſſages of his Writings, declared againſt the latter Opinion very eagerly.

Ep. ad Cæſarium, Homil. de Conſub. in lib. Quod Chriſtus ſit Deus. V. Theodor. in Dialog.

In his *Panegyricks* of the Saints, he aſcribeth to them all manner of Felicity; he places them in Heaven, in the ſame Rank with Angels, and Archangels, of Prophets, and Martyrs; and yet in other places, he ſeems to affirm, that their Happineſs is referred to the Day of Judgment; but theſe may agree well enough, if we ſay, that he ſpake in the latter of a perfect and conſummated Happineſs.

Homil de B. Philog. Hom. de S S. Homil. 39. in ep. 1. ad Cor. & Hom. 28. in ep. ad Hebr. Hom. 29. Matth.

Angels, if we believe S. *Chryſoſtom*, are ſo called, becauſe they declare the Will of God unto Men; for which cauſe the Scripture repreſenteth them with Wings: They take care of Men, are preſent at Divine Services, and every Chriſtian hath his Guardian Angel.

Homil. 3. de Incompreh. Hom. 3. in ep. ad Coloſſ. Hom. 14. in ep. ad Hebr.

The Devil is not wicked of his own Nature, but is become ſuch by Sin. God permits him to tempt Men for their good. It is a Childiſh thing to believe, that thoſe are Angels which the Scripture calleth the Children of God in *Geneſis*, and of whom it is ſaid, that they converſed with the Daughters of Men; ſince they are of a ſpiritual and incorporeal Nature.

Hom. de Diabolo tentatore. Hom. 22. in Geneſim.

He Confeſſes in ſeveral places, that the Fall of the firſt Men was prejudicial to the whole Race, which ever ſince is become ſubject to Pains, Sickneſſes, and Death, from which it was free before Sin: He acknowledgeth, that an inclination to Evil, and Luſts, are Conſequences of the firſt Man's ſin: but he ſeemeth not to have owned Original ſin, after the ſame manner that S. *Auſtin* doth; at leaſt it cannot be denied, that he hath given another Sence to thoſe places of S. *Paul* which

which ſeem to prove it moſt. As for Example, when he expoundeth that famous paſſage, *Rom.* 5. 12. By *One man ſin entred into the World*, &c. He underſtandeth of Death what S. *Paul* ſaith of Sin, becauſe it is the Wages of Sin; and upon thoſe other words of the ſame Chapter, *As by the diſobedience of one, many are become Guilty*, &c. *This Sentence*, ſaith he, *ſeems to have much of Difficulty: for how can it be, that one only Man having ſinned, many ſhould be made guilty by his ſin? We may eaſily conceive, that the firſt Man being become mortal, it was neceſſary, that his Off-ſpring ſhould be mortal likewiſe; but what Likelihood, and what Reaſon is there, that a man ſhould be a Sinner, becauſe of anothers diſobedience? ... What then ſignifyeth the word Sinner? In my Opinion it ſignifyeth nothing elſe, but a condemned Man, ſubject to Pain and Death:* This is a way of ſpeaking which does not agree with S. *Auguſtin*'s Doctrine: Tho' it is not hard to defend S. *Chryſoſtom*, by ſaying, That tho' he ſpake thus, yet he admitted all that Divines own concerning Original ſin: For what is Original ſin, according to them? It is either a Privation of Original righteouſneſs, or Luſt with the guilt of Sin, or pain and Guilt together. But S. *Chryſoſtom* acknowledges all theſe: for in the firſt place he Confeſſeth, that by the firſt Man's ſin, all men were deprived and ſpoiled of the State of Innocence, that they are become not only mortal, and ſubject to Pain and Grief, but alſo inclined to Evil. Thus, in his Opinion, Luſt is an effect of the firſt Man's ſin; and that Concupiſcence in men, makes them unworthy of eternal Life, if the Grace of Jeſus Chriſt ſaveth them not by Baptiſm.

S. *John Chryſoſtom.*

He aſcribes much to the ſtrength of Free-will; He always ſpeaks as if he believed that it depends upon our ſelves to do good or evil, and affirms that God always gives his Grace to thoſe who on their ſide doe all they can; That we muſt begin, and God makes an end; That he followeth the motions of our Wills, and giveth them their Perfection; yet he owns the neceſſity of Grace to do good, but ſubmits it ſtill to our Will: So that according to him, *We are to will and chuſe the good, and God gives us the neceſſary Grace to fulfil the ſame; he prevents not our Will, that our Liberty may not be prejudiced; he worketh good in us, but that is when we are willing: when our Will is determined, he draweth to himſelf, but only thoſe who do all their endeavours to come near to him.* Thoſe Principles about foreknowledge, and Predeſtination, agree very well with theſe Concluſions. *God did not predeſtinate men, but as he foreſaw their merits: foreknowledge is not the cauſe of the event of things, but God foreſaw them becauſe they ſhall happen. He calls all men; Jeſus Chriſt died for all men; he prepared his Grace for all, he predeſtinated thoſe whom he foreſaw would uſe his Grace well:* He Confeſſes, that no man is free from ſin in this Life, nay he excepteth not the holy Virgin *Mary*.

De verbis Jer. Hom. 1. Hom. 2. in 1. ad Cor. Hom. 41. in Geneſim. Hom. de tribus pueris. Hom. 12. in ep. ad Hebr. & 8. in ep. ad Phil. & 19. ibid Hom. 17. in Joan. Hom. 18. in ep ad Rom. & 12. in ep. 1. ad Cor. In Matth. Hom. 83. Hom. 45. in Joan. In orat. de S. Pelagia. Serm. de Zachæo. Hom. 34. in Matth. Hom. 80. in ep. ad Rom. Hom. 16. & 18. in ep. ad Rom. & Hom. de obſcur. Prophet. Serm. 5. de Lazaro. Hom. 45. in Matth.

Hom. de Bapt. Chriſti.

S. *Chryſoſtom* attributes much vertue and efficacy to Sacraments, but he requires very holy diſpoſitions, that Men may be the better for them. " He ſaith, That Circumciſion and the other " Sacraments of the Jews, did not blot out Sins, but cleanſed only Bodily filthyneſſes; whereas " our Baptiſm hath far greater Vertue purifying the Soul, delivering it from ſin, and filling it " with the Grace of the Holy Spirit: that *John*'s Baptiſm was indeed more excellent, than that " of the Jews, but much inferior to ours, becauſe it conferred neither the Holy Ghoſt, nor the " remiſſion of Sins, but only exhorted Men to Repentance. The Baptiſm of Jeſus Chriſt, not " only frees the Soul from ſin, but alſo ſanctifyeth it, wherefore it is called the Laver of Regeneration, becauſe it reneweth the Soul through Grace. Yet he does not believe, that Baptiſm produces theſe Effects in thoſe of riper years, unleſs they are well diſpoſed to receive it. " He exacts " from thoſe that come to this Sacrament, that they be watchful in the things of their Salvation, " diſingaged from worldly Cares, and that they renounce all diſorderly Converſation: that they " be zealous in their Devotion, and baniſh from their Hearts all thoughts unbecoming ſo holy " an Action, and keep their Souls prepared for the coming of this great King.

In Serm. ad Illuminandos.

Ibid.

And becauſe the *Clinicks*, (that is ſuch as receive Baptiſm at the point of Death) have not time thus to prepare themſelves, he doubts of their Salvation. He ſpeaketh of their Condition in ſuch terms, as deſcribe the Caſe of a dying man very naturally, who deferred to repent of his Sins till the hour of Death, and then would receive the Sacraments. " Altho', ſaith he, Sacraments con- " tain the ſame Graces, when the Preparation is different, yet all may not receive them. They " receive Baptiſm laying upon their Beds, you receive it in the boſom of the Church, which is the " Mother of all the Faithful; they receive it weeping, and you with joy; they with groans, and " you with thankſgiving; they in the heat of a Fever, and you under the Senſe of the heavenly " Grace: every thing here hath a Relation to the Grace received, there every thing diſagrees " with it; there are ſighings and tears, while the Sacrament is adminſtred, Children cry, the " Wife tears her Hair, Friends are dejected, Servants weep, the whole Houſe is in Mourning; " and if you mind the Spirit of the ſick Perſon, you ſhall find it more full of Sorrow, than that " of the Standers by; for as a ſtormy Sea divides into ſeveral Waves, ſo his Soul being agi- " tated with troubles is torn with a thouſand Diſquiets, racked with infinite Troubles. ..... " In this torture comes in a Prieſt, whoſe Preſence is more dreadful both to the Company, and " to the ſick Man, than the Sickneſs it ſelf: his Viſit ordinarily cauſeth greater Deſpair, than the " Phyſicians Sentence, that there is no hope of Recovery. They imagine that Sacraments, tho'

" Inſtruments

" inſtruments of the Spiritual life, are infallible tokens of Corporal death. But this is not yet " the end of his Miſery, nor the height of his Affliction; ſometimes while Neceſſaries for the " Sacrament are preparing, the Soul departs out of the Body; and often, tho' remaining in the " Body, yet it receives not the fruit of the Sacrament; for when the Sick perſon knows no " body, hears not the Prayers, and cannot utter the Words whereby he is to engage with God, " when he is half dead; what benefit can he reap from the Sacrament? *S. John Chryſoſtom.*

S. *Chryſoſtom* doth not diſcourſe oftner, nor in higher terms of any one Myſtery, than of the Euchariſt. He ſays in many places, that the Body and Blood of Chriſt are upon the Altars: That Jeſus Chriſt hath left us his Body and Blood: That the Bread and Wine become the Body and Blood of Chriſt: That we ought not to doubt of it, ſeeing Chriſt himſelf affirmeth it: That it is a ſurprizing Miracle, comparable to the greateſt Wonders: That by vertue of Chriſt's Words, in the Celebration of this Myſtery, Chriſt is offered in Sacrifice: That Jeſus Chriſt offereth himſelf to God the Father: That this Sacrifice is made without ſhedding of blood: That Angels and Arch-angels are preſent at it: That fire from Heaven conſumeth the things offered, and changeth them into the Body and Blood of Jeſus Chriſt: That this Table is to be approached unto with reverence and trembling: That there is need of Holineſs, to receive holy things: That Penitents ought not to come near; and that theſe Myſteries muſt be hid from Catechumens: That Men ought not only to be freed from Sin, but alſo from Earthly affections, and penetrated with divine Love, tranſported with an holy Zeal, and poſſeſſed with fervent Charity. Three ſorts of Prayers were made at the Celebration: The Firſt for thoſe that were poſſeſſed; the Second for Penitents; and the Third for the Faithfull. There was mention made of the Dead, and Invocation of Saints; The *Sanctus* was recited; The Catechumens and Penitents were put out; The Energumenes were brought in at the Conſecration, and Prayers were made for them.

Hom. 51. & 83. *in Matth. Hom.* 45. *in Joan. Serm. de de prodit. Judæ. Hom.* 45. & 46. *in Joannem. L.* 3 *de Sacerdot. c.*4. *Hom.* 24. *in ep. ad Cor. Hom.* 3. *in ep. ad Eph. Hom.* 51. *in Matth. Hom.* 52. *de S. Euſtathio. Hom.* 14. & 17. *in ep. ad Hebr. l.* 6. *de Sacer. c.* 1. *Hom.* 51. *in Matth. Hom.* 15. *in ep. ad Cor. Serm. de prodit. Judæ. Hom. in S. Euſt. Hom.* 33. *in Nat. Domini. Serm. de prodit. Judæ.*

S. *Chryſoſtom* wiſht that all thoſe who were preſent might communicate; and ſticks not to ſay, That all thoſe that are unworthy to communicate, are not worthy to partake of the Prayers: And that as he who finds not himſelf guilty of any Sin, ought to communicate every day; ſo he, on the contrary, that hath committed Sin, and repented not, ſhould not doe it, even upon Feſtival-days.

Hom. 83. *in Matth. Hom.* 21. *ad Pop. Hom.* 22. *ad Pop. Ant. l.* 6. *De Sacerdot. c.*4. *Hom. in Chriſti Natalem.*

The Sacrament was adminiſtred to dying perſons, and it was preſerved in a Box.

Hom. 72. *in Matth.*

Laſtly, That none but the Prieſts alone have the power to adminiſter the Euchariſt, which is the great thing that exalteth their Dignity.

Hom 41. *in* 1. *ad Cor. Hom. de Seraphim.*

But there is another Power inveſted in them which is not inferior to the other, which is that of binding and looſing, of retaining and remitting of Sins. It were to be wiſhed that Men needed no Repentance, but that they might keep their Baptiſmal purity without ſpot: But it being impoſſible not to Sin, God hath prepared the remedy of Repentance. Thoſe that are guilty of high Crimes, as Murther, Adultery, or Fornication, and the like, are put out of the Church and enjoyned publick Penance; but if they mend their faults, they may come in again, having purified themſelves by Repentance. As many as continue in Sin, and yet will come into the Church, notwithſtanding the Admonitions of Chriſt's Miniſters, aggravate their crime. Men may hope for pardon, whatſoever their Sin be; but let them have a care of being too confident: Few days are enough to get pardon for Sin. * " God, ſaith he, in the Ninth " Homily of Repentance, doth not conſider the length, but the zeal of Penance. If you " have ſinned ſeveral times, repent; come into the Church and put away your Sins. As you " uſe to riſe up as often as you fall, ſo as often as you have ſinned repent of your Sin, and " never deſpair. If you ſin a ſecond time, repent again; and beware leſt ye fall into that " conſternation, which may make you loſe the hope of future benefits. Tho' ye ſhould ſin " in the laſt day of your life, yet enter into the Church by repentance; this is the time of Re- " medy, and not of Judgment: God requireth not the penalty of Sin, but grants pardon " for it. He wiſely addeth in the following Homily, That none ought to deſpair, but every " one ought to beware of preſumption; for theſe two extreams are equally dangerous, becauſe " Deſpair hinders Men from riſing again, and Preſumption makes thoſe fall that ſtood upright " before: Sloth cauſes us to come ſhort of Heaven, and Deſpair precipitates into an Abyſs " of Malice.

Hom. 17. & 83. *in Matth. Hom.* 24. *in ep. ad Cor. Hom.* 33. *in Matth.* * *L.* 3. *de Sacerdot. ibid. Hom. ad illumin. Hom. de Davide & Saul. Hom. de Diab. tentatore. Hom. de B. Philogonio. Hom.* 9. *de Pœnitentiâ.*

And thus S. *Chryſoſtom* obſerves a juſt Medium between the exceeding Severity of ſome who thruſt Men into deſpair, and the ſoft Compliance of others, who promiſe Remiſſion without a true and ſincere Repentance. Whoſoever hath committed Sin, muſt own and confeſs it before God, if he would obtain pardon: He muſt be truly affected with a ſenſible grief for his wickedneſs; he muſt truly return to the Lord, and be converted; abhorr his iniquity, forſake his vi-

In Hom. de Pœnit.

cious habits, after his courſe of life, and love God with all his heart, and above all things, and doe every thing for his ſake, *&c.*

S. John Chryſoſtom.

The onely thing that may ſeem difficult in S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Diſcourſes concerning Penance, is what he ſaith of Confeſſion of Sins: For in ſeveral places he ſeems to affirm, That it is not neceſſary to confeſs to Men, but that it is ſufficient to confeſs to God, who knoweth the ſecrets of the heart. Thoſe paſſages are remarkable, and have often been alledged by the Enemies of Confeſſion. It has been anſwered by ſome, That S. *Chryſoſtom* ſpoke onely in oppoſition to a publick Confeſſion, ſuppoſed to have been aboliſhed by *Nectarius*; but theſe Men doe not obſerve, that moſt of theſe paſſages, even the moſt expreſs, are taken out of the Homilies preached at *Antioch* by S. *Chryſoſtom*. The beſt, and the moſt natural Anſwer is, That S. *Chryſoſtom* does not ſpeak in thoſe places of thoſe enormous Crimes that are ſubject to Canonical Penance; but in general of ſuch light offences as Chriſtians daily commit; for the remiſſion whereof, they need neither Confeſſion nor Abſolution, but only true Motions of inward repentance. He likewiſe diſcourſeth of that ſort of Sins, when he ſaith, That they are forgiven by Tears, by Alms, by Humility, by Prayer, and other remedies of that nature. However, S. *Chryſoſtom* was very ſevere in the puniſhment of Sinners; and he not only wiſht that notorious Sinners might be put out of the Church, and enjoyned Penance, as Adulterers and Blaſphemers; but he threatned alſo to excommunicate thoſe who came to the holy Myſteries negligently, and ſuch as lived in hatred and quarrels, that minded Stage-plays, were envious, proud, *&c.* Neither would he have great Lords to be ſpared; * *For*, ſaith he, *as to Eccleſiaſtical Correction, Princes are but as other Faithfull, there ought to be no diſtinction.* He adds, That the Miniſters of Jeſus Chriſt ſhould doe their Duty, tho' there were no hope that their reproof could prevail: Yet he would not have the Sword of the Church uſed lightly, or that Anathema's ſhould be indiſcreetly pronounced. This is the ſubject of the diſcourſe concerning Anathema's; wherein he endeavours to refute thoſe, who without lawfull authority, undertook boldly to condemn their Brethren, and to pronounce Anathema's upon ſuch matters as they were ignorant of. And he obſerves, that Men ought to be extreamly reſerved in this caſe, and not to publiſh Anathema's inconſiderately againſt any: But when there is neceſſity, it ought to be done with an intention to cure, and not to deſtroy thoſe that are under that penalty. † He ſaith further, in another place, That Zeal muſt be temper'd with Mercy, for otherwiſe it degenerates into Fury, and other Men's faults are not hardly to be judged of.

Hom. 21. ad Pop. Ant.
Hom. 9. de incompreh. Dei natura.
Hom. 8. de Pœnitentiâ.
Hom. 9. de Pœnitentiâ.
Hom. 20. in Geneſim.
Hom. in Pſ. 50.
Hom. 11. in Lazarum.
In Hom. de non evulgandis fratrum peccatis.
Serm. de pœnit. & mœſtitia Regis Achab.
Hom de bapt. Chriſti.
* *Hom 22. ad Pop. Ant.*
De Davide & Saul, Hom. 3.
Hom. 17. in Matth.
Hom. 4. in ep. ad Hebr.
In lib. contra gent. de S. Babyla. *Hom. de Anathemate.* † *Hom. 9. in Geneſim.*

In Hom. de SS. In Orat. de S. Babyla. Hom. de B. Philogonio. Hom. 2. ad pop. Antioch Hom. 1. in ep. ad Theſſ. Hom. 1. in illud Modico vino utere. *Hom. 21. in Acta. Hom. 41, 42. in 1 ad Cor.*

In S. *Chryſoſtom*'s time Martyrs were had in honour; they were commemorated in the publick Services; their Feſtivals were kept, and their Relicks reverenc'd; not that they believed there was any vertue in thoſe Bones, but becauſe the ſight of their Graves, Urns, or Bones, affected and awakned the Mind, after the ſame manner, as if the Dead were preſent, and prayed with us; becauſe the ſight of their precious Relicks made an impreſſion upon the Mind. They viſited the holy Places with Devotion; but S. *Chryſoſtom* obſerves, that the chief intention of thoſe Pilgrimages ought to be the aſſiſting of the Poor. The Dead were pray'd for: and S. *Chryſoſtom* exhorts their Relations to give Alms in their behalf.

Hom de bapt. Chriſti.

Ibid.

Hom 3. de Incompreh.

Sundays and great Feſtivals were kept with great Solemnity. S. *Chryſoſtom* exhorteth Chriſtians to ſpend that day in Exerciſes of Devotion: He zealouſly reproveth all thoſe who employ that day about Buſineſſes or Recreations; affirming, That God's Curſe will light upon their Labours, and diſſipate what they get by neglecting his Service. In ſeveral places he encourageth the Faithfull to frequent Divine Service and the Publick Prayers of the Church, and ſhews that they are more powerfull and of greater efficacy, than private ones: He reproves thoſe that gave attention to Sermons, but would go out as ſoon as the Sermon was ended. "When I preach, (ſays he, in the Third Diſcourſe of the incomprehenſible Nature of God) I "that am Chriſt's Servant as you are, you come in throngs to hear me; you hearken to my "words, and exhort one another, and attend with patience unto the end; but when Jeſus Chriſt "appeareth in the Myſteries, the Church is empty; you go out as ſoon as you have heard "the Sermon, which is a ſign that you have profited nothing; for had the Truths preached "unto you made any impreſſion upon your Minds, you would have ſtay'd in the Church, and "have partaken of theſe ſtupendious Myſteries with reverence and devotion; but, alas! you "depart immediately after the Sermon, as if you came only to hear a Conſort of Muſick. "Some, to excuſe themſelves, uſe this weak reaſon; We can pray at home, but can hear no "Sermons but at Church: You deceive your ſelves; for tho' ye may pray at home, yet your "Prayer cannot have the efficacy of that in the Church, where ſo many Prieſts join their Prayers with yours, and where a common Voice crieth to Heaven to implore God's mercy. "*Common Prayer is a wonderfull Conſort, proceeding from a Concord of Charity*: To which we "are to add the Prayers of the Prieſts, who are ſet over the Aſſemblies; that the Prayers of "the People, tho' weaker of themſelves, may gather ſtrength by being joined to thoſe of "God's Miniſters.

The

The Faſt of *Lent* was exactly obſerved, with Abſtinence from Meats; but for any Bodily Infirmity it might be diſpenſed with. Two days of the week were exempt from Faſting, that the Body might have ſome Reſpite.

S. John Chryſoſtom.

S. *Chryſoſtom* looks upon the Holy Scripture, *As the ground and Rule* of all the truths of Religion; He exhorts all the Faithful to read it exactly: and this Advice he preſſes an infinite number of times; He expounds it Litterally, and draws from it edifying moral Inſtructions, but he never propoſes any forced Allegories, nor reſolveth thoſe Queſtions that have more of Curioſity than Profit, as moſt Writers of Commentaries, whether Ancient or Modern very frequently do: I ſhould never make an end, if I ſhould Collect all the common places of S. *Chryſoſtom* upon moral Subjects: I ſhall only mention two or three of the moſt conſiderable upon every Subject, and point at ſome others.

Hom 3 & 4. *de Statuis. Hom.* 11. *in Geneſ. Serm* 3. & 4. *de Lazaro. Hom.* 1. & 2. *in Matth. Hom.* 10. 30, 32, 58.

in Joannem. Hom. 11. & 31. *in Eundem. Hom.* 1. *in ep. ad Rom. Hom.* 9. *in ep. ad Coloſ. Hom.* 19. *in Acta.*

Opinions of S. Chryſoſtom *upon ſeveral moral Principles.*

Of the Love of God.

MOST Men have taken up a falſe Notion of the Love of God, looking upon it as an Act of the mind, which thinks it has a Love for God, and expreſſes it with words. S. *Chryſoſtom* to undeceive them of this Error, proves by a compariſon with the love men have for the Creature, that the love which they ought to have for God, is a ſtrong cleaving of the Heart to God, which is the Rule, Principle, and Motive of all their Actions, and which begets in them a contempt of all that is not God. " If thoſe (ſaith he in his Comment " upon *Pſalm* 91.) that are in love with Corporeal Beauties, have no Senſe for all other things " in the World, and follow no buſineſs, but that of beholding continually an Object which " is ſo dear and ſo acceptable to them; Can a man that loveth God, as God ought to be " loved, have any Senſe afterwards of the good and evil, of the Pleaſures and Afflictions of " this Life? No truly, for he is above all theſe things, and his delight is only in good things " that are Immortal, and of the ſame Nature with him whom he loveth; thoſe that love the " Creatures do quickly change, 'tho unwillingly, their Affection, for Oblivion; becauſe the " things which they love decay and corrupt; but this ſpiritual love hath neither end nor bounds, " but contains in it ſelf more Pleaſure and Profit than any thing elſe, and nothing is able to " extinguiſh it.

He compareth the love that we ought to have for God, with that which covetous Men have for riches; in the Sixth Homily upon the Second Epiſtle to *Timothy*. " It is a ſhameful " thing, *ſaith he*, that Men poſſeſſed with a violent Paſſion for riches, ſhould ſhew nothing " of that love which they ought to have for God; and that, we have leſs Conſideration for " God, than covetous Men have for wealth. For to get Money they watch much, undertake " long Journeys, expoſe themſelves to Dangers, Hatred and Ambuſhes, and undergo all " Extremities, but we refuſe to bear with the leaſt word for God, or to expoſe our ſelves to " the leaſt hatred for his Service, *&c.*

In the Third Homily upon 1 *Cor.* he tells Chriſtians, That they love Jeſus Chriſt leſs than their Friends. " Many, *ſaith he*, have endured the loſs of their Goods, for the Service " of their Friends; but none are willing, I will not ſay, to be deprived of their Goods for " Jeſus Chriſt, but even to be reduced to mere Neceſſaries for his ſake, or to content themſelves with what they have at preſent. We often bear with Affronts, and make our ſelves " Enemies for our Friends; but none will incurr the Hatred of any for the Service of Jeſus " Chriſt, and both this Hatred and Love are looked upon as unprofitable things; we never " deſpiſe a Friend when we ſee him hungry, but would not give a Morſel of bread to Jeſus " Chriſt who cometh to us daily . . . . . if our Friend be ſick we viſit him immediately; but " tho' Chriſt is often detained in Priſon in the Perſons of his Members, we come not at him. " When a Friend is going a Journey we melt into tears, but tho' Chriſt daily departeth from " us, or rather we daily put him away by our ſins, yet we are not affected with Grief upon " that Account.

Laſt of all, S. *Chryſoſtom* obſerveth *Hom.* 52. upon the *Acts*, That, " Whoſoever loveth God " truly, will deſpiſe all the things of this World, even thoſe that are the moſt precious and illuſtrious. Glory and Shame are indifferent things to him; he is no more Sollicitous than if " he were left alone in the World: He deſpiſeth Temptations, Scourgings, Dungeons, with " as much Courage, as if all theſe were endured by another, or as if his Body were a Diamond; he laughs at the Pleaſures of this Life, and is not in the leaſt ſuſceptible of Paſſions.

See the Twentieth Homily upon S. *Matthew*, where he ſhews that God is to be loved not in Words but in Deeds. *Hom.* 30. upon 2 *Cor. Hom.* 3. upon 1 *Tim. Hom.* 52. upon the *Acts.*

Of

S. John Chryſoſtom.

Of the Love of our Neighbour.

" CHarity (ſaith S. *Chryſoſtom* in the Sixth Homily upon the Epiſtle to *Titus*) is the greateſt " of all Vertues, it brings the Lovers thereof to the very Throne of God. Virginity, " Faſting, and Auſterities profit only thoſe that practiſe them; but Alms-deeds reach to all, " and embrace all the Members of Jeſus Chriſt: Now there is no Vertue greater than that " which reunites ſcattered and ſeparated parts. Charity is the Badge of Chriſtian Religion, " whereby the Diſciples of Jeſus Chriſt are known: That is it which cures our Crimes, cleanſes " the Spots of our Souls, it is as a Ladder to aſcend into Heaven, and it joyns all the parts of " Chriſt's Body together.

See the Sixtieth Homily upon S. *Matthew*, the 15th. and 78th. upon S. *John*, the 40th. upon the *Acts*, the 8th. upon the *Rom.* the 32d. upon 2 *Cor.* the 9th. upon *Epheſ.* the Second upon the laſt to *Tim.* the 33d. upon 1 *Cor.* the 4th. upon *Theſ.* the 10th. upon the Epiſtle to the *Epheſ.* the Second upon the Epiſtle to the *Philippians.*

Of Alms-deeds.

THE firſt effect of Charity is to give Alms, and the Obligation to Alms-deeds, is included in the Commandment of Loving our Neighbours as our ſelves. S. *Chryſoſtom* recommends this Vertue in ſo many places, that he ſaith himſelf in the 89th. Homily upon S. *Matthew*, That they upbraided him with ſpeaking of nothing elſe. " Giving of Alms " (ſaith he in ſeveral places) renders Men like unto God, cleanſeth from ſin, and appeaſeth " the Anger of God. To give to the Poor, is to give unto God, it is to lend to him upon " Uſe. We are not only adviſed, but commanded to give Alms. Men are not Maſters but " only Stewards of their Goods. God who is the Soveraign Lord hath entruſted them with " the rich, that they might relieve the poor. All other good works are unprofitable with- " out Alms-deeds. Alms ſhould be given with Joy, and in abundance. Men ought not to " ſtay till Death to diſpoſe of their Charity; but if they have done nothing in their Life- " time, it is good to leave to the poor after Death, and give them as much as to a Child, or " at leaſt as to a Servant. Theſe Principles and Maxims S. *Chryſoſtom* repeateth often in his Homilies, as the Thirtieth Homily upon *Geneſis*, that upon *Pſalm* 101. the Second Sermon concerning *Lazarus*, the Seventeenth Homily upon 2 *Cor.* the Sixth upon *Titus*, The 5th. 35th, 45th, 47th, 48th, 52d. 66th. 78th, 80th, 86th, upon S. *Matth.* The 23d, 25th, 27th, 40th, 76th, upon S. *John*, the Seventh upon *Coloſ.* the 11th, 15th, 18th, upon *Rom.* the 20th, 21ſt, and 43d, upon 1 *Cor.* the 5th, Homily of Penance, the Sermon upon the Petition of the Sons of *Zebedee*, the firſt Homily of Faſting, and in an infinite number of places beſides.

Of Riches and Poverty.

AS the Luxury of Riches hinders Men from giving of Alms, ſo we ought not to wonder that S. *Chryſoſtom* preaching upon Charity, declaims vehemently againſt Riches, and ſpeaks in Commendation of Poverty. " Riches (ſaith he in the Second Homily of Statues) are not " forbidden, if a good uſe be made of them. But what Probability is there that Men ſhould " not neglect Jeſus Chriſt who is naked, while they build marble Palaces for themſelves? O " wretched Man! to what purpoſe is the Magnificency of thy Houſe? This Palace will not, " but thy good works will follow thee. .... To day rich, and to morrow poor. I muſt " confeſs, that I cannot forbear ſmiling when I read in Wills and Teſtaments, I give and " bequeath to ſuch a one, the Revenue of my Eſtate for Life, and to ſuch a one the Fee- " ſimple. To ſpeak Properly, we have but the uſe of things, the Propriety belongs not to " us, and tho' we ſhould poſſeſs them all our Life-time, yet will they leave us when we " die .... Poverty is a ſingular advantage to thoſe that know how to uſe it well. It is a " Treaſure that cannot be taken away, a ſupport that cannot fail, and a Sanctuary that cannot " be violated. If you ask the Admirers of that fooliſh Magnificence, what is the Object of their " Admiration? They will anſwer you, that it is either the brave Horſe that carrieth this new *Cra-* " *ſus*, or his rich Livery, his gilded Clothes, or the delicate Meats that are ſet before him, or the " Pleaſures he enjoyeth. This is what is admired, and what cannot be too much deplored; and " yet none of theſe Commendations are directed to this rich Man, they all belong to his Horſe, " his Clothes or his Equipage, they admire how well he is mounted, they praiſe his Men, his " Clothes, but they ſay nothing of his Perſon. Can there be a greater Folly? But on the other " ſide, if you ſee a poor Man in want, and under contempt, deſpiſed by thoſe that ſee him, make

" much

" much of him, and by your eſteem of him, the Beholders will be excited to Vertue. They " will tell you, that he is an indigent Fellow, a Wretch; but do you ſay on the contrary that he is " a happy Man, becauſe he hath God for his Friend, becauſe he hath not faſtned his Heart to periſh- " ing Riches, nor defiled his Conſcience. With ſuch Chriſtian Diſcourſes as theſe inſtruct your Bre- " thren; let both your Praiſes and your Contempts have no other Aim than the Glory of the " Almighty.... One may commend, reprove, and be angry for God's ſake. If you find a Servant, " a Friend, a Neighbour, robbing, or committing Lewdneſs; If you hear one telling a Lye, or " Blaſpheming; If you perceive that your Neighbour is going to proſtitute his Soul at a Play, call " him back, check, and correct that Sinner: Theſe good works will be done to the Honour of " God. If this Servant, or this Friend hath offended you, and is departed from his Duty, for- " give him, that will be Forgivneſs for God's ſake; make alſo Friends and Enemies to your " ſelves for God's cauſe. Do you ask how? thus it is: Never contract that ſort of Friendſhip which " is gotten by Luxury, Intereſt or Ambition, but ſeek to make you ſuch Friends, as may adviſe " you to Moderation under a great Fortune, and Comfort you in Adverſity, who may prompt " you only to Honeſty, and who by their Counſels and Prayers may unite you to Jeſus Chriſt. " If you ſee a lewd Perſon, one full of dangerous Opinions, break off all commerce with " him.... If you ſpeak in any Company, let your words be Godward. He did ſo often Diſ- " courſe againſt Riches, and the abuſe of them, that he ſaith himſelf, in the Sermon againſt *Eu-* " *tropius*, upon *Pſalm* 44. that they accuſed him of hating rich Men. " But, *ſaith he*, why ſhould " I not ſpeak continually againſt them, ſince they ceaſe not to torment the Poor? I complain " not of them becauſe they are rich, but becauſe they uſe their Riches ill: for I make this Pro- " feſſion, Never to blame any Body for being wealthy, but for with-holding what is not his own. " ... The preſent Life (addeth he) is a Pilgrimage; let no man ſay, I have a Town, a Houſe, " an Eſtate, *&c.* No Man hath any thing here below: all the good things of this Life, are the " Inſtruments of our Journey; we are travelling as long as this Life laſteth. Some gather wealth " in this Journey, and bury Gold in the way, and pray tell me, when you are come into an " Inn, do you furniſh it with ſuperfluous Houſhold-ſtuff? No certainly, you are contented to " eat and drink there, and to be gone as ſoon as you can. This Life is an Inn, we are ſcarce " come into it, but we are obliged to quit it, therefore let us do it readily; let us keep nothing " here, that we may loſe nothing in the next Life. You are Travellers in this Life, and leſs than " Travellers; for a Traveller knoweth, when he cometh into his Inn, and when he goeth out, " *&c.* In this dreadful Ignorance I loſe a great deal of time; and while I am laying up of " Proviſions, God calls me, and upbraids me thus, Thou Fool! whoſe ſhall theſe things be which " thou haſt prepared? for this very Night thy Soul ſhall be demanded of thee.... But what, " will ſome Perſons ſay, muſt be done in this Caſe? even this, Hate temporal Goods, love eter- " nal Life, part with your Eſtate, I do not ſay with all, but with what is ſuperfluous; do not covet " what is another's; ſpoyl not the Widow, nor rob the Orphan; raviſh not the Goods of this " World, but take Heaven by violence; Jeſus Chriſt approves of this violence, *&c.* Do not " vex the Poor, but doe him Right, *&c.*

S. *John Chryſoſtom.*

See *Hom.* 4. upon S. *Matthew*, where he proves by the Example of the Three Children, that were caſt into the Fiery Furnace, that Riches are not to be worſhipped: The 9th. Homily upon S. *Matthew*, where he ſhews, that we ought not to be lifted up, becauſe of Riches: The 20th, and 64th, againſt the deſire of wealth: The 42d. againſt Luxury and Pleaſures: The 48th. againſt exceſs in Clothes: The 80th. and 81ſt. Homilies againſt Covetouſneſs: The 88th. againſt the Luxury of Women: And, the 19th. Homily upon S. *John*, concerning the uſe that ought to be made of Riches.

Of Forgiving, and againſt Revenge.

THE Second effect of Charity towards our Neighbour, is forgiving of our Enemies, in oppoſition to a Spirit of Revenge, of Enmity and Reſentment. S. *Chryſoſtom* declaims ſeverely againſt this Vice, in an Homily purpoſely compoſed on that Subject, which is the Twenty-ſecond, concerning Statues. Theſe are ſome of his Notions. " The revengefull Man, *ſaith he*, is not " leſs unworthy of the Communion, than the Blaſphemer and Adulterer. The lewd Perſon puts " an end to his Crime when he has ſatisfied his impure Deſire; but he that keeps up an obſtinate " Hatred, ſins continually, and never makes an end. The fire of Luſt is ſpent by enjoyment; " but that of Hatred feeds it ſelf, and is renewed every moment. With what face then can we " implore the Mercy of God, whilſt we are full of bitter hatred againſt our Brethren? Your Bro- " ther hath done you an injury; but doe you not often commit injuries againſt God? Doe you " compare the Servant with his Maſter? In the mean time, he that wrongeth you, was perhaps " wrong'd by you before: But what wrong hath God ever done you? or rather what benefits " hath he not taken pleaſure to beſtow upon you, and you in requital return only injuries to him " again? In a word; pretending to be revenged of others, you puniſh your ſelves: The hatred " you harbour, is your own tormenter, to tear your own bowels. Is there any thing more un- " happy than he who meditates revenge? He is a Mad-man that never enjoyeth any reſt, his

S. *John Chryſoſtom.*

" Heart being filled with Storms and Troubles: He abhorreth all the Actions, the Words, and " the very Name of his Enemy. And to what end is this Fury, and theſe Torments? We ought " to forgive our Enemies to prevent the pains we feel by hating them. What folly is it to ſeek " revenge at our own coſt; to doe our ſelves a great miſchief, that another may receive a leſſer, *&c.*

See the 61ſt. Homily upon S. *Matthew*; the 39th. upon S. *John*; the 38th. upon the *Acts*; an Homily upon the Epiſtle to the *Theſſalonians*, and ſeveral other places.

Of Faſting.

NExt to giving of Alms, Faſting is one of the moſt powerfull means to obtain pardon for Sin; but that Faſting may be profitable, it muſt be accompanied with a regular life. This S. *Chryſoſtom* takes notice of almoſt every-where, when he diſcourſes of Faſting. See how he expreſſeth himſelf, in the Second Homily of Statues. " I doe not call Faſting a meer abſtinence " from Meats, but forbearance from Sin: For Faſting is not able of its own nature to blot out " the pollution of our offences, except neceſſary diſpoſitions doe attend it.... Let us therefore " have a care, that in Faſting, we fall not ſhort of the price and reward that belongs to it: But " let us learn perfectly to practiſe it holily. Afterwards he ſets forth the qualities of a Faſt by " the example of that of the *Ninevites*.... He (ſaith our Author) offers an injury to Faſting, who " defines it to be an abſtinence from Meats. You Faſt, Brother; but ſhew me your Faſting by " your Works: but you will ask me, what Works? I require therefore, that when you ſee a " poor Man, you be ſure to help him in his miſery; that you reconcile your ſelf to your enemy; " that another Man's Glory may not excite your Envy; and that you ſhut your Eyes when you " meet an handſome Woman: For Faſting reſpects not the Mouth barely, but the Ear, the " Hands, the Feet, and all the other Parts of the Body. Covetous Hands ſhould faſt, and " touch no more other Men's goods; the Feet ſhould faſt, and run no more to profane Shews; " and the Eyes ſhould faſt, by turning aſide from that beauty, whoſe ſight is ſo dangerous.

In the Fourth Homily of Statues, he lays down the ſame Maxims again. " We ſee, *ſaith he*, " nothing but People making merry, and ſaying one to another; Victory, all is our own, Mid- " lent is over. My advice to theſe is, That they ſhould conſider, whether the inward Man is " in a better condition than it was when the Faſt begun: For then indeed we have reaſon to re- " joyce, when our Faſting does not end with thoſe Vices that it began with, and when we are " come to the Feſtival of *Eaſter* with a Conſcience purified by Faſting. I know ſome who, in " the middle of Lent, do dread already that of the next year.... Can there be a greater weakneſs? " But whence cometh it? Even from this, That we make Faſting to conſiſt only in forbearing " of Meats, and not in the reforming of our Manners.

" There may be (ſaith he in the 22d. Homily) ſeveral reaſons not to Faſt; but there is none not " to correct a vicious habit. You have broken your Faſt, becauſe of a bodily infirmity. Well: " But why doe you not forgive your Enemy? Is there any corporal indiſpoſition that hinders? " Laſtly, He obſerveth in the 7th. and 11th. Homilies upon *Geneſis*, that the true Faſt is abſti- " nence from Sin; for forbearance of Meat was introduced to reſtrain the motions of the Fleſh, " and to ſuppreſs the Paſſions. See the Homilies of *Faſting* and of *Alms-deeds*, and the 57th. upon S. *Matthew*.

Upon this; That Man is obliged to doe all for God, and to direct all his Actions to him alone.

COncerning a Chriſtian's Duty, S. *Chryſoſtom* diſcourſeth thus in the 23d. Homily, againſt thoſe that kept the Feaſts of the New-Moons. " S. *Paul* (ſaith he) commands us to doe all things " to the Glory of God: *For whether you eat, or whether you drink, or whatſoever ye doe, doe all* " *to the Glory of God.* You will ask what relation have theſe things to the Glory of God? In- " vite a poor Man to your Table; this is called to eat and drink to the Glory of God. You may " alſo work for God by ſhutting up your ſelves in your own Houſes: How, and by what means, " will you ſay? When you hear the Diſorders and Inſolencies committed in the Streets, by lewd " Men, then ſhut your doors, have nothing to doe with that helliſh Crew, and you ſhall keep " your Houſes for the Glory of God. You may alſo glorifie the Lord both by your Praiſes " and by your Contempt: As for example; When you ſee a wicked Man gorgeouſly apparell'd, " and ſumptuouſly adorned with the ſpoil of the Countries, which he hath brought to deſolation, " and attended with a great number of Servants; and ſome weak Soul is blinded with that vain " luſtre, diſcover to him his errour, and make him ſee the vanity of that inſignificant Pomp, and " pity the happineſs of that unhappy Man. Thus may Men deſpiſe things for the Glory of God. " This contempt is an inſtruction for thoſe that are witneſſes thereof. We prove God to be pre- " ſent at all the actions of our lives, even in our purchaſes and ſales, when we are contented with " an

" an honeſt gain, and when we take no advantage of other Men's neceſſities to advance the rates " of our Commodities.

" In your Faſts and Prayers, in your Contempt and Praiſe, in your Silence and Diſcourſes, in " Selling and Buying, think always on the Glory of God.

S. John Chryſoſtom.

See upon the ſame Subject the 6th. Homily upon S. *Matthew*, the 79th. upon the ſame, the 9th. and 14th. upon the *Acts*, and the 18th. upon the *Romans*.

Of the neceſſary Diſpoſitions to communicate worthily.

NOne of the Fathers have ſpoken more powerfully and largely than S. *Chryſoſtom*, concerning the neceſſary Diſpoſitions to communicate worthily, nor more dreadfully againſt unworthy Communicants.

He requireth in the firſt place, that thoſe who draw near to the Lord's Table, ſhould put away their Sins. " It is written (ſaith he in the Firſt Sermon of Penance) That without Holineſs no " Man ſhall ſee God; but whoſoever is unworthy to ſee God, is not worthy to partake of the " Body and Blood of Chriſt; wherefore S. *Paul* will have a Man to examine himſelf, *&c.* Reform " the Diſorders of your life paſt, and then come to that holy Table, and participate of that Sacri- " fice with a pure and unſpotted Conſcience.

" He ſaith the ſame things in the 22d. Homily of Statues; Seeing we are advancing into *Lent*, " let us advance in Vertue; it is in vain to run, except we get the prize of the Race: Our Au- " ſterities and Faſtings will profit us nothing, if we come not to the holy Table with an exact " purity of Heart: For Lent, Prayers and Sermons are appointed in the Church, for no other " purpoſe, but to make us participate ſafely of the unbloody Sacrifice, and to waſh away with " the Waters of Repentance, the filthineſſes of our Sins; without this our labour is vain: But if " by Abſtinence you have corrected one Vice, and gained one Vertue, and put off one evil habit, " then you may boldly take place at the Table of the Lord.

" He recommends the ſame thing in the Homily of *Seraphims*. I tell you plainly, *ſaith he*, " I pray, I beſeech you not to come to the Lord's Table with a Conſcience defiled with Crimes: " For to communicate in this condition, is not Communion, but Condemnation; and tho' you " ſhould a thouſand times come to the Body of Jeſus Chriſt in that condition, yet inſtead of recei- " ving benefit by it, you would become the more guilty. Let Sinners therefore keep away; that is, " thoſe who perſevere in their Sin. This I warn you of betimes, even now, that when the day " of that heavenly Feaſt ſhall come, you may not ſay, I am unprepared, you ſhould have gi- " ven me warning.... I know that we are all guilty, that no man can boaſt of having a pure " heart in this World: That's not the worſt; but that not having a pure heart, they will not " draw nigh unto him that can purifie them.

But to be pure is not ſufficient, according to S. *Chryſoſtom*, to partake of that holy Table; " Men muſt have a care beſides, that they come not thither negligently. " Let no Man (ſaith " he in the 83d. Homily upon S. *Matthew*) approach this Sacred Table with diſguſt, negligence " or coldneſs; but let all come with a longing deſire, with zeal and love.... You ought there- " fore to watch over your own actions carefully, knowing that thoſe who receive unworthily the " Body and Blood of Jeſus Chriſt, are threatned with a dreadfull puniſhment. If you cannot " endure, without horrour, *Judas*'s crime, who ſold his Maſter; and the *Jews* ingratitude, who " crucified their King; beware alſo of becoming guilty of profaning the Body and Blood of Je- " ſus Chriſt: Let no *Judas*, no covetous Man come hither; let none but true Diſciples of Jeſus " Chriſt be preſent at that Feaſt, *&c.* For this Reaſon this holy Father obſerves in the Homily of *Judas*'s Treachery, that this holy Altar is not to be approached unto without reverence.... That no Hypocrite, no Man full of iniquity ought to come near to this Sacred Table. According to " theſe Principles, (he ſaith in the 17th. Homily upon *Hebrews*) That, generally ſpeaking, no " reckoning is to be made either of thoſe who communicate but once in the Year, or of thoſe that " doe it often, or ſuch as receive ſeldom; but of thoſe that communicate with a pure Conſcience, " a clean Heart, and a blameleſs Life. Let as many as are thus diſpoſed come always; and as " many as are not, let them not come once, becauſe they cannot but draw God's Judgments " upon themſelves, and become worthy of Condemnation. Doe you think that Forty days " Penance is ſufficient to cleanſe you from all your Sins?

See upon the ſame Subject the 52d. Homily againſt thoſe that Faſt at *Eaſter*; the Homily upon the Nativity of Jeſus Chriſt; the 7th. Homily upon S. *Matthew*; the 24th. 27th. and 41ſt. upon 1 *Cor.* the 3d. upon the Epiſt. to the *Epheſians*; the 17th. upon the Epiſt. to the *Hebrews*; the 5th. upon *Titus* and ſeveral other places.

Of

S. John Chryſoſtom.

Of Prayer.

" GOD requireth of us fervent and conſtant Prayer; he often with-holds thoſe things that " we ask of him to excite our Zeal. This Obſervation is found in the Firſt Homily concerning Statues, in thoſe upon *Geneſis*, in the Commentary upon *Pſal.* 7. and in the Homily upon theſe Words, *Phil.* 1. *What then? Chriſt is preached.* He deſcribeth both the Conditions and the Effects of Prayer in the 2d. Homily upon *Hannah*. In the 5th. Homily upon the ſame Subject, he ſheweth the Strength and Virtue of Prayer; He lays down the Neceſſity of Prayer in ſeveral places of his Works. See the 22d. Homily upon S. *Matthew*, the 36th. upon S. *John*; he ſpeaks of Thankſgiving in the 25th. upon *Matthew*, in the 35th. upon S. *John*'s Goſpel, and in the 14th. upon 2 *Cor.*

Of Attention in Prayer.

" WE pay leſs reſpect to God, than a Servant doth to his Maſter, a Soldier to his General, or " even a Friend to his Friend; for we ſpeak to our Friends with attention: But whilſt our " Knees are on the ground, and we are treating with God about the buſineſs of our Salvation; " whilſt we beg pardon for our Crimes, we faint, our Mind is at Court, or at the Bar, and there " is no correſpondence betwixt our Thoughts and our Words. We daily commit this fault, *&c.*

" Many go into the Church, and there utter a great number of Prayers; and then come out, " not knowing what they have ſaid: They move their Lips, but they do not apply their Minds " to their Diſcourſes. What? you hearken not to what you ſay, and would you have God hear it? " I kneeled, ſay you, but your Heart was ſome-where elſe: Your Mouth uttered Petitions, but " your Mind was about Bargains, Trading, Exchange or Viſits. It is in the time of Prayer that the " Devil aſſaults us, knowing that then we profit ſpiritually; he ſuggeſts to our Spirits a multi- " tude of Thoughts. See the 36th. Homily upon the *Acts*, wherein he exhorts Chriſtians to pray in the Night.

Of Humility, againſt Pride.

HUmility, according to S. *Chryſoſtom*, is the principle of all Vertues, and the ground of all good Works. This he proveth in the 47th. Homily upon S. *Matthew*: " We ſhould not be " lifted up for our good Works, but acknowledge our unworthineſs before God. Vertues are like " Riches; if we expoſe them publickly, we are in danger of loſing them; to preſerve them, they " muſt be hid. The more good we doe, the leſs we ſhould boaſt of it; if we be proud for it, we " loſe its reward. The greateſt Action, and the moſt acceptable to God, is to entertain low " Thoughts of our ſelves.... Nothing conduces more to make us beloved of God, than to reckon " our ſelves moſt imperfect; that is the heighth and perfection of Wiſdom.

See the 3d. Homily upon S. *Matthew*; the 4th. upon the ſame Goſpel; the latter end of the 25th. and 65th. upon the ſame; the 28th. 38th. 41ſt. and 48th. upon S. *John*; the 21ſt. upon the *Romans*; the 11th. upon 2 *Theſſal.* and the 2d. Homily upon the Epiſtle to *Titus*; where he ſpeaks againſt the love of Glory.

Of Chriſtian Watchfulneſs.

S. *Chryſoſtom* deſcribeth in ſeveral places the various Devices which Satan uſeth to tempt us, very eloquently. Upon this Subject one may conſult the Homily of *the Tempter*, where he proves that Temptations are profitable for us, provided we ſtand always upon our guard, and watch continually over our ſelves. This he recommends in that place, and in the 13th. Homily upon S. *Matthew*; where he proves, that in this World the Devil's temptations are to be reſiſted: In the 14th. where he ſhews that the diſeaſes of the Soul are not to be neglected; and in many other places, where he gives both Precepts and Means to avoid Temptations and Sins.

Againſt

Againſt Covetouſneſs.

S. *Chryſoſtom* declares his Indignation againſt Covetous Men in many places, and the Picture which he makes of them is enough to beget in us an abhorrency to them. Thus he ſpeaks of them, *Hom.* 9. upon 1 *Cor.* "What can be more impudent, ſhameleſs and bold, than a miſera- "bly covetous Man? A Dog is more modeſt than the covetous Man, who ſeizeth upon that which "is another Man's. Nothing is more filthy, than thoſe Hands which take all; nothing more "cruel, than that Mouth which devoureth all, and is never ſatisfied. Look not upon his Face "and Eyes, as if they were the Eyes and Face of a Man. The covetous Perſon is never contented, "till he hath got all that the World hath; all is brutiſh in his Face; he is Inhumanity it ſelf, *&c.* In the 39th. Homily upon 1 *Cor.* he ſheweth how abominable a thing a covetous Man is, who having gathered great quantities of Corn, to ſell it dear, laments, becauſe it is growing cheap. In another place, *Hom.* 18. upon the Epiſtle to the *Epheſians*; he ſays that Covetouſneſs is a kind of Idolatry. He carries the ſame Notion in the 64th. Homily upon S. *John*. In a word, all his Homilies are full of Invectives againſt covetous Men; He writes againſt Uſury in the 56th. Homily upon S. *Matthew*, in the 12th. upon the *Romans*, and in the 15th. upon 1 *Cor.*

S. *John Chryſoſtom.*

Of Meekneſs, and againſt Anger.

THo' S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Zeal gave his Enemies occaſion to accuſe him of being paſſionate; yet one may eaſily judge by his Writings, that he was a great lover of Meekneſs, and that he diſapproved of Paſſion; See his Moral Exhortations, in the 29th. Homily upon S. *Matthew*, the 33d. and 48th. upon S. *John*, the 6th. upon the *Acts*, and the 17th. upon the Epiſtle to the *Epheſians*.

Againſt Envy.

"ENvy is the moſt abominable of Sins: Hell never produced one more to be abhorred. Other "Sinners have ſome pleaſure; but the Envious Man torments himſelf, whilſt he torments o- "thers. Envy hath been the cauſe of all miſchief. This crime is ſo much the more dangerous, "becauſe no Penance is enjoyned for it. Men fanſie they may blot it out by ſome ſmall Alms, or "a ſhort Faſt; they do not weep bitterly for it, as for Adultery or Fornication, *&c.*

Theſe are ſome of S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Notions about Envy, taken out of the 40th. Homily upon S. *Matthew*. One may read upon the ſame Subject the Homily upon *Pſal.* 49. *Hom.* 37. upon S. *John*, the 3d. upon 1 *Cor.* the 24th. and 27th. upon 2 *Cor.* and the 3d. upon the Epiſtle to the *Philippians*.

Againſt Drunkenneſs.

"THere is not a more dangerous or hatefull Sin than Drunkenneſs, ſaith S. *Chryſoſtom*, in the "firſt Diſcourſe upon theſe words of S. *Paul* to *Timothy*, *Uſe a little Wine for thy ſtomach's "ſake, and thine often infirmities*. A Drunkard is a dead Man living, voluntary ſick, a perſon "uſeleſs either for the Commonwealth, or for his Family; one whoſe preſence is intolerable, "whoſe breath, voice and ſteps are equally odious.

See the 27th. Homily upon the *Acts*, the 25th. upon the Epiſtle to the *Romans*. See alſo the 56th. Homily upon S. *Matthew*, and the 27th. upon the *Acts*.

Againſt Swearing and Blaſphemies.

S. *Chryſoſtom* diſcourſeth againſt Swearing and Blaſphemies almoſt in all the Homilies of Statues, where he declaimeth vehemently againſt that Vice.

See alſo the 8th. 10th. and 11th. Homilies upon the *Acts*.

Concerning Publick Shows and Stage-plays.

S. John Chryſoſtom.

S. *Chryſoſtom* living in Two great Imperial Cities, where Plays, Shows, Comedies, *&c.* were very frequent, and to which the People were much addicted; one needs not wonder, that he ſhould ſo often and ſo earneſtly inveigh againſt thoſe diſorders. He calls their Stages, Schools of Lewdneſs, Academies of Incontinence, and Peſtilential Pulpits. "I here, *ſaith he*, you ſee lewd Women repreſenting Adulteries, and uttering Blaſphemies. With what Eyes will you look upon your Wives, your Children, Servants or Friends at your going out of ſuch places? He refuteth in another Sermon the ſpecious pretences they had to plead for Plays: theſe are his Words. "What harm, ſay you, is there in going to ſee a Play? Is that ſufficient to keep one from the "Communion? But I will ask you, Whether there can be a more ſhameleſs Sin, than to come "to the holy Table, being defiled with Adultery? Yes, it is a kind of Adultery to go to a Play; "and if you will not believe me, hear the Words of him who is to judge of our life. Jeſus Chriſt "tells us, That whoſoever looketh upon a Woman to luſt after her, committeth Adultery. "What can be ſaid of thoſe, who paſſionately ſpend whole days in thoſe places, in looking upon Women of ill fame and reputation: With what face will they dare to affirm, that they "beheld them not to luſt after them? And ſo much the rather, becauſe they hear laſcivious "Speeches, they ſee wanton Actions, they are entertained with amorous Songs, and with Voices "capable of ſtirring up ſhamefull Paſſions; they ſee Women dreſſed, painted, and adorned on "purpoſe to inſpire Love. The Aſſiſtants are in ſuch confuſion and idleneſs, as promote Riotings; "and theſe are natural effects both of the preparations and conſequences of Plays. The Muſical "Inſtruments, Conſorts and Songs, are equally dangerous; they flatter ſtrangely, they effeminate "the heart, and prepare it to yield to the ſnares laid for them by profligate Women. For if in the "Church it ſelf, where Pſalms are ſung, the Scripture is read, where the dread of the Almighty "appears, and Men are in a poſture of reverence? If, I ſay, in that ſo venerable a place, Luſt "will creep in as a Thief, How ſhall they be able to overcome the motions of Concupiſcence, "that conſtantly frequent the Stage, who neither ſee nor hear any thing but what is profane "and dangerous; whoſe Hearts are full of evil Thoughts, and whoſe Eyes and Ears are aſſaulted "continually? But if this be impoſſible, how ſhall they juſtifie themſelves from the guilt of "Adultery? And if they are Adulterers, how can they pretend to come into the Church, and "to participate of the holy Table before they have done Penance?

See the 4th. Homily concerning *Hannah*, the 1ſt. 7th. 17th. 37th. and 38th. upon S. *Matthew*, the 32d. and 58th. upon S. *John*, and the 17th. Homily upon the Epiſtle to the *Epheſians*, againſt Mountebanks, and Jeſters, and Stage-players.

Of Balls and Gaming.

S. *Chryſoſtom* exclaimeth as much againſt Balls and publick Meetings, as he does againſt Stage-plays. "There are (ſaith he in the 23d. Homily to the People of *Antioch*) no Enemy ſo dan"gerous as thoſe nocturnal Recreations, thoſe pernicious Meetings and Dances. Our former miſ"carriages call for Tears, for Shame and Sorrow, and yet Mirth breaks out every-where..... I "ſhall ſay nothing of idle Expences; but I am very much troubled at Gamings and Taverns; "how much is there of Impiety and Intemperance? He ſpeaks againſt Games of Chance in the 15th. Homily to the People of *Antioch*; where he ſhews, that they are occaſions of Blaſphemies, Loſſes, Anger, Quarrels, and all manner of Crimes.

Of the Dignity and Qualifications of the Miniſters of Jeſus Chriſt.

WE have already ſet down S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Opinion concerning the Dignity and Excellency of the Prieſthood, when we mentioned his Books upon that Subject, and the Homilies concerning the Hiſtory of *Uzziah*. We alſo joyned to that ſome places of the ſame Treatiſe, concerning the Qualifications of a Biſhop, and the Weight of his Office. But to thoſe one may add, what he ſays to the ſame purpoſe, in the 1ſt. Homily upon the Epiſt. to *Titus*, and in the 3d. upon the *Acts*; where he openly declares his Opinion, that few Biſhops were ſaved. Upon the ſame Subject one may conſult the 1ſt. Homily upon the Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*, the 4th. upon that to the *Philippians*, and the 3d. upon the *Acts*. He enjoyns Chriſtians in ſeveral places to be very reſpectfull towards the Prieſts; as in the Homilies upon the Song of *Hannah*, in the 22d. upon S. *Matthew*, in the 86th. upon S. *John*, and in the 2d. upon the 1ſt. Epiſt. to *Timothy*. His Obſervation in this Laſt is, That we ſhould not hear thoſe Paſtours that are fallen into Hereſy; but, on the contrary, we ought to avoid them, and ſeparate from them: But not from wicked

ed Prieſts, whoſe Character is to be honoured; becauſe, notwithſtanding their Wickedneſs, they truly offer the holy Sacrifice, and validly adminiſter the Sacraments.

S. John Chryſoſtom.

Upon the Uſefulneſs and Excellency of a Monaſtick Life.

WE have ſufficiently declared S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Opinion of a Monaſtick Life, in the Extracts of the Treatiſes which he compoſed in his Retirement. To theſe one may add the Homily of Statues, where he ſpeaks of the *Egyptian* Monks, the 1ſt. 8th. 55th. 69th. 70th. 71ſt. 72d. upon S. *Matthew*, and the 14th. upon the 1ſt. Epiſt. to *Timothy*.

Of the State of Marriage, and of the Duties of Married Perſons.

IN the firſt place S. *Chryſoſtom* requireth, that in chuſing of a Wife, Men ſhould have greater regard to Vertue than Riches. He lays down this Maxim in the 74th. Homily upon S. *Matthew*; there he pleaſantly ſhews how much rich Wives prove troubleſome to their Husbands. He ſays the ſame thing in the 48th. and 56th. Homilies upon *Geneſis*, in the 49th. upon the *Acts*, in the 12th. upon the Epiſtle to the *Coloſſians*, and in the 17th. 19th. and 28th. Sermons of the 5th. Volume. He exhorteth Husbands to live well with their Wives, and ſhew them good Examples. In the 38th. Homily upon *Geneſis*, in the Expoſition of the 43d. *Pſalm*; in the 30th. Homily upon S. *Matthew*, and the 20th. upon the Epiſtle to the *Epheſians*; in the 10th. upon the Epiſtle to the *Coloſſians*, he treateth at large of the Love which Husbands ought to have for their Wives, and of the reſpect that Wives ought to ſhew towards their Husbands. He diſcourſes upon the ſame Subject in the 26th. Homily upon 1 *Cor.* and the 60th. upon S. *John*.

Of the Education of Children, and the Duties of the Maſter of a Family.

S. *Chryſoſtom* being yet in his Retirement, and ſenſible of the little care that Fathers took to bring up their Children well, employs part of the Third Book againſt thoſe that found fault with a Monaſtick Life, to complain of that miſcarriage; and goes ſo far as to affirm, That a Father who breeds up his Child ill, is more cruel than he that puts him to death; becauſe he makes him liable to eternal Damnation, which is infinitely worſe than loſs of life. This matter is handled likewiſe in the Homilies concerning *Hannah*; where he ſhews, That not only Fathers, but Mothers alſo are obliged to give their Children good Education. In the 60th. Homily upon S. *Matthew*, he blameth the Careleſneſs of Parents in the choice of a Tutour. Laſtly, In the 21ſt. and 22d. Homilies upon the Epiſtle to the *Epheſians*, he admoniſhes Fathers to be leſs ſollicitous about their Children's getting School-learning; and to take more care that they be taught Piety and the Chriſtian Religion. Read the 59th. Homily upon S. *Matthew*; the 9th. upon 1 *Tim.* and the 1ſt. upon *Rom.* where he diſcourſeth of the Duties of a Maſter in a Family, in relation to his Wife, Children and Servants. He obſerves in the 15th. Homily upon the Epiſtle to the *Epheſians*, That a Miſtreſs is not to abuſe her Maid-ſervants. See alſo the 16th. Homily upon the 1ſt. Epiſtle to *Timothy*.

Of Afflictions.

S. *Chryſoſtom* not only teaches us that we ought to bear the loſſes, ſickneſſes, and other afflictions that may happen in this World patiently: But he ſhews beſides, that they are the portion of all good Men: He gives Eight Reaſons for it, worth reading, in the Homily upon theſe Words of S. *Paul* to *Timothy*, *Uſe a little Wine*; in the 4th. and 5th. Diſcourſes concerning Statues; in the 28th. Homily upon the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*; in the 33d. upon S. *Matthew*; in the 8th. upon 2 *Tim.* and in the 28th. and 29th. Homilies upon the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*.

Of

Of Death.

S. *John Chryſoſtom.*

S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Homilies are full of excellent Inſtructions concerning Death; wherein he ſhews, that inſtead of fearing Death, a Chriſtian ought to deſire it. "To what purpoſe, ſaith he in "the 5th. Homily of Statues, ſhould a Man fear ſudden Death? Is it, becauſe it brings us the "ſooner to our Haven, and haſtens our paſſage to an happy life? What folly is this? We expect "eternal felicity, and thoſe good things which no Eye hath ſeen, no Ear heard, and which ne-"ver entred into the Heart of Man; and yet we doe not only put off the fruition of them, but "we fear it, yea we abhor it. He tells us in other places, That this life, being but a journey, a train of Miſeries, a baniſhment from our own Country, *&c.* we ſhould be very miſerable if it never were to end.

See the 21ſt. and 32d. Homilies upon *Geneſis*; the Diſcourſe upon theſe Words of S. *Paul, Be not ſorry for the death of your Brethren*; where he carries this Notion further, and ſaith, That we ſhould be as glad to go out of this World as Criminals are to get out of Priſon. See the 1ſt. Homily upon *Geneſis*, the 14th. upon the Epiſtle to *Timothy*, and the 7th. upon the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*.

Laſt of all, He hath one Sermon to prove that Death is not to be feared.

From theſe Principles, he concludes in ſeveral places, that we ought not to weep for the Dead, but on the contrary rejoyce; for that they have quitted this miſerable life, to enter into one which is both eternal and happy. See the 34th. Homily upon S. *Matthew*, the 62d. upon S. *John*, the 21ſt. upon the *Acts*, the 6th. upon the Epiſtle to the *Theſſalonians*, and the 4th. upon the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*.

Chriſtian Maxims which S. Chryſoſtom *lays down and maintains in his Sermons.*

WE ought not to be addicted to the Goods of this World. *Hom.* 2. upon *Matthew*.

Perſons who are not vertuous, will receive no advantage from the Vertues of others. *Hom.* 5. in *Matthew*.

The Vertue of our Relations will doe us no good, if we our ſelves want Piety. *Hom.* 10. on *Matt.*

Men ought to exerciſe themſelves in the practice of all Vertues. *Hom.* 11. on *Matthew*.

No Mercy is to be looked for after Death, but only ſevere Juſtice; there is no middle place between Hell or Heaven. *Hom.* 14. upon *Matthew*.

He that reflects upon the joys of Heaven, will find it eaſie to practiſe Vertue. *Hom.* 16. upon *Matthew*.

The Commandments of God are not impoſſible to thoſe that are willing to keep them. *Hom.* 21. on *Matthew*. Nay, they are eaſie with God's grace. *Hom.* 56. and 76. on *Matthew*, and 87. upon S. *John*.

Let him that is in the State of Grace, not truſt too much to his own ſtrength, leſt he fall; neither let him that is fallen, deſpair. *Hom.* 26. and 67. upon *Matthew*.

Spiritual advantages are to be preferr'd before thoſe things that otherwiſe ſeem to be moſt neceſſary. *Hom.* 26. upon *Matthew*.

A Man of an ill life, is worſe than a dead Man. *Hom.* 26. upon *Matthew*.

Paſſionate, intemperate, debauched, and covetous Men are worſe than thoſe that are poſſeſſed with the Devil. *Hom.* 28. upon *Matthew*.

The Yoke of Vertue is light and eaſie, that of Sin is heavy and troubleſome. *Hom.* 38. upon *Matthew*, and 88. upon *John*.

We ought to examine, and be ſorry for our faults, and not be concerned for thoſe of other Men. *Hom.* 24. upon *Matthew*, and 60. upon S. *John*.

Vertue is more to be eſteemed than Miracles. *Hom.* 46. upon *Matthew*.

To feed the Poor is better than to give Ornaments of Gold or Silver to the Church. *Hom.* 50. upon *Matthew*.

He that offends another, wrongs himſelf more than the other. *Hom.* 51. upon *Matthew*.

A Man that is addicted to worldly things, is in the moſt unhappy ſlavery that can be. *Hom.* 58. upon *Matthew*.

It is better to adorn our Souls with Vertue, than the Body with rich Clothes. *Hom.* 69. upon *Matthew*.

A Soul polluted with Crimes, ſtinks worſe than a putrefied Body. *Hom.* 57. upon *Matthew*.

It is to no purpoſe to have been Baptized, and to be in the true Church, unleſs we lead our Lives conformably to the Doctrine of the Goſpel, and our Baptiſmal profeſſion. *Hom.* 6. and 10. upon *John*.

What-

S. John Chryſoſtom.

Whatever appears great in this World is nothing before God. *Hom.* 44. *in Joan.*

Nothing ought to be better husbanded than Time. *Hom.* 58. upon *John.*

We ſhould not ask of God temporal, but ſpiritual Goods. *Hom.* 43. and 54. upon *John.*

A Chriſtian ought to work not only for himſelf, but alſo for others. *Hom.* 20. upon the *Acts.*

It often happens that thoſe who deſign to afflict the Righteous, and hinder the purpoſes of God concerning them, doe further them when they do not intend it. *Hom.* 49. upon the *Acts.*

The loſs of worldly Goods ought not to be lamented, but that only of the joys of Heaven. *Hom.* 10. upon the *Romans.*

We ought to doe that which is good in this World, and not depend upon the Prayers of our kindred and friends after death. *Hom.* 42. upon 1 *Cor.*

The Salvation of others ought to be preferred before our own ſatisfaction. *Hom.* 29. upon 2 *Cor.*

Vertues are like Treaſures, they muſt be hid to be kept: If they be expoſed publickly, there is danger of loſing them. *Hom.* 3. upon *Matthew.*

To be Maſter of one's own Paſſions, is true liberty. *Hom.* 17. upon 1 *Tim.*

Nothing is to be lamented but Sin. *Hom.* 3. upon the *Hebrews.*

No Man is offended but by himſelf. *See his Diſcourſe upon this Paradox and his Letters Paſſim.*

It is eaſie to get Vertue, and preſerve it too. *Paſſim.*

It is more eaſie to live well, than ill. *Paſſim.*

Small Sins are to be avoided as well as great ones. *Paſſim.*

One only Sin, one evil Action is ſufficient to condemn us eternally. *Paſſim.*

The accuſation of Conſcience is the greateſt torment. *Paſſim.*

It is better to ſuffer our ſelves, than to make others ſuffer. *Epiſt. to* Olympias.

The ignominy of this World, is glory in the eyes of God. *Paſſim.*

This preſent life is death, and death is life. *Paſſim.*

Afflictions, Perſecutions, and Sickneſſes, are deſirable; but delights, pleaſures and joy are to be feared. *Paſſim.*

God's chaſtiſements are great benefits: The good things which he beſtows in this world are great temptations. *Paſſim.*

Giving of Alms is the trade that brings the greateſt profit. *Paſſim.*

Solitarineſs and a Monaſtick life, are more to be deſired than the greateſt Kingdoms. *Paſſim.*

True Soveraignty conſiſts in commanding our own Paſſions. *Paſſim.*

It is an effect of God's bounty, that the execution of Precepts, which are neceſſary to our Salvation, does not depend upon the weakneſs of our Bodies. *Hom. in illud, Modico vino utere.*

Sorrow is the product of Sin, and Sorrow takes away Sin: That which was the penalty of Sin, is become the Salvation of Man. Sin brought weakneſs into the World, and Sorrow hath deſtroy'd Sin. *Hom.* 1. *de jejun.*

Our Worſhip is not like that of the *Jews*, which was loaded with many Ceremonies, and needed much preparation. He that went into the Temple to pray, was to buy Pigeons, to carry Wood, Fire, a Knife, and a Victim. Chriſtians want no ſuch thing: in every place they have an Altar, a Knife, and a Victim; or rather they themſelves are the Altar, the Prieſt, and the Victim. In what place, or what condition ſoever they are, they may offer their Souls to God. *Hom.* 4. *de Anna.*

Man ſhall be puniſhed for his Sins, either in this world, or in the next: He ought to be puniſhed here, to prevent puniſhment hereafter. *Serm.* 5. *de Lazaro.*

Ignorance of the Scripture makes Hereſies. *Serm.* 3. *de Lazaro.*

Theſe are ſome of thoſe Maxims wherewith S. *Chryſoſtom* filleth his Diſcourſes; but he enlargeth upon them with ſuch abundance, expoundeth them with ſo great Eloquence, and purſues them with ſo great ſtrength, that it is impoſſible to diſcover their beauty without reading them in their Original. In reading of theſe Sermons, all Preachers ought to ſpend their time, and not in the Sermons of Modern Authors; which, for the moſt part, are full of nothing but empty Allegories, falſe Notions, forced Declamations, unprofitable Queſtions, affectations of Wit, Jingles, Antitheſes, and other things of this nature, that have no correſpondency with thoſe Evangelical Truths, which ought to be preached with maſculine and natural Eloquence.

But that S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Works may be more eaſily read, and that the Editions which ſhould be uſed, may be known, I ſhall draw up a Catalogue of the moſt conſiderable.

The firſt Collections of S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Works were made of the Verſions of his Book.

The firſt was Printed at *Baſle* by *Pfortzen anno* 1504. There was another made in *Germany* by *Cratander anno* 1522. and one at *Paris* 1524. Theſe were followedby the Edition of *Frobenius* in five Volumes, *anno* 1533, and 1547. which laſt is larger and more correct. That of *Venice* in 1574, in five Volumes, by *Hervetus*, is better than the foregoing; but the moſt perfect of theſe ancient Latin Editions is that of *Nivelle*, in four Volumes in *Folio*, of 1581. which was made by the advice and care of the moſt learned Men of that Age; as *Billius*, *Hervetus*, *Nobilius*, *Zinus*, &c.

The firſt Greek Edition of all S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Works, is the famous Edition of *Eaton*, procured by the care and vaſt labour of the learned Sir *Henry Savile*, who having made enquiry in all

S. John Chryſoſtom.

the Liberaries of the World for the Books that went under S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Name cauſed them to be Printed in a very fair Character, and very exactly, with very juſt, very learned and uſeful Notes. He diſtinguiſhed the Books that are S. *Chryſoſtom*'s, from thoſe that are dubious or ſuppoſititious, and hath put them in an excellent Order for a firſt Edition. It is divided into eight Volumes.

The firſt contains the 67 Homilies upon *Geneſis*, the Commentaries upon the *Pſalms*, and *Iſaiah*, the two Homilies upon the 50th. *Pſalm*, which he places among the doubtful Books, and the Expoſition of the 51ſt. 95th. and 100th. *Pſalms*, and ſo on to the 107th. and upon the 119th. which he placeth among the ſuppoſititious Writings.

The Second Volume contains the 90 Homilies upon S. *Matthew*, and the 88 upon S. *John*.

The Third and the Fourth comprehend all the Homilies upon S. *Paul*.

The Fifth hath Sixty two Sermons upon ſeveral particular paſſages of the Holy Scripture, and Thirty four other Sermons upon the Saints or Feſtival days, with Seventy three Sermons upon ſeveral Subjects which he Ranks among the ſuppoſititious Books.

The Sixth Volume is made up of the Treatiſes of S. *Chryſoſtom*, the Homilies againſt the Jews, that of God's incomprehenſibility, the Sermon of *Anathema*, his Sermon after he was ordained Prieſt, the Twenty two Diſcourſes about Statues, and ſeveral other Sermons upon divers Subjects, and particularly of Penance, Faſting, Alms-deeds, and other Chriſtian Vertues. At the latter end there are ſome Homilies which he puts among the Collections, that were anciently made out of S. *Chryſoſtom*, and ſome ſuppoſititious Sermons, with the Liturgy, and two Prayers to God.

The Seventh Volume begins with a Diſcourſe upon the Scandal of certain Perſons, cauſed by the Perſecution and Malice of ſome Prieſts. After this is the Treatiſe wherein he proves that none is offended but by himſelf, Seventeen Letters to the Widow *Olympias*, and Two hundred forty three Letters to his Friends, with Five Letters of *Conſtantius* the Prieſt, and a hundred and five Sermons, which falſly bear S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Name, the Authors whereof are not certainly known. Theſe Sermons are followed by other Diſcourſes of known Authors, *viz.* Six Homilies of *Severianus* of *Gabala* upon *Geneſis*, the Homily of *John* the Faſter about Penance, the Homily upon the Epiphany aſcribed to S. *Gregory Thaumaturgus*, the Homily of the Croſs, by *Pantaleon* a Monk of *Conſtantinople*, and Forty eight Homilies upon ſeveral Points of Morality, collected out of S. *Chryſoſtom*'s works by *Theodorus*. That Volume endeth with Seven Prayers of S. *Chryſoſtom*, which are in Latin, the three laſt of them are ſuppoſititious.

The Laſt Volume containeth ſome Supplements of Books Printed in the other Volumes, the Seven Orations in praiſe of S. *Paul*, the Sermons upon *Eutropius*, upon the deſign which Men ought to have in Preaching, and upon ſome other Subjects. The Appendix to this Volume, hath ſeveral Books which are ſomething like S. *Chryſoſtom*'s. The Firſt is an Anſwer in *Theodorus*'s Name, to an Exhortation made by S. *Chryſoſtom*: Which is certainly ſpurious. The Second and Third are two Diſcourſes of *Libanius* to *Theodoſius*, upon the Sedition at *Antioch*. After theſe Diſcourſes follow the Extracts which *Photius* hath taken out of S. *Chryſoſtom* and *Iſidore Peluſiota*'s Letters in Commendation of this Father. The Lives of S. *Chryſoſtom* take up a good part of this Volume: there are thoſe that were written by *George* of *Alexandria*, the *Panegyrick* by *Leo* the Emperour, the Life of S. *Chryſoſtom* by an Anonymous Author, that of *Simeon Metaphraſtes*.

The various Readings, Conjectures, Reſtitutions, and Notes of *Savil*, *Bois*, and *Downs* conclude the Volume, with a very uſeful Table of S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Books, by their beginnings diſpoſed in an Alphabetical Order. Another Table upon the Notes, and an *Errata* upon all the Volumes.

Almoſt at the ſame time that Sir *H. Savil* was at work in *England*, to publiſh an Edition of the Original Text of S. *Chryſoſtom*'s works, *Fronto Ducæus* labour'd in *France*, to Print them in Greek and Latin. He Printed them at *Paris*, *Anno* 1609. the firſt Volume which contains the Twenty one Sermons of Statues, and Fifty ſix others, with Notes at the end. In the ſame Year came out a Second Volume containing the Homilies and Sermons upon *Geneſis*, the Five Sermons concerning *Hannah* and *Samuel*, Three Homilies upon *David* and *Saul*, a Sermon againſt Idleneſs, a Tranſlation of S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Life written by *Palladius*, a Latin Sermon of Continency, and ſome other Sermons in Latin with Notes. The Third Volume Printed in 1614. contains the Homilies and Sermons upon the *Pſalms*, and the Commentary upon *Iſaiah*. The Fourth Volume Printed the ſame Year, contains the Works and Letters of S. *Chryſoſtom*, his Firſt Sermon, and two others upon his Exile; it ends with the Notes of *Fronto Ducæus*. The Fifth Volume is a Collection of Seventy Sermons upon ſeveral paſſages, both of the Old and New Teſtament, and upon ſome other Subjects; it was Printed in 1616. The Sixth contains Seventy three Sermons, which *Fronto Ducæus* does not attribute to S. *Chryſoſtom*; the Homilies made up of Collections taken out of S. *Chryſoſtom* by *Theodorus*, and the Notes of *Fronto Ducæus*. The works of S. *Chryſoſtom* upon the New Teſtament were not Printed then, becauſe they had been lately Printed by *Commelinus* in Four Volumes. The Firſt contains the Homilies of S. *Chryſoſtom*, and the imperfect Work upon S. *Matthew*, the Second, the Homilies upon S. *John*, the Third the Homilies upon the *Acts*; and the Laſt, the Homilies upon S. *Paul*, and the Commentary of *Andreas Ceſarienſis* upon the *Revelations* of S. *John*. Theſe Books are in the Greek and Latin Edition of S. *Chryſoſtom*, Printed at *Paris* in 1633, and divided into Six Volumes, which is not ſo exact as the Edition of *Commelinus*, and the Six firſt Volumes that were Printed in 1636, are not ſo exact as thoſe that were Printed before.

The

The Latin Edition of *Ducæus* Printed at *Paris* in 1613. Containeth, beſides the Books that are named already, a great many other Homilies which are not in the Greek, and which in all Likelihood were Compoſed by Latin Authors as we obſerv'd before. The Tranſlation was all Reviſed by *Fronto Ducæus*; it was Printed at *Antwerp*, and lately Printed at *Lyons* with ſome Additions. It is very ſtrange, that thoſe who took Care of this Edition, did not only leave the ſame confuſion that is in the others, but have even confounded it more, and loaded it with many uſeleſs things. S. *John Chryſoſtom.*

[Theſe are all the General Editions of S. *Chryſoſtom's* Works. I ſay nothing here of particular ones, whether Greek or Latin, of ſeveral of his Works, which are the Springs and Brooks that make up the great Rivers, becauſe it would be too tedious in this Place. But the Catalogue of ſuch as are come to my knowledge are in the following *Note ?

*Homiliæ in Sacram Scripturam.

In Geneſim Græc. Lat. Morel. 1594.
Lat. Oecolampad. interpret. Paris, 1524.
In Pſalmos, Nivelle, 1606.
In Iſaiam. Lat. à Tilmanno, Paris, 1555.
Argumentum in Jeremiam, Gr. Aug. 1602.
In Matth. Gr. Oxonii, Lat. 1537.
Opus Imperfectum, in Matth. ex Off. Caveleriana, 1602.
De publicano & Phariſæo, Paris, 1595.
Serm. 4. *in Lazarum, in illud Apoſtoli*, Nolite de Dormientibus contriſtari, *&c. Oxon.* 1580.
In Joannem. Aret. interprete, Romæ, 1470.
In omnes Pauli Epiſtolas Græc. à Donato Veronenſi, An. 1529. *in fol.* 3. *Vol. Lat. apud Hervag.* 1530.
In Ep. ad Galatas, interpret. Eraſmo, Baſiliæ, 1526.
In Ep. ad Philip. Flaminio interprete, Rom. 1578.

TRACTATUS.

De Sacerdotio Libri Sex. Græc. Oxon. 1586. *Aug.* 1599. *Lov.* 1529, 1568. *Baſil.* 1544. *Lat. Paris.* 1561.
De Virginitate Græc. Lat. Livineio interp. Ant. 1565. & 1575. *ex verſione Poggiana. Romæ*, 1562.
De providentia apud Oporinum, Baſil. 1552.
De orando Deum, interprete. Eraſmo, Baſil. Froben. 1500, 1551. *Col.* 1573. *Ant.* 1579. *Paris*, 1538.
Aliquot opuſcula. Ex V. Eraſmi, Baſ. 1529.
Liber de vita Babylæ contra Gentiles, Gr. Baſil. 1527. *Paris*, 1528. *Lat. per Brinium, Paris*, 1528.
Sermones ad Theodorum Lat. 1524. *Baſiliæ*, 1547.
Comparatio Regis & Monachi, Baſil. 1533. *Gr. Lat. Paris*, 1558 *Baſil.* 1526.
Quod nemo læditur niſi à ſeipſo. Græce in Octavo, Paris, 1541.
Liturgia ſive Miſſa, Lat. Eraſmo interprete, Paris. 1537. *Græc. Paris*, 1560. *Venet.* 1601, 1620. *ex verſione Hervet.* 1548. *Paris.*
Orat quod Chriſtus ſit Deus, Ingolſtad. 1579. *apud Chevallon, Lat* 1536. *Romæ*, 1526.
In Euch. Græc. 1571. *Morell.* 1561. *Lat. Wormatiæ*, 1541. *Pragæ*, 1544. *Ant.* 1560. *Gr. & Lat. Venetiis*, 1528. *in Bibl. P P.*
Epiſtolæ ad Innocent. Baſil. 1529.
Ad Cæſarium Moinii Varia Sacra, Roterad. An. 1687. [*Londini* 4*to.* 1688.]

HOMILIÆ VARIÆ.

Hom. ad Pop. Ant. de Statuis, Londini Græc. Lat. 1590.
Orat. in illud, Modico vino utere. *Hanov.* 1550. *in Octavo, Col.* 1582.
In illud, Oportet Hæreſes eſſe. *Oecol. interp. Mog.* 1522.
Hom. 6. *contra Jud. Hoeſchelio interpret. Aug.* 1602.
Orat. Sex de fato & providentia, Gr. Oct. Baſil, 1526. *Paris*, 1554. *Hagenoæ*, 1533.
Orat. 6. *Gr. Oxon. Gr. Lat.* 1586. *Orat. in Eutropium, in Pſ.* 100. *& in laudem crucis, Paris*, 1554. *Tilmanno interprete.*
De non contemnenda Eccleſia Dei, Morell. 1560.
In terræ Motum, &c. alia Orat. interprete Ducæo, Burdigalæ, 1604.
Hom. de Anathemate, Gr. Lat. Paris, in Oct. 1547.
Libri tres de providentia Dei, ad Stagirium Lat. Aloſti, 1487. *ibid Orat. de dignitate humanæ Originis.*
Chryſoſtomi Orat. 10. *a Beurero, Romæ*, 1581. *Gr. Lat. Friburg.* 1585. *in Oct.*
Varii tractatus, ibid. De animi humilitate, Jejunio & Temperantia, Mog. 1604.
De Manſuetudine, Paris, 1570. *De benignitate, Paris*, 1594.
De politia Morali, Paris, 1545. *Orat.* 6. *Paris*, 1554.
Orat. aliquot. Lat. Gr. Lat. Romero in Oct. Baſ. Oporin. 1551.
Hom. Gr. Hoeſchelio interprete, 1587.
Hom. 2. *Tiguri*, 1558. *Aliæ, Lipſiæ, Ann.* 1538. *Aliæ, Paris*, 1606. *Orat. Gr. Romæ*, 1594.
Florilegia, Mog. 1603. *Lat. Hagenoæ*, 1528.

SERMONES PANEGYRICI.

Hom. 4. *in Job, Perionio interprete, Paris*, 1565, *Col.* 1568.
Homiliæ de laudibus Pauli, Aniano interp. Paris, 1499. *cum op. Bedæ ſeorſim*, 1509.
De Petro & Paulo Orat. 2. *Gr. Lat.* 1582.
Idem cum Orat. in duodecim Apoſtolos, Romæ, 1580.
Sermones Panegyrici in S. S. Martyres, Burd. 1601.
Duæ homil. de S. S. Lugd. 1624. *Gr. Lat. Paris*, 1594.

IN FESTA.

In Nat. Chriſti, & in præcurſorem, Ant. apud Tornes, 1609.
Sermo in Paſcha, Ant. 1598. *Sermones in Aſcenſionem, & alii... ex Ed. Voſſii, Mog.* 1604.
Orat. de occurſu Domini, Col. 1568.]

Antiochus,

Antiochus *and* Severianus *of* Gabala.

Antiochus and Severianus of Gabala.

IN the days of S. *Chryſoſtom* there were two famous Preachers, who preached in his Church, in his Abſence; The firſt, *Antiochus*, was Biſhop of *Ptolemais* in *Phœnicia*; and the Second, *Severianus*, was Biſhop of *Gabala* in *Cœleſyria*. *Antiochus* came firſt to *Conſtantinople*, where having preached a long time, and got ſome Money, he returned to his Church. *Severianus* having heard that *Antiochus* was become rich by preaching at Court, reſolved to imitate him, and therefore went thither with ſeveral Sermons which he had prepared. He was well received by S. *John Chryſoſtom*, into whoſe favour he endeavoured at firſt to inſinuate himſelf, afterwards he grew acquainted with ſeveral Perſons of Quality, and got into the favour both of the Emperor and the Empreſs; and tho' he wanted *Antiochus* his parts, yet he got into great Eſteem and Reputation. S. *Chryſoſtom* being obliged (as hath been obſerved) to go into *Aſia*, to compoſe the Affairs of the Church of *Epheſus*, found not a Biſhop fitter to preach in his Abſence than *Severianus* of *Gabala*, whom he thought to be his Friend. But whether this Biſhop, taking occaſion of S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Abſence, had a deſign to get into the Eſteem and Affection of the People of *Conſtantinople*, to uſurp that See, or whether *Serapion*, S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Archdeacon, had by his Letters begotten S. *Chryſoſtom* an Averſion to *Severianus* of *Gabala* as a Perſon that diſturbed the Peace of his Church, aiming at getting into his place; or Laſtly, whether there was any ſecret Jealouſie betwixt them; Theſe two Biſhops were never Friends ever afterwards. S. *Chryſoſtom* being come back, drove away *Severianus*, accuſing him of ſaying, that the Son of God was not made Man, becauſe that Biſhop finding that *Serapion* would not ſtand up before him had uttered theſe Words, *If* Serapion *dies a Chriſtian, the Son of God is not made Man.* This *Serapion* told S. *Chryſoſtom*, leaving out the firſt part, *If* Serapion *dies a Chriſtian.* But *Severianus* being well at Court, the Empreſs recalled him; and did all ſhe could to reconcile them, which S. *Chryſoſtom* refuſed to do, till the Empreſs intreated him for the ſake of *Theodoſius* her Grand-Child, whom ſhe laid at his Feet in the Church of the Apoſtles. S. *Chryſoſtom* (if *Socrates* may be credited) could not then reſiſt the intreaties of the Empreſs: but this Reconciliation was not ſincere, and both theſe Biſhops harboured ſtill an Averſion one to the other. And therefore, in the time of S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Diſgrace, *Severianus* ſided with *Theophilus*, and the reſt of his Enemies to deſtroy him. This is the Account which *Socrates* gives of the Diſſention of *Severianus* of *Gabala*; *Hiſt. Eccl. B. VI. cap.* 11.

The Author of S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Life accuſes this Hiſtorian of want of ſincerity upon this occaſion; But till we meet with another Hiſtorian of greater credit, ſetting forth the matter of Fact after another manner, we cannot reject this Relation, nor feign other Motives of Diſſention betwixt theſe two Biſhops, than thoſe related by *Socrates*, who lived near S. *Chryſoſtom*'s time.

The ancient Tranſlator of ſome of S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Homilies, *Anianus*, obſerves, That *Antiochus* had, *plauſibilem dicendi pompam*, a pompous and lofty Stile, which got him the applauſe of the People. There is no doubt, but formerly they had ſeveral of his Sermons. *Gennadius* mentions but two of his Books: The former is a long Treatiſe againſt Covetouſneſs, and the latter a Diſcourſe upon the Miracle of the blind Man, to whom Jeſus Chriſt reſtored ſight, ſpoken of in the Ninth Chapter of S. *John*'s Goſpel: a work of Unction and Humility. *Trithemius* mentions ſeveral Sermons, and other unknown works of this Author. *Theodoret* quoteth a paſſage of his, but does not Name the Book where he found it, the words are theſe. *That if we do not confound the two Natures in Chriſt, there will be no difficulty in underſtanding the Myſtery of the Incarnation.* *Gelaſius* in his Book *of the two Natures*, citeth alſo ſome places of *Antiochus* upon the Incarnation, taken out of his Sermons upon the Nativity, *Eaſter*, againſt Hereticks, and from another Sermon. Laſtly, *Poſſevinus* tells us, That there were ſome Homilies of this Author in the *Medicean* Library at *Florence*. I don't know whether they were ever publiſhed.

Severianus of *Gabala* was leſs eloquent, dryer, and more barren, than *Antiochus*. *Socrates* obſerves, that he pronounced the Greek Language ill, becauſe he ſtill kept ſome thing of the *Syriack* Accent. *Gennadius* ſays, That he had read a Commentary of this Author, upon the Epiſtle to the *Galatians*, and a Treatiſe upon the Feſtival of Chriſt's Baptiſm, and the Epiphany.

We have obſerved already, that among S. *Chryſoſtom*'s works there are ſeveral Sermons, which in all appearance belong to *Severianus* of *Gabala*, and among the reſt a Diſcourſe of the Seals, and upon the brazen Serpent, which are quoted by *Theodoret*, under the Name of *Severianus* of *Gabala*, and ſeveral others in the ſame Stile, whereof we have given a Catalogue amongſt S. *Chryſoſtom*'s works. To theſe we may joyn the Homily upon Chriſt's Nativity, which is in the Fifth Volume of the *Eaton* Edition of S. *Chryſoſtom*'s works, *Pag.* 843. and the Sermon of the Croſs in Greek in the ſame Volume, *P.* 898, which afterwards was Printed in Greek and Latin by Father *Combefis*, cited by S. *Damaſcen* in the third Diſcourſe of Images, under the Name of *Severianus* of *Gabala*. We have alſo Six Sermons of the ſame Man upon the Creation of the World, Printed in Greek in the *Eaton* Edition of S. *Chryſoſtom*, and in Greek and Latin, in the laſt Volume of the Supplement to the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, by Father *Combefis*. *Severianus* obſerves in the Preface, that all the Books of the Holy Scripture have the Salvation and Benefit of Men for their

their ultimate End: but that the Book of *Geneſis* is the Ground and Fountain of all the Truths, both in the Law and in the Prophets, becauſe it containeth the Hiſtory of the World's Creation, without which God's works cannot be known. He adds, That he very well knew, that ſeveral Fathers had written of that matter, but that it did not diſcourage him from writing upon the ſame Subject, ſince the latter Writers were not diſcouraged by the Diſcourſes of the former: that he pretended not to deſtroy what others had done, but to add ſuch things as might ſerve for the Edification of the Church: At laſt, he deſireth his Auditors, not to inquire whether his Notions be new, but only whether they are right: In Proſecution of the ſame Subject, he ſaith, that *Geneſis* is an Hiſtory written by the Lawgiver *Moſes*, and dictated by the Holy Ghoſt who inſpired him: That tho' it be a Narration, yet it may be called a Prophecy, becauſe that, as there are three ſorts of Prophecies, the firſt of Writings, the Second of Actions, and the third of both: So likewiſe there are three parts of each Prophecy: That the firſt reſpects the preſent, the Second what is to come, and the third what is paſt. Men Propheſie upon the preſent, when they diſcover what is deſigned to be kept from them: as *Eliſha* did, who knew *Gehazi*'s wickedneſs: Men Propheſie upon the future, when what is to come is foretold. And there are alſo Prophecies of what is paſt, when by Divine Inſpiration things already paſſed are written, whereof no knowledge was had otherwiſe. In this Sence *Severianus* ſaith, that *Moſes* was a Prophet in the Hiſtory of the World's Creation. He obſerves further, that *Moſes* propoſed to himſelf two things in his Writings, to teach, and to gives Laws: That he began by Inſtruction in relating the Creation of the World, to teach Men, that God having created them, had a right to give them Laws and Precepts. *For*, ſaith he, *had he not ſhewed at firſt, that God is the Creator of the World, he could not have juſtifyed, that he was the Soveraign Lawgiver of Men: becauſe it is Tyranny to pretend to impoſe Laws upon thoſe, that do not belong to us, whereas it is very natural to inſtruct ſuch as depend upon us.* He endeth this Preface by ſhewing the Reaſon, why *Moſes* ſpake not of the Creation of Angels and Archangels: Firſt becauſe it was not pertinent to his Subject: Secondly, becauſe had he done it, there was danger that Men would have worſhipped them.

Antiochus, and *Severianus* of *Gabala*

After this he explains the Text of *Geneſis* about the World's Creation, in a plain and literal way: He doth not inlarge upon the ſpiritual Sence, but rather finds fault with ſome Explications, as being too much Allegorical. But he maketh ſeveral trifling Reflections, as when he obſerves in the Fifth Homily, that the firſt Man was called *Adam*, a word ſignifying Fire in the Hebrew, becauſe that as this Element eaſily ſpreads and Communicates it ſelf, ſo the World was to be peopled by this firſt Man. Several other Notions of this Nature may be found in that Work, which have neither Beauty, nor Exactneſs, nor Truth. He Anſwers the *Arians* and *Anomæans*. He obſerves in the Fourth Homily, that all Hereſies bear the Names of their Authors, whereas the true Church has none other Name, than that of Catholick Church. He inlargeth but little upon Morals; yet at the Latter end of this Fourth Homily he recommends Faſting, provided it be accompanied with Abſtinence from Vices. In a word, One may ſay that this whole Work, tho' full of Erudition, yet is of no great uſe, and deſerveth not the Eſteem of Men of true Judgment.

Father *Combefis* hath added to theſe Homilies ſome Fragments taken out of ſome *Catena's* upon the Scripture, attributed to this Author, and extracted out of his Commentaries upon *Geneſis*, *Leviticus*, *Numbers*, *Deuteronomy*, and upon *Joſhua*. But if theſe paſſages did not ſhew themſelves to be written in *Severianus* his Stile, one could not affirm it upon the credit of theſe *Catena's*. One might with greater Confidence produce two paſſages of *Severianus* of *Gabala* upon the Incarnation, quoted by *Gelaſius* in the Book of the two Natures, where he obſerves, That the firſt is taken out of a Diſcourſe of this Biſhop againſt *Novatus*.

ASTERIUS AMASENUS.

Aſterius Amaſenus

Asterius (*a*) Biſhop of *Amaſea* a City of *Pontus*, flouriſhed at the latter end of the Fourth Century (*b*), and in the beginning of the Fifth. The Sermons of this Biſhop have been quoted with Commendation by the Ancients (*c*). There are but a ſmall number of them extant, Collected by F. *Combefis* at the beginning of his firſt Volume of the Supplement to the *Bibliotheca Patrum*; The Five firſt were Printed formerly by *Rubenius*, who publiſhed them at *Antwerp*, *Ann.* 1608. and afterwards inſerted into the *Bibliotheca Patrum*:

[*a*] Aſterius.] There were ſeveral of that Name. The oldeſt is an Heretick of *Arius* his Party, mention'd in the firſt Volume. There is another *Aſterius* commended by *Theodoret*, in *Philotheo*, c. 2. but different from this, as well as the Catholick Biſhop of the ſame Name, who lived in the time of S. *Athanaſius*.

[*b*] *Towards the latter end of the Fourth Century.*] We have obſerved, That in the Sermon upon New-Years-day, he ſpeaks of *Ruffinus* his Death, and of *Eutropius* his Diſgrace, which he tells us happen'd the Year before, which juſtifyeth that he lived at the ſame time with S. *Chryſoſtom*.

(*c*) *The Sermons of this Biſhop have been quoted with Commendation by the Ancients.*] He is cited in the Second Council of *Nice*, *Act.* 4. and 6. *Photius* made ſome Extracts out of his works, *Cod.* 271. *Hadrianus* in *lib. de un.* quotes his Homilies, and *Nicephorus* defends them againſt the *Iconoclaſts*.

Aſterius Amaſenus.

The ſix following were lately publiſhed by F. *Combefis*, who joyned to them the Extracts made by *Photius* out of the Homelies of *Aſterius Amaſenus*, and a Diſcourſe upon S. *Steven* the Proto-Martyr, formerly publiſhed under the Name of *Proclus*.

The firſt Sermon is upon the Parable of *Dives* and *Lazarus*. He begins it with this Reflection; " That our Saviour not only made uſe of Precepts to teach us Vertue, and to forbid " Vice, but that he further propoſed illuſtrious Examples to inſtruct us in that way of Life, which " we ought to follow. Afterwards he ſets down the Text of S. *Luke*'s Goſpel, making moral Reflections upon each Verſe.

Upon theſe words, Verſe 26. *There was a rich Man which was cloathed with Purple, and fine Linen.* He obſerves, that the Holy Scripture by theſe two words, underſtands all Extravagancies of Riches, That the only uſe of Garments is to cover our Bodies, and defend them from the injuries of the Air: That God hath provided for this, by creating Beaſts with hair and wooll, whereof Stuffs are made to ſecure us againſt both cold weather, and the Beams of the Sun. That beſides he hath given the uſe of Flax for a greater Conveniency; that theſe things ought to be applyed to our uſe, in giving God thanks, not only becauſe he made us, but alſo becauſe he has provided all neceſſaries, to cover and defend us from the Injuries of the Seaſon, " But, *ſaith he*, " if you leave the uſe of Wooll and Linen, if you deſpiſe what God hath prepared, and to ſa- " tiſhe your Pride, you will have ſilk Garments, thin like Cobwebs; if after this you hire a Man " at a dear rate to take out of the Sea a ſmall Fiſh, that you may dye them in its Blood; Do " you not Act the parts of effeminate Men?

He reproves thoſe afterwards whoſe Garments were painted with ſeveral Figures, of Men, Beaſts, and Flowers, and ſpares not thoſe, who by a ridiculous Devotion, Printed upon their clothes ſome Godly Hiſtories: As the Marriage of *Cana* in *Galilee*, the Sick of the Palſie in his Bed, the blind Man cured, the Woman that had an Iſſue of Blood, the Sinner at the feet of Jeſus Chriſt, *Lazarus* riſen again. *Aſterius* ſpeaks againſt this Practice after this manner: *If theſe Perſons will believe me, let them ſell thoſe clothes, and honour the true Images of God. Do not paint Jeſus Chriſt, it is enough that he humbled himſelf, by taking voluntarily a Body for us.... Paint not the Paralytick upon your Garments, but ſeek for the poor to ſuccour them. It is to no purpoſe to look upon the Woman having the Iſſue of Blood, but it is very neceſſary to help this poor Widow. It ſignifies nothing to behold the ſinful Woman at the feet of Jeſus Chriſt, but it will ſignifie much to bewail your own ſins. What good will the Picture of* Lazarus *his Reſurrection do you? endeavour rather to riſe ſpiritually. To what purpoſe do you wear upon your Backs, the Image of him that was born blind? Eaſe this blind Man rather. Why do you draw the Shrines of Relicks? rather feed the poor. And wherefore do you carry about you the Repreſentation of thoſe Water-pots at the Marriage where our Saviour made Wine; while you ſuffer the poor to die for thirſt?* This paſſage hath been alledged by the *Iconoclaſts* as favouring their Opinions. The Catholicks on the contrary have quoted another, taken out of an Homily of the ſame Author, concerning the Woman afflicted with the Iſſue of Blood, where he ſpeaks of the Statue of Jeſus Chriſt erected by the ſame Woman in *Paneas*, a Town of *Paleſtine*. But neither of theſe paſſages, belong to the queſtion betwixt the Catholicks, and the *Iconoclaſts*; for this which we have tranſcribed, is not againſt Images placed in Churches, but againſt the Fancy of particular men, who trimmed their Habits with Figures, repreſenting ſome Hiſtories of the Bible; and that of the Statue of Jeſus Chriſt ſet up by the Woman that was afflicted with an Iſſue of Blood, hath no Relation to the publick Service of Images.

But to return to our Sermon, *Aſterius Amaſenus* purſuant to his Subject, ſaith that Chriſtians ſhould beware of Luxury and Pleaſures, becauſe none can live in Pleaſure without Riches. But, ſaith he, *It is impoſſible to heap up much Riches without Sin.* He excellently deſcribes all the things that are neceſſary to thoſe that ſeek their Pleaſure, and having numbred them, he adds, " To have theſe things, how many poor Men muſt ſuffer? how many Orphans muſt be ruined? " how many Widows muſt have weeping Eyes? and how many Perſons muſt be brought to the " utmoſt Miſery? A Soul taken up with theſe, forgets her ſelf, remembers not what ſhe is, " thinks not upon Death, nor a Reſurrection, nor Eternity. And when the fatal and unavoida- " ble moment comes, that the Soul is ready to ſeparate from the Body, then a remembrance " of the Life paſt will be of little uſe: ſhe then will think of Repentance, but it will be to no " purpoſe. For then only will Repentance be available, when there is a Reſolution of correcting " our former Life. And regret and ſorrow for ſin ſeem to be of no uſe, when a Man is not in a " condition either to do good, or to practiſe Vertue. The reſt of this Homily is a literal and moral Explication of that parable, full of ſolid Notions, and natural Reflections.

There is not leſs Eloquence in the Second Sermon of this Author, upon another Parable of S. *Luke*'s Goſpel, concerning that Steward whom his Maſter called to an Account for his Adminiſtration and for his Goods. It beginneth with this Maxim; That moſt Men's ſins proceed from an opinion that the Goods which they poſſeſs are their own, and that they are abſolute Maſters of them; That this falſe perſwaſion is that which makes us go to Law, Quarrel, and make War for the wealth of this World, looking upon it as proper and convenient for us, and deſerving our Love and Eſteem. " Yet, *ſaith he*, it is nothing ſo; on the contrary we are to look upon all which " we have received, as none of ours; we are not Maſters of the things which we have at home; " we are like Pilgrims, Strangers, Baniſhed and Captives, carried whither we would not,

" at

" at a time when we expect it leaſt, and at once we are ſtript of all, when the Soveraign Diſpen-
" ſer of our fortune pleaſeth. This Notion he inlargeth upon in his Expoſition of the Parable of *Aſterius Amaſenus.*
the unjuſt Steward. There one may find excellent Sentences, upon the Contempt that Men ſhould caſt upon Riches, and upon the uncertainty of this preſent Life. He inſiſts particularly upon proving, that Men are not Owners, but Stewards of their wealth; and from this Principle he concludes, That as many as have received of God ſuch good things ought to diſtribute them faithfully, and be always ready, yea even deſirous, to give God an Account. And at laſt he obſerves, That after Death there will be no time for Repentance: that this Life is the proper time to keep God's Commandments in, as the other is of enjoying the Reward of good Works.

The Third Sermon againſt Covetouſneſs was preached by S. *Aſterius* in one of thoſe Aſſemblies which were made in Churches to celebrate the Feſtival of ſome of the Martyrs. This Homily is full of very natural Deſcriptions of the Hard-heartedneſs of covetous Men. Covetouſneſs in his Opinion, doth not conſiſt only in the unjuſt deſire of having that which is anothers, but in a deſire of having more than we ought to have. According to this Notion, it is eaſie to find in the Scriptures ſeveral Examples of covetous Men; and having produced them, he ſheweth, that all other Vices waſte with time: but that the older a Man grows the more covetous he is. This Remark is followed by a Deſcription of a covetous Man, where he omits none of thoſe Characters that can make him appear miſerable, and render him odious to all the World. He proveth that Covetouſneſs is the Spring and Cauſe of all the Crimes and Sins committed in the World. And in ſhort, he ſhews that it is to no purpoſe to be concerned for this World's Goods: but far better to put all our truſt and confidence in God's providence and mercy.

The Fourth Sermon is againſt the profane Feſtival of the firſt day in the Year, and againſt the cuſtom of New-years-gifts. *Aſterius Amaſenus* declaimeth againſt that Practice. " *He ſaith,*
" That the Liberalities of that day have no rational ground; That they cannot be called Tokens
" of Friendſhip, becauſe true Friendſhip is not grounded upon Intereſt; That neither can they
" be called Alms, ſince the Poor partake not of them; That they are not of the Nature of Con-
" tracts, ſeeing there is neither loan nor exchange in that Traffick. In a word, That they are
" not pure Gifts, ſince there is a neceſſity of giving them. What Name then, *ſaith he*, can be
" given to the Expenſe of that day? The Church gives a reaſon for all the Feaſts which it cele-
" brates. It keeps the Feaſt of *Chriſtmas*, becauſe upon that day God made himſelf known
" unto Men. At *Candlemas* it rejoyceth, becauſe we are drawn out of the obſcurity of Dark-
" neſs wherein we lay. Laſtly, we celebrate with Joy, Pomp, and Alacrity the day of the Re-
" ſurrection, for as much as this day repreſents unto us the Immortality which we are to enjoy.
" Theſe are the Reaſons which the Church hath to keep Feaſts, and there are the like for the
" celebrating of all the reſt: But what reaſon can be given for the Feſtival of *New-Years-Day*,
" and for the profuſion then Practiſed? O Folly! O Impertience! At that day every one runs
" with a deſign to get another Man's Goods. Thoſe that give, doe it with Grief, and they
" that receive Preſents do not keep them, but beſtow them upon others. One ſends to his Pa-
" tron, what he received of his Client: Another makes his Complement to receive Money. The
" poor give to the rich, and inferior people ſend Preſents to the Great Ones. As Brooks make
" ſmall Rivers, which at laſt fall into Great Ones; in like manner the Preſents which the com-
" mon People make to thoſe above them, do all turn to the profit of great Lords, upon
" whom they beſtow them: and thus this Feaſt is the beginning of Miſeries, and the over-
" whelming of the Poor. Farmers and Labourers are conſtrained to give to their Landlords; If
" they fail, they are abuſed. Miſerable People run like Fools through the Streets, asking from
" Door to Door, deafening every Body with their Noiſe and Cries. It is a day of Riot for Sol-
" diers. The Conſuls and Governours having made themſelves rich with the Pay due to Sol-
" diers, the Spoyls of Widows, and the publick Treaſury, having got Money by ſelling Juſtice,
" by ſhameful Contracts, by diſtributing this Money to Fidlers, Stage-Players, Dancers, and Co-
" medians, lewd Women, and baſe Fellows, are at this Expenſe to feed their Vanity. O Folly!
" O Blindneſs! God promiſes an eternal Reward to thoſe who diſtribute to the Poor, but theſe
" rather chuſe to ſpend fooliſhly, that they may get a vain and tranſitory Glory. But after all,
" what is the end of all that Vanity? what Figure ſoever any can make in this World, the end
" is always a Grave that buryeth Men in eternal Oblivion.

He deſcribes here the fatal end of *Ruffinus*, and *Eutropius*, who juſt before were deprived both of their Dignities and of their Eſtates, and concludes with theſe words of the wiſe Man: *Vanity of Vanities.* " Dignities, *ſaith he*, are Dreams and Viſions, which vaniſh after having given
" ſome kind of delight for a very ſhort time: They are Flowers, that dry on a ſudden, having
" flouriſhed for a while.

The Firſt Sermon is *about Divorce.* *Aſterius* ſhews there by ſeveral Reaſons that Men are not to put away their Wives, yet he excepteth Adultery, and ſaith, " that if a Man puts away his
" Wife for Adultery, inſtead of taking her again, he commends him for avoiding a Perſon who
" by violating Chaſtity hath broken the indiſſoluble bond of Marriage. He obſerves, that the
" Law of the Goſpel is the ſame for Men as for Women; but that the Roman Laws, have not
" obſerved the ſame Equity; not permitting Wives to leave their Husbands, but only Husbands
" to put away their Wives. The reaſon commonly alledged of this difference, is, that Husbands

do

Aſterius Amaſenus.

do not prejudice their Wives, in committing Adultery, whereas by this Crime, Wives doe introduce into Families other Men's Children, and make them Heirs, who have no manner of Right. *Aſterius* ſticks not to ſay, that this Reaſon is impertinent, becauſe Men abuſing either Virgins or Wives, overthrow and diſhonour their Reſpective Families, and wrong their Parents and their Husbands very conſiderably.

The Sixth Sermon upon the Hiſtory of *Suſanna*, is full of curious moral Notions. This is one. "A Man overtaken with a Sin is often drawn by that firſt Crime into all ſorts of Iniquity, as "on the contrary one Vertue is the cauſe of another.

The Seventh Sermon is upon the miraculous cure of the Man that was born blind, he exalts the Greatneſs of the Miracle, and draws an Argument for Chriſt's Divinity from it.

The Eighth is a *Panegyrick* in Commendation of S. *Peter*, and S. *Paul*; he ſhews there how wonderful their miracles were, and in ſeveral places eſtabliſheth S. *Peter*'s Primacy amongſt the Apoſtles. "All the Apoſtles, *ſaith he*, muſt give place to S. *Peter*, and Confeſs, that he alone "deſerveth the firſt Rank, if a compariſon of the Graces God gave to the Apoſtles, is a Token of "Priority of Honour.

The following Sermon is a Diſcourſe in Commendation of *Phocas* the Martyr. He affirms in the Preface, that a remembrance of the Actions of Saints, and of the Martyrs Engagements, is one of the moſt powerful Arguments that can be, to encourage Chriſtians to Piety and Vertue. He addeth that for this Reaſon they kept their Relicks, that they are expoſed to ſight in Shrines, that their Feaſts are kept, and Churches built to their Honour, to refreſh the Memory of their generous Actions. Afterwards he relates the Life of *Phocas* the Martyr, in a very plain and natural manner, without any mixture of ſuch Hiſtories as are rather miraculous than rational. He ends, with the Honours that were paid to that Saint. He ſays, That the Memory of him was famous in the Countrey, where his Body lay; That at *Rome* he was reſpected almoſt as much as S. *Peter* and S. *Paul*, and that his Head was had in great Veneration. *Aſterius* tells us that the Martyr *Phocas*, he ſpeaketh of, was born as *Sinope*, and a Gardiner by Profeſſion, without mentioning that he was a Biſhop. This is it perhaps, which hath occaſioned the Diſtinction of two *Phocas's* Martyrs. The one martyr'd under *Trajan*, whoſe Feaſt is kept *July* 14. and the other ſimply a Martyr; whoſe remembrance is celebrated on the 5*th*. of *March*. The *Greeks* mention them both upon the 22*d*. of *September*. Perhaps it is but one and the ſame Man, whoſe Hiſtory hath been variouſly reported. For both are ſuppoſed to have been of *Sinope*, and the ſame Miracles are aſcribed to both. Be it as it will, Seamen choſe this Saint for their Patron, as *Aſterius* obſerves at the latter end of this Homily.

The Tenth Sermon in Commendation of Martyrs, was preached in an Aſſembly, met together for the Honour of the Martyrs. He begins with this Reflection: "Very often we receive much "good from our greateſt Enemies unawares. Had not Satan perſecuted the Church, we ſhould "have had no Martyrs. He afterwards obſerves, That Martyrs are not only Patterns of Vertue, "but alſo Accuſers of Vice. And this, ſaith he, is thus to be underſtood. A Martyr hath conſtantly endured fire and flame, why will you not tame the heat of Luſt with Chaſtity? A "Martyr hath not regarded all the wealth of the World, wherefore do you not deſpiſe a ſmall "Sum for the love of God? A Martyr hath put off his own Body for God's ſake, why then "will ye not part with the meaneſt Garment to cover a poor Man? We ought either to Honour and imitate the Saints as our Maſters, or fear them as our Accuſers. Out of Honour "to Martyrs, we preſerve their Relicks with Veneration, looking upon them as Veſſels of Benediction, Organs of bleſſed Souls, and aſſured Pledges of their Good-will. The Churches are "guarded by the Martyrs, as by ſo many Soldiers. The afflicted make Addreſſes to them, and "with Confidence implore their Interceſſion. It cureth Diſeaſes, comforteth in Poverty, and "appeaſeth the anger of Princes. Finally the Churches of Martyrs are an Harbour in a Storm, "and a refuge in all Miſeries. The Father whoſe Child is ſick, prayeth unto God for his Cure by "the interceſſion of a Martyr, ſaying, *You Holy Martyr that ſuffered for Jeſus Chriſt interceed for us. You who can Addreſs to God with greater Boldneſs, carry this word for your fellow Servants. Tho' you are no longer in the World, yet you know the Pains and Afflictions of this Life. Your ſelves have formerly pray'd to the Martyrs, before you were Martyrs, they heard you when you intreated them, now that you can hear us grant us our Requeſts.* But leaſt ignorant Perſons ſhould yield to Martyrs the Honour which belongs only to God, he adds, "We doe not adore the "Martyrs, but we Honour them as God's Servants. We Honour not Men, but admire them: "We lay up their Relicks in beautified Shrines, and we build magnificent Churches to their "Memory, to render them the ſame Honour in the Church, that is given in the World to thoſe "that have done famous Actions. He goeth on to eſtabliſh this Principle in the reſt of this Diſcourſe, where he ſpeaks ſo ſtrongly of the worſhip of Saints and Martyrs againſt ſuch as deſpiſe them, that it gives occaſion of Suſpicion whether this be not of a younger Age, than that of *Aſterius Amaſenus*.

The Eleventh Sermon is a *Panegyrick* upon S. *Euphemia* cited in the Seventh general Council, *Act*. 4. and by *Photius*. It ſeemeth not to me to be of *Aſterius Amaſenus* his Stile. The Author relateth the Hiſtory of that Saint, and obſerves, that ſhe was repreſented upon a Winding-ſheet that was near her Grave.

After theſe Sermons come thoſe Extracts produced by *Photius*, *Vol.* 271. The firſt is taken out of a Sermon of Penance upon the ſinful Woman, among the Works of *Gregory Nyſſen*, to whom he aſcribed it in the Second Volume of his *Bibliotheca*; but after ſerious reflection, I have found that it is more likely to be written by *Aſterius Amaſenus*. *Aſterius Amaſenus.*

The Second Extract is taken out of the Sermon upon S. *Steven*, among *Proclus*'s Sermons. It differs from that which S. *Gregory Nyſſen* made upon that Subject, tho' I confounded them in the Second Volume.

The Third is taken out of the Homily upon the Parable of the Traveller, who going to *Jericho* was taken and wounded by Thieves, *Luk.* 10. He ſuppoſeth that this Accident was real, and that Jeſus Chriſt makes uſe of it to inform the Jews of the Greatneſs of his Charity and Mercy. This wounded man going down to *Jericho*, is the Figure of *Adam*, who by his Sin fell from the happy State wherein he was created, and at the ſame time cauſed the Fall of all mankind. The *Levite* and the Prieſt are *Moſes* and S. *John*, who finding this Man, that is all mankind, deſtitute of Grace, Vertue and Piety, and wounded by his Enemies, did indeed look upon him with Compaſſion, but could not cure him. That the *Samaritan* is Jeſus Chriſt, who carries a Treaſure of Grace, hidden till the time of the New Law. This Expoſition of the Parable is pretty exact ſo far, but the Compariſon he makes afterwards, betwixt the Body of Jeſus Chriſt, and the Horſe that carried this *Samaritan* is hardly tolerable, *Becauſe*, ſaith he, *the Body of Jeſus Chriſt is as it were the Vehicle of the Divinity.*

The Fourth Extract of *Photius* is taken out of an Homily upon the Prayers of the *Phariſee* and of the *Publican*, ſpoken of *Luk. ch.* 18. Here is an excellent Definition of Prayer. " Prayer is a confe-
" rence with God, a forgetting of earthly things, and an Aſcenſion into Heaven. He that pray-
" eth ſtanding with his hands lifted up to Heaven, doth by this poſture of his Body repreſent
" the Croſs; and if he prayeth with the Heart, and his Prayer is acceptable to God, he hath the
" Croſs in his Heart. For Prayer extinguiſhes in him the Deſires of the Fleſh, the love of Ri-
" ches, and puts off from his Spirit the thoughts of Pride and Vanity. He addeth, " That Vain-
" glory corrupts the beſt Actions, as Prayer, Faſting, and Alms, *&c.* and renders them impro-
" fitable.

The Fifth Extract is out of the Homily upon the Hiſtory of *Zacchæus*, it containeth nothing conſiderable.

The Sixth is upon the Parable of the prodigal Son. He ſaith that the Father ſpoken of in that Parable repreſents the Father of Eternity; That the two Sons, are two ſorts of Men; That the prodigal Child is a Figure of thoſe that have loſt the Grace of Baptiſm; That the Portion of Goods which he deſires of his Father, is the Grace of Baptiſm, and the Participation of the Body of Jeſus Chriſt; That this Child doth indeed ask it well, but does not keep it, but goes into a foreign Countrey, that is he departeth from God's Commandments; That the Devil is that Citizen and Prince who commandeth the Swine, that is debauched Perſons; That this Sinner at laſt acknowledging his Fault, cometh back to God his Father, but with fear and confeſſing his unworthineſs; That the Father full of Compaſſion and Mercy receiveth him, embraceth, and puts upon him new Robes; That theſe new Robes cannot be Baptiſm which cannot be received a ſecond time, but Repentance, which is inſtead of Baptiſm, and which blotting out our Sins with tears, makes us clean and acceptable to God; That the Ring afterwards given to this prodigal Child, is the Seal of the Holy Ghoſt, which is given in Repentance as well as in Baptiſm.

The Seventh Extract is of a Sermon upon the cure of the Centurion's Servant. *Photius* ſaith, that *Aſterius* upon occaſion of that Hiſtory, treateth of the Duties of Maſters and Servants; That he adviſeth Servants to obey their Maſters readily and heartily; and exhorteth their Maſters to uſe them with Meekneſs and Bounty, looking upon them as Brethren. " For, *ſaith he*, they are made
" of the ſame Mould with us, they have the ſame Creator, the ſame Nature, the ſame Paſſions;
" they have a Body and a Soul as we have, *&c.* The Homily at the beginning of the Faſt, from which *Photius* hath taken out the Eighth Extract, is in Latin among the Works of S. *Gregory Nyſſen*. I now Confeſs, that it rather belongs to *Aſterius*, than to that Father.

The Ninth Extract is of the Homily upon the Man born blind, which we have entire.

The Tenth is upon the Woman having an Iſſue of Blood. There he ſpeaks of the Hiſtory of the Statue, which that Woman cauſed to be ſet up in Honour of Jeſus Chriſt in the City of *Paneas*.

This is all that F. *Combefis* hath collected of the Works of *Aſterius Amaſenus*: but ſince that, *Cotelerius* in the ſecond Volume of his *Eccleſiaſtical Monuments*, hath given us three Homilies upon *Pſalm* 5, 6, and 7. which he aſcribeth to *Aſterius Amaſenus*, upon the Authority of two *Catenæ* upon the *Pſalms*. He obſerves that before theſe Homilies there was one upon *Pſalm* 4. Printed in the Seventh Volume of the *Eaton* Edition of S. *Chryſoſtom*, *pag.* 431. which he likewiſe attributeth to the ſame *Aſterius*. I confeſs I miſ-truſt very much the Quotations of theſe *Catenæ*, and I ſhould rather believe, that theſe Commentaries belong to *Aſterius* the Philoſopher, who according to the Teſtimony of the Ancients, writ a Commentary upon the *Pſalms*, than to the Biſhop of *Amaſea*, who is not ſaid to have written upon that Subject. *Cotelerius* pretends that the Conformity both of Stile and Doctrine demonſtrate that theſe Homilies were written by *Aſterius Amaſenus*. But tho' I pay a great deference to the Judgment of that learned Man, yet I find no ſuch Reſemblance; however I would not be believed upon my own word, but leave it to thoſe to judge, who will take the Pains to compare them.

Aſterius Amaſenus.

The Stile of *Aſterius Amaſenus* is plain, but with a great deal of natural Beauty. His Characters and Deſcriptions are excellent: His Sermons would be eſteemed in this Age, where thoſe things are extremely valued. He is very ſevere in his Morals; the Reflections he makes are exact and ſolid. He explains the Scripture-Parables after an ingenious manner, and draws from them very uſeful Thoughts. He doth not excite his Auditors by violent Motions as great Orators do; but inſinuates into their minds Chriſtian Truths, by his agreeable and natural way of propoſing them: and inſenſibly begets in them an Abhorrency of Vice, and a love of Vertue, only by a bare Picture lively drawn.

ANASTASIUS.

Anaſtaſius.

ANASTASIUS was choſen Biſhop of *Rome*, after the Death of Pope *Siricius*, *Anno* 398. He was an illuſtrious Perſon, as commendable for neglecting his private Intereſt, as for his Paſtoral Vigilance. Under his Pontificate, *Flavianus* and the *Eaſtern* Biſhops were reconciled to the Church of *Rome*, and to the other *Weſtern* Churches. The buſineſs of the *Origeniſts* making a great noiſe in the Church, he thought it his Duty to declare his Senſe of that matter: He therefore made a Decree after the Example of *Theophilus*, whereby he condemned both the Works and the perſon of *Origen*, and being informed that *Ruffinus* the Prieſt was his chief Defender, he cited him to come to *Rome*, and appear before him: but *Ruffinus* deferring to appear, he condemned him as an Heretick in the Year 401. at the Sollicitation of a Lady called *Marcella*, who produced Evidences againſt him her ſelf, and ſhewed the Errors that he had left in the Tranſlation of the Books of *Origen*'s Principles, as S. *Jerom* ſays *Ep.* 16.

John of *Jeruſalem* having heard of this Judgment, writ him a very civil Letter, wherein after abundance of Commendations he ſpake in *Ruffinus* his behalf. *Anaſtaſius*, having returned him thanks for his Complements, anſwered, That he could not but condemn *Ruffinus* his conduct, becauſe he had tranſlated the Books of *Origen*'s Principles, with a deſign that the People ſhould read them as Catholick Books; that the Fear he was in leaſt they ſhould corrupt the Doctrine of the faithful in his Church, obliged him to condemn them: that he was informed that the Emperours had made an Edict to forbid the reading of *Origen*'s works: that *Ruffinus* having approved in his Tranſlation the Opinions of *Origen*, deſerved to be treated after the ſame manner, as he that firſt publiſhed them. Laſtly, he declares, that he will hear no more of him; that he might ſeek for Abſolution where he pleaſed, for his part he looked upon him as an excommunicated perſon.

This is the only true Letter of *Anaſtaſius*, the two others are written by *Iſidore*. The firſt directed to the *German* and *Burgundian* Biſhops is dated Fourteen years before *Anaſtaſius* was Pope. Thoſe of *Burgundy* to whom it is directed, were not then converted. It is made up of ſeveral paſſages of the Letters of *Innocent*, S. *Leo* and *Flavianus*, &c. It is full of Faults, and far from the Stile of the true *Anaſtaſius*. The ſecond addreſſed to *Nectarius* is dated Fourteen years after *Anaſtaſius* his Death, and is taken out of *Innocent*, S. *Leo*, *Gregory*, &c.

We have not the firſt Synodical Letter of *Anaſtaſius*, wherein he condemned *Origen*'s Books, nor the Letter wherein he cited *Ruffinus*, nor that directed to *Venerius* of *Milan*, whereof he ſpeaks in his Letter to *John*. It is believed, that he writ a Treatiſe *of the Incarnation* directed to *Urſinus*, whereof ſome Fragments are found at the latter end of *Liberatus*'s Breviary. But it is certain, that they belong to *Anaſtaſius*. This Pope died in the beginning of the Year 402 and left *Innocent* his Succeſſor.

CHROMATIUS, *Biſhop of* Aquileia.

Chromat. Biſhop of Aquileia.

CHROMATIUS, Biſhop of *Aquileia*, whom S. *Jerom* in his Preface to the *Chronicles*, calleth *the moſt Holy and Learned Biſhop of his time*, writ and preached ſeveral Sermons. There is but one Diſcourſe of his extant upon the Beatitudes, upon Chriſt's Sermon on the Mount, and upon the words of S. *John* to Jeſus Chriſt, *I ought to be baptized of thee*. Which probably is a Fragment of a Commentary, compoſed by this Saint upon the whole Goſpel of S. *Matt.* He explaineth the Letter of the Goſpel, inſiſting particularly upon the Moral Precepts thereof. In the Expoſition of what the Goſpel ſaith concerning Divorces, he ſeems to have believed, That a Man might Marry another Wife, after being divorced for the cauſe of Adultery, but he condemneth thoſe that abandon their Wives upon any other Account, and Marry again, tho' he confeſſeth that humane Laws allowed it. He expounds the Lord's Prayer, and recommends the Exerciſe thereof, the Love of our Neighbour, Alms-deeds, Faſting, and other Vertues ſpoken of in Chriſt's Sermon upon the Mount. In the laſt Fragment he diſcourſeth of the Efficacy of Chriſt's Baptiſm.

The Stile of this Author is not very lofty, but his words are well choſen, his Notions juſt, his Expoſitions literal, and his Reflections uſeful. He was one of the moſt famous Biſhops of the *Weſt*, and held Correſpondence with the Learnedeſt men of his time. He is one of the Three to whom

S. *Chryſoſtom*

S. *Chryſoſtom* directed the Letter, to demand help of the *Weſtern* Biſhops: and he ſubſcribed the Letters written for him to the *Eaſt*. His Works were printed by themſelves at *Baſil* in 1528. and at *Lovain* in 1548. and afterwards in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*: I ſay nothing of a Letter bearing the Name of *Chromatius* directed to S. *Jerom*, in which he deſires to have the Martyrology of *Euſebius*; It being certain, that both this Letter and the pretended Anſwer of S. *Jerom* are ſpurious, as *Baronius* evidently proves in the Seventh Chapter of his Preface to the *Roman* Martyrology.

Chromat. Biſhop of Aquileia.

GAUDENTIUS, *Biſhop of* Breſcia.

SAint *Philaſtrius*, Biſhop of *Breſcia*, who compoſed the Book of Hereſies mentioned in the foregoing Century, dying in 386. in the Year 387, the Biſhops of the *Province*, together with S. *Ambroſe*, did, with the Conſent of the people, chuſe for his Succeſſor *Gaudentius*, who was gone to travel in the *Eaſt*; But fearing, leaſt he ſhould abide in the *Eaſt*, dreading the Burden of the Epiſcopal Charge, they not only ſent Deputies to him, with a Letter to deſire his Return; but wrote a Letter beſides to the *Eaſtern* Biſhops to intreat them, that they would not admit him to the Communion, if he refuſed to come and govern the Dioceſs, of which he was choſen Biſhop. Whereby *Gaudentius* found himſelf obliged to accept of that Charge, and being come back, was ordained by S. *Ambroſe* and the Biſhops of his Province.

Gaudentius, Biſhop of *Breſcia*.

All theſe Circumſtances are recorded in the Diſcourſe which he made to them immediately after his Ordination. He was but young when they choſe him, as he ſays in the ſame place. He was one of the Deputies ſent to *Conſtantinople* in 404, or 405. by the *Weſtern* Biſhops, to demand S. *John Chryſoſtom*'s Re-eſtabliſhment in his See. Poſſibly he lived a great while afterwards.

To this Biſhop is attributed the Life of his Predeceſſor S. *Philaſtrius*, which *Surius* Printed upon the Eighteenth day of *July*. Yet I cannot believe that it is certainly his; but we find in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* Nineteen Inſtructions, or Sermons, which are unqueſtionably Genuine, and which he collected himſelf, to ſend them to one *Benevolus*, one of the moſt conſiderable Men in *Breſcia*; who had formerly been Receiver of the Emperor's Memorials, and Injunctions, and who had quitted that Employment, that he might not be obliged to doe any thing againſt his Conſcience in obedience to the Empreſs *Juſtina*, who Countenanced the *Arians*, and perſecuted S. *Ambroſe*.

This *Benevolus* was conſtant at Divine Service, and heard the Sermons of *Gaudentius* with Pleaſure; but having been hindred by Sickneſs from hearing thoſe which this Holy Biſhop preached at *Eaſter*, he prayed him to commit them to writing; and to Anſwer the deſire of this Man, the Holy Biſhop did write his Sermons almoſt in the ſame words that he preached them: He joyned to them four ſmall Treatiſes upon ſome places of the Goſpel, and a Fifth upon the Martyrdom of the *Maccabees*.

As to the other Sermons which the Copyers writ as *Gaudentius* was preaching, he will not own them for his, fearing that there may be ſome Errors in them; this *Gaudentius* declares in the beginning of his Preface: Afterwards he comforts *Benevolus* in his Sickneſs, ſhowing that God permits often, Saints and righteous Men to be afflicted with Poverty and Sickneſſes, whereas he lets the wicked enjoy a perfect Health and much Wealth, becauſe both Puniſhments and Rewards are reſerved to the Day of Judgment: that in the mean time he inflicteth viſible Chaſtiſements upon the impious and refractary, to frighten others by their Puniſhments: but permits likewiſe the righteous to be afflicted for Three Reaſons, 1. to Correct, 2. to Purifie, and 3. to try them. The ſeverity he uſeth towards them is a Fatherly ſeverity. He ſends them Afflictions, to manifeſt their Vertue both to Men and Angels, and ſo all the Sufferings of the righteous are either for their Profit, or for their Glory. Whoſoever honoureth, and loveth God truly, thinks himſelf Happy in the midſt of Tribulations, and bleſſeth God for all that happeneth to him.

The firſt of thoſe Sermons preached on *Eaſter-Eve*, is directed to the *Catechumens* that were to be baptized: He begins it with a thought that is rather ſubtle than ſolid, to give a Reaſon why *Eaſter* is celebrated in the Spring, after the ill Weather of Autumn, and the ſeverity of Winter, and before the heat of Summer. It is, ſaith he, to ſhow that Jeſus Chriſt the Son of Righteouſneſs, diſſipates by his light the Darkneſs of Jewiſh Errors, and ſoftens the hardneſs of the Heathens Hearts, preventing with his Beams, the hot Fire of the Judgment of the great Day. He adds, That the World having been created in the Spring, it is juſt that it ſhould be repaired in the ſame Seaſon. Afterwards he compareth the Chriſtian's Paſſover with that of the *Jews*; and the deliverance of the People of *Iſrael* from *Egypt* thro' the *Red Sea*, with the Regeneration of Sinners, by the waters of Baptiſm.

The Second Sermon is directed to the Novices: *Gaudentius* expoundeth in that inſtruction the Myſtery of the Euchariſt, which was hid from them till that time. He compares it with the *Jews* Paſchal Lamb, taking notice that That was but the Figure, and not the real thing. "Whereas "in the truth of the New Law, it is the ſame Lamb dead for all; which being offered in all "Churches,

Gaudentius, Biſhop of *Breſcia*.

" Churches, nouriſhes under the Myſtery of Bread and Wine, thoſe that offer it, giveth life to " them that have a lively Faith, and ſanctifieth by Conſecration thoſe that conſecrate the ſame. " This is the Fleſh of the Lamb, this is his Blood.... It is the ſame Lord Creator of all things, " who having made Bread out of the Earth, forms his Body of this Bread, becauſe he is able, " and hath promiſed it. He who formerly changed Water into Wine, now changeth Wine into " his Blood. Having expounded thus plainly the Myſtery of the Euchariſt, he ſpeaks of the Diſpoſitions that Men ought to be in to come to it: He findeth them all repreſented by the Ceremonies obſerved by the *Jews* in eating the Paſchal Lamb; but his Similitudes are ſo far fetcht, that one would hardly have obſerved them. For who can believe that the Leathern Girdle that the *Iſraelites* were girded withall, was a Figure of the Mortification of Sins? Who would imagine, that when they are forbidden to break a bone of the Lamb, the meaning is that the Scripture-precepts ought to be obſerved? And who can conclude from burning the remainders of the Lamb, that Men ſhould conſume by a lively Faith the doubts which they might have about the Euchariſt. Theſe Allegories, and ſuch-like in this place, are ſomething forced, and I queſtion whether many people can reliſh them. At laſt he exhorteth the new baptized ſtrongly to believe that Myſtery, and giveth Two myſtical Reaſons why Jeſus Chriſt choſe Bread and Wine to be the matter of that Sacrament.

He proſecutes, in the Five following Sermons, his Lecture upon that place of *Exodus*, which ſpeaketh of the Circumſtances and Ceremonies wherewith the *Jews* offered the Paſchal Lamb; and he applies them to the Sacrifice of Jeſus Chriſt upon the Croſs, and to what is done among Chriſtians; and ſometimes he draws from them ſome Moral inſtructions.

The Eighth and Ninth are upon the Goſpel of the Marriage in *Cana* of *Galilee*; He commendeth Virginity, reproving thoſe at the ſame time who condemn Matrimony, and warneth Parents, that though they may inſpire into their Children the love of Virginity, yet they cannot enjoyn them the Vow of perpetual Continency. He maintains, that the Virgin *Mary* did not loſe her Virginity in bringing Jeſus Chriſt into the World. Both theſe Inſtructions are full of many Similitudes. He exhorteth the new baptized not to loſe the Grace of their Baptiſm.

The Tenth Inſtruction is upon *Exodus*; There he brings many Allegories upon the Paſſover, and upon the Lord's Day. He ſeems to be perſwaded, that the World ſhall end after the accompliſhment of Six thouſand Years; and that thoſe Dead who appeared after Chriſt's death, were of the number of thoſe Righteous ones, whom the Soul of Chriſt, that deſcended into Hell, delivered in that day. Theſe are the Ten Sermons which *Gaudentius* preached in *Benevolus* his abſence during *Eaſter* Holy-days.

The other Sermons are particular Tracts which he collected to joyn them to the foregoing. The Firſt is upon the Sick of the Palſie, whom Jeſus Chriſt cured on the Sabbath-day. The Second is upon Chriſt's Words, *John* 12. *And now is the judgment:* Which he expoundeth thus: *The World is going to judge its Creator and Maſter.* The Third is upon the Nativity of Jeſus Chriſt, and of that patience wherewith he endured *Judas* his Treaſon. Upon occaſion of this unhappy Apoſtle's covetouſneſs, he exhorteth to Alms-deeds, which he makes no ſcruple of comparing with Baptiſm; ſaying, That as the Water of Baptiſm quenches Hell-fire, ſo abundance of Alms quenches the fire of Luſt that remains after Baptiſm, or at leaſt hinders it from breaking out into a Flame. He occaſionally ſpeaks by the bye againſt thoſe who ſay they cannot faſt, becauſe they will not. He concludes with an Exhortation to love God and our Neighbour. This Sermon is better written and more uſefull than the others.

The Fourth is about the ſending of the Holy Ghoſt, and contains a curious Obſervation againſt ſuch as pretend to fathom Myſteries. *We ought to believe that God is what he hath revealed himſelf to be; his Actions are not to be examined with a rebellious Spirit, but to be admired with Faith, and Submiſſion: For the Word of God is direct, and all his Actions are for the exerciſe of our Faith.... And ſo let us have a care of aſſaulting, if we may ſo ſpeak, the Divine Myſteries with injurious Queſtions. Neither Scrupulouſneſs nor Curioſity will help us to diſcover them, but only make us loſe the Faith which leads to Salvation and Eternal life.*

The Fifth Sermon is in commendation of the *Maccabees*. *Gaudentius* endeavoureth to give reaſons, Why Swine's fleſh was forbidden to the *Jews*.

The Sixth Sermon is that which he preached at his Ordination in the preſence of S. *Ambroſe* and the other Biſhops. He ſpeaks at firſt of the Violence that was uſed towards him to make him accept the Biſhoprick of *Breſcia*. He commends his Predeceſſor *Philaſtrius*: He entreateth S. *Ambroſe*, the firſt of the Biſhops there, to ſpeak in the Name of all the Biſhops, as S. *Peter* the Prince of the Apoſtles ſpeaketh for them all. He ends, deſiring the Biſhops to implore God's mercy, that he would aſſiſt him with the Vertue of the Holy Ghoſt to govern his Dioceſs well.

The Seventh is a Panegyrick upon the Forty Martyrs, for whoſe honour they had built a Church, to depoſit their Relicks. S. *Gaudentius*, who called many Biſhops to that Feaſt, having ſpoken concerning the Relicks of ſeveral Martyrs, which he had gathered; *viz.* thoſe of S. *John Baptiſt*, S. *Andrew*, S. *Thomas*, S. *Luke*, S. *Gervaſius*, S. *Protaſius*, S. *Nazarius*, and the Aſhes of the SS. *Siſinnius* and *Alexander*, who had lately ſuffered Martyrdom: He adds, that Travelling through *Cappadocia*, he found at *Cæſarea* a Convent of Women, where S. *Baſil*'s Nieces were, who were ſo kind as to give him part of the Relicks of the Forty Martyrs, left with them by their Uncle. He deſcribeth afterwards thoſe Saint's Martyrdom, taken out of S. *Baſil*'s diſcourſe; then

he

he makes an end, ſaying, That the then conſecrated Church being adorned with the Relicks of ſo many Saints, was to bear the Name of an Aſſembly of Saints.

Gaudentius, Biſhop of Breſcia.

The Eighth Diſcourſe is a Letter to *Germinius*, wherein he explains the Parable of the Unjuſt Steward, related *Luke* 16. There he treateth chiefly of the Obligation to give Alms.

The Laſt Diſcourſe is likewiſe a Letter to a Deacon called *Paul*, to expound that notable place of S. *John*'s Goſpel, which the *Arians* did alledge againſt the Divinity of Jeſus Chriſt: *My Father is greater than I. Gaudentius* there refutes *Arius* and the *Arians* with great earneſtneſs; affirming, that this place is to be underſtood of Chriſt's human Nature.

It is not neceſſary to give a Character of S. *Gaudentius*. He is ſufficiently known by what we have ſaid of him. His Style is plain and without affectation, full of forced Allegories, extraordinary Notions, and far-fetcht Alluſions. His Sermons are dry, barren, neither inſtructive nor moving in any conſiderable degree. In one word, they have not the ſtrength, eloquence, beauty or exactneſs obſerved in the Sermons of thoſe Greek Authors formerly mentioned.

JOHN *of* Jeruſalem.

John of Jeruſalem.

AFter the Death of S. *Cyril*, which happened in the Year 387, a Monk called *John*, a great Defender of *Origen*'s Books, Opinions and Followers, ſucceeded in that See. S. *Epiphanius* being perſwaded, that the *Origeniſts* were very dangerous Hereticks, reproved him before ſeveral perſons for taking their part. But inſtead of yielding to S. *Epiphanius*'s admonition, *John* declared himſelf openly againſt him, and upbraided him as a Patron of the *Anthropomorphites*; that is, of thoſe who affirmed that God had a Body. Soon after S. *Epiphanius* ordained *Paulinianus*, S. *Jerom*'s Brother, out of his own Dioceſs, in that of *Cæſarea*; and that gave *John* an occaſion to complain of him, and to accuſe him of violating the Canons. S. *Epiphanius* excuſed himſelf upon the account of the Cuſtom of his Country; and obſerves in his Letter, that it was not this Ordination which moſt offended *John*, but that he was accuſed of being an *Origeniſt*. This Letter of S. *Epiphanius* was written in 392. S. *Jerom* was much engaged in the quarrel, and upholding S. *Epiphanius*'s Party, was excommunicated of *John*, who uſed all his endeavours to expell him out of *Paleſtine*. On the other ſide, *Ruffinus* took *John*'s part; ſo that this quarrel betwixt two zealous Biſhops, being fomented by theſe two learned Men, grew to a great heighth in a little time. Count *Archelaus* endeavoured to accommodate the matter; and as they accuſed one another of Hereſie, it was agreed, That for their Reconciliation, they ſhould make a Confeſſion of Faith; but *John* appearing not in the Aſſembly called for that purpoſe, the Accommodation was broke off.

Theophilus, Biſhop of *Alexandria*, informed of this Diviſion, thought it his duty to endeavour to quiet it: Therefore he ſent his Deacon *Iſidore* for that end; who being already preposſeſſed in *Origen*'s behalf, ſtrengthned *John*'s Party, and returned without effecting any thing; and only brought *Theophilus* a Letter from *John*, wherein he juſtified himſelf, and accuſed S. *Epiphanius*. This Letter having been ſpread in the Weſt, obliged both S. *Jerom* and S. *Epiphanius* to write to *Theophilus*, that he ſhould make haſte to declare againſt the *Origeniſts*. This Biſhop deferr'd for ſome time to make this Declaration, ſuſpecting that S. *Epiphanius* was guilty of the *Anthropomorphites* Error, which he abhorred. But he found himſelf obliged to declare himſelf of a Party, by the Seceſſion of certain Monks of *Egypt*, infected with the *Anthropomorphites* Error; who after they had read a Letter of this Biſhop againſt that Doctrine, came in great fury to *Theophilus* with a deſign to kill him. *Theophilus* to appeaſe them, made uſe of *Jacob*'s words to *Eſau*, *I ſee your faces as the face of God*. This perſwading the ſilly Monks, that his Mind was altered, and that he really believed that God had a face, they were quieted. But they being perſwaded that *Origen* was the greateſt enemy of the Doctrine which they maintained, ſaid unto him; *If you be of this mind, then condemn* Origen's *Books*. This was the Reaſon (if we may believe the Hiſtorians of that time) for which *Theophilus* was forced to declare againſt that Author and his Party; at the time when *Theophilus* was fallen out with *Iſidore*, the Long-brethren and the other Monks of *Nitria*. He accuſed them of *Origeniſm*, and forced them to retire to *Conſtantinople*. All this while *John* of *Jeruſalem* continued in his Opinion, and writ a Letter in favour of *Ruffinus* and of *Origen*, to Pope *Anaſtaſius*. His enmity againſt S. *Jerom* laſted long, as we learn by a Letter of Pope *Innocent*; and he joined himſelf to *Pelagius*, and cauſed him to be abſolved in the Council of *Dioſpolis*, as appears by the Letter which S. *Auguſtin* wrote to him. He died in 416.

Gennadius ſaith that he writ a Book againſt his Adverſaries; wherein he profeſſed to admire the Wit, but not the Doctrine of *Origen*. That Diſcourſe is loſt.

There is attributed to this Author a Treatiſe dedicated to *Capraſius* of the Inſtitution of Monkery; but that viſibly appears to be the work of a Latin Author, who compoſed it of purpoſe to prove, That the Order of the *Carmelites*, which began in the time of the Old Law, was very ancient in the Church, and that many Chriſtians were of this Order in the Primitive Church. It is a heap of Fables, Viſions and Dreams concerning *Elias*, and ſome other Prophets, whom this Author feigneth to have been Monks of Mount *Carmel*. But what is more ſurprizing, is, that upon occaſion of this ſuppoſed Book, there was a *Carmelite* that either had ſo little ſence him-

John of Jeruſalem.

ſelf, or rather believed that others were ſo dull, as to attribute to the ſame Author ſeveral Books, which are either without the Name of an Author, or falſely aſcribed to others; which he hath had the confidence to collect and publiſh at *Bruxells* in Folio, *ann.* 1643, under the Name of *John* of *Jeruſalem*'s Works; as if this pretended Author muſt neceſſarily be the Father of all theſe unknown Children. But in one word; Though this famous * *Carmelite*, who took the pains to collect them, hath beſtowed a whole Volume to ſhew that the Diſcourſes contained in his Firſt Volume, were truly written by *John* of *Jeruſalem*, and hath endeavoured to juſtifie them from all ſorts of Errors; yet one may ſay that he hath done nothing leſs than what he promiſeth in the Title, and that he hath filled that long and tedious Treatiſe with idle Conjectures, groundleſs Suppoſitions, manifeſt Falſhoods, or with Matters no ways pertinent to his Subject. So that this great Building failing at the foundation, is quickly fallen into ruine, and is become an object of Laughter to all perſons that pretend to Learning.

[* *Petrus Waſtellus.*]

THEOPHILUS *of* Alexandria.

Theophilus of Alexandria.

THEOPHILUS was ordained Biſhop in the Year 385, after the Death of *Timotheus*. We have already obſerved that he was a politick and daring Man. He took away the remains of Idolatry in the City of *Alexandria*, by cauſing the Temples and Idols that were left to be pulled down, and by diſcovering to the People the Frauds and the Stratagems which the Idol-prieſts made uſe of to uphold their Superſtition; having hollow Statues wherein Men were hid, who perſwaded the People that the Statues ſpoke.

This generous Action got *Theophilus* much credit and reputation, and gave him great power in *Alexandria*. The Council of *Capua* having referred to him the judgment of *Flavian*'s buſineſs, he dealt very moderately with him; but he ſhowed much partiality in the Ordination of S. *Chryſoſtom*; being deſirous to have preferred *Iſidore* to that See: However, they were friends in appearance for a while, and they united together to procure the Reconciliation of the Eaſtern with the Weſtern Biſhops. We have ſpoken before of his Carriage in the caſe of *Origen*, and the *Origeniſts*, of the policy of his Conduct, and the paſſion which he ſhewed in the buſineſs of S. *Chryſoſtom*. There is no likelihood that he ever repented of the injuſtice and violence which he exerciſed againſt S. *John Chryſoſtom*: For though S. *John Damaſcene* ſaith, that when he was near death, he cauſed the Image of that Saint to be brought to him; yet one cannot affirm it upon a teſtimony of that nature, eſpecially becauſe S. *Cyril* his Succeſſor, in the Church of *Alexandria*, perſiſted after his death to refuſe to pay any honour to the Memory of this Saint, and to inſert his Name into the Diptychs. It is more likely, that what is related in the Lives *of the Fathers in the Deſert*, is true; *viz.* That this Biſhop, being at the point of yielding up the Ghoſt, and reflecting upon the long Penance of S. *Arſenius*, cried out; *O how happy art thou* Arſenius, *to have always had this hour before thine eyes! Which ſheweth*, ſaith an Author of that time, *that Monks who have quitted all the hopes of the World and of the Court, to mourn in the Wilderneſs, die more peaceably than the Archbiſhops that go out of their Dioceſes, to diſturb the peace of the Church by caballing at Court againſt the moſt innocent and holieſt of their brethren.* Yet S. *Leo* calls him *Theophilus of happy Memory*; not that he had an opinion of his Sanctity, but becauſe dying in the Communion of the Church, that Title of Honour could not be denied him.

" He wrote, ſaith *Gennadius*, a large Treatiſe againſt *Origen*, wherein he condemns both his " Writings and his Perſon, ſhowing at the ſame time that he was not the firſt that condemned " him, but that he had been excommunicated by the Ancients, and particularly by *Heraclas*. " He compoſed another Book againſt the *Anthropomorphites*, who hold that God hath an hu- " mane ſhape, and members like unto ours: Wherein he refuteth their Opinions, and convinceth " them by teſtimonies of Holy Scripture; proving, that God is of an incorruptible and ſpiritual " Nature; whereas all Creatures are in their Natures corruptible and ſubject to change. He likewiſe preſented to *Theodoſius* the Emperour a ſmall Treatiſe concerning *Eaſter*, where he fixes the Day, and time of the Moon when it ought to be celebrated, according to the deciſion of the Council of *Nice*, adding ſome Obſervations touching the Solemnity of that Feſtival. This Cycle began in the Year 380, and determined *Eaſter* Day for 100 Years conſecutively, as S. *Leo* aſſures us in the 94th. and 95th. Letters of the new Edition.

Gennadius ſaith further, that he had read Three Books concerning *Faith*, that bore *Theophilus* his Name; but addeth, that he did not believe them to be his, becauſe they are written in a different Style.

S. *Jerom* mentions Five Epiſtles of *Theophilus*, which he had tranſlated into Latin. The Firſt was a Synodical Letter againſt *Origen* of the Year 399. The Second was a Paſchal Epiſtle for the Year 401, and three other Paſchal Epiſtles for the Years 402, 403, and 404. We have not the Two firſt, the other Three are among S. *Jerom*'s Epiſtles. The Firſt is divided into four Parts, according to the Obſervation of that Saint. In the Firſt *Theophilus* exhorts the Faithfull to celebrate the Feaſt of *Eaſter* worthily. In the Second and Third he ſpeaks againſt *Apollinarius*. In the Laſt he adviſeth Hereticks to repent. In all the Three he ſhews his averſion to *Origen*, accuſing him with great vehemence, of ſeveral Errors. It is obſerved in the Laſt that the Chri-

Chriſtians of that time forbore in *Lent* the Uſe of Wine and Meat. In theſe Diſcourſes he interſperſes ſome Moral Notions, and endeth all his Epiſtles with giving notice of the Day when *Lent* ſhall begin, and of *Eaſter* Day and *Whit-ſunday*.

Theophilus of Alexandria.

We have beſides, amongſt S. *Jerom's* Epiſtles, Three Letters of *Theophilus*: One to S. *Epiphanius*, wherein he exhorts him to aſſemble a Council againſt *Origen*, and Two other Letters againſt the *Origeniſts*.

There are ſome Greek Fragments of the Paſchal Letters cited by *Theodoret* in the Council of *Epheſus*, and in that of *Chalcedon*, which are among thoſe that we have, or elſe are taken out of other Letters of the ſame nature: For the Council of *Epheſus* quoteth a Sixth Paſchal Letter; and *Juſtinian* in his writing againſt *Origen*, produces a great part of the Synodical Letter againſt *Origen*, and Two other fragments of a Letter, and of a Treatiſe directed to the Monks of *Scheta*.

Facundus, l. 6. ch. 5. quoteth a Book of *Theophilus* againſt S. *Chryſoſtom*, full of Invectives and Calumnies againſt that Saint whereof he gives ſome Inſtances, which ſhew how much Paſſion and Rage had blinded him.

Laſtly, One may ſee in *Zonaras*'s and *Balſamon*'s Collections ſome Laws and Canonical Letters of this ſame Biſhop.

The Firſt is a Paſtoral Letter; wherein he ſaith, that when *Chriſtmas* Eve happens upon a *Sunday*, ſome light Meat may be eaten, that ſo we may not ſeem to follow the practice of Hereticks, by eating nothing on the *Sunday*, and yet not to break the Law of Faſting altogether.

The Second is a Letter containing ſome Rules for the Province of *Lycopolis*, directed to *Ammon*.

The Firſt concerneth thoſe who had communicated with the *Arian* Biſhops; he ordereth that they ſhould be depoſed, allowing them ſtill leave to dwell in the place, and to be dealt with as was appointed by the Biſhops of *Thebais*.

The Second is upon the occaſion of a Prieſt, who was ordained after he had committed a crime with a Woman that was divorced from her Husband. *Theophilus* determines that he ought to be ſuſpended from his Miniſterial Function.

The Third is concerning a Prieſt who had been excommunicated by his Biſhop. *Theophilus* declares, that the Prieſt that was Excommunicated by his Biſhop, ought to be eſteemed Excommunicate till he had juſtified himſelf by the Law.

The Fourth concerneth a Deacon, who was accuſed to have Married his Brother's Daughter. *Theophilus* ſaith, That if he Married her before Baptiſm, and had not co-habited with her ſince he was Baptized, he might continue in the Clergy; but if he had co-habited with her after Baptiſm, he ought to be degraded from the Clergy.

In the Fifth that relateth to an Accuſation brought againſt a Reader, *Theophilus* gives this Order; That if he be convicted of Fornication, he ought to be degraded; but if this Accuſation is grounded only upon ſuſpicion, no regard is to be had to it.

In the Sixth he ſets down a Rule to be obſerved in Ordinations; he ſaith, That the Biſhop is to Ordain none, who is not choſen by the whole Clergy in the preſence of the People; and that the Biſhop is to give his Approbation before he can be Ordained.

The Seventh appointeth, That whatſoever is left of the Offering after Communion, ought to be diſtributed to the Clerks, and to the Faithfull, and none of it to the Catechumens.

The Eighth is alſo concerning a Clerk that was accuſed of Fornication. *Theophilus* affirms, That if he be convicted of the Crime, he ought to be depoſed; but if he gives a good account of his Behaviour, and it cannot be proved that he committed the Fact, they ought not to give him any trouble.

The Ninth Canon is about chuſing a new Steward in the Church.

The Tenth enjoyns, That the Poor, the Widows and the Pilgrims ſhould not be diſturbed, and that none ſhould uſurp the Church-goods.

The Second Letter contains a Rule, whereby it is ordered conformably to the Canon of the Council of *Nice*, That the *Novatians*, who had a mind to come into the Church, might receive Ordination.

The Third to *Agatho*, was written upon occaſion of a perſon, who knowing not the Laws of the Church, had contracted an unlawfull Marriage; and being cenſured for it, had left his Wife with her conſent. He adviſeth the Biſhop to whom he writeth, to place them among the Catechumens, if he thought fit, and if he judged that they did it ſincerely; otherwiſe he will have him deal more ſeverely with them.

The Laſt Letter is directed to *Menna*; where he forbids him to admit into the Communion of the Church, a Woman that had wrong'd another, before ſhe had made reparation.

Theophilus hath nothing in his Writings that can turn to his Commendation: They are dark, unintelligible, full of falſe Reaſonings and Reflections, that do not concern his Subject. He was a good Politician, but an ill Author. He knew better how to manage a Court-intrigue, than to reſolve a queſtion of Divinity. The only Rule of his Opinions was his Intereſt or his Ambition. He was ready to embrace any Opinion or Party that could ſatisfie his Paſſion, without examining much whether it was juſt or reaſonable.

Theo-

THEODORUS *of* Mopſueſta.

Theodorus of Mopſueſta.

THEODORUS, a Prieſt of *Antioch*, *Diodorus* and *Flavian*'s Diſciple, S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Companion, and, as ſome have affirmed, *Neſtorius*'s Tutor, was choſen Biſhop of *Mopſueſta*, about the beginning of the Fifth Century of the Church. Many were the Works that he writ; but the misfortune which they had to be condemned with his Perſon, in the Fifth Council, by the Intrigues of *Juſtinian* the Emperour, cauſed them to be loſt, except the Titles and Fragments that were collected either by his Accuſers, or by his Defenders.

It is probable that he writ Commentaries upon the whole Bible: *Photius*, Vol. 25th. of his *Bibliotheca*, ſaith, That he had read a Commentary of *Theodorus* upon *Geneſis*, divided into Seven Parts. *Facundus* and the Fifth General Council mention Commentaries of *Theodorus* upon the *Pſalms*, the Book of *Job*, the *Canticles*, the Twelve leſſer Prophets, the Goſpels of S. *Matthew*, S. *John* and S. *Luke*, upon the *Acts*, the Epiſtle to the *Romans*, and upon the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*. In theſe Commentaries he inſiſted moſt upon the Hiſtorical ſence, avoiding all Allegories: He writ a Book likewiſe to juſtifie that way of expounding the Scripture, intituled, *Of Allegory and of Hiſtory againſt Origen*, quoted by *Facundus*. *Photius* obſerveth further, That *Theodorus*'s Commentaries are full of frequent Repetitions; that they are tedious, and unpleaſant to read. The firſt of his Commentaries is that upon the *Pſalms*; he ſaith himſelf, that it was the moſt imperfect and leaſt exact. In his Commentary upon *Job*, he ſays, That though the Hiſtory of *Job* be true at the bottom, yet it is written in a fabulous way: He obſerveth beſides, when he Comments upon the Book of *Canticles*, that it is a difficult thing to write an uſefull Commentary upon that Book; and that it was forbidden both among the *Jews*, and among the *Chriſtians* to read it publickly, ſince in all probability it was a Nuptial Song, though it is to be underſtood of the Love of Wiſdom.

The other Treatiſes of this Author were very long, and very numerous: When he was young he compoſed a large Work of the Incarnation againſt the *Apollinariſts* and *Anomœans*, divided into Fifteen Books, which, according to his own Teſtimony, contain'd above Fifteen Thouſand Verſes; wherein he ſhewed, ſaith *Gennadius*, *by convincing proofs, and by teſtimonies of the Scripture*, (for he ſpeaketh of *Theodorus*, in the 12th. Chapter of his Book, concerning Eccleſiaſtical Writers,) *That in Jeſus Chriſt there is the fullneſs both of the Divinity and of the Humanity; That Man is made of two Subſtances, the Soul and the Body; That Senſe and Underſtanding are not ſeparate Subſtances, but Faculties of the Soul. The Fourteenth Book is concerning the Trinity: But in diſcourſing of uncreated Nature, he treateth alſo of Creatures. The Laſt Book contains many Quotations out of the Fathers, to confirm his Doctrine by the Authority of Tradition.* Some conſiderable Fragments of this Treatiſe *of the Incarnation* are cited by *Facundus*, and in the Fifth Council.

He wrote beſides Five and Twenty Books againſt *Eunomius*, in defence of S. *Baſil*'s Books, mentioned by *Photius* in the 25th. Volume of his *Bibliotheca*; ſome whereof are cited by *Facundus*, and in the Fifth Council: Four Books againſt *Apollinarius*; A Book intituled *The myſtical Book*; A Treatiſe to thoſe that had been Baptized; Two Letters to *Artemius* of *Alexandria*; An Epiſtle to *Cerdo* upon the Interpretation of the *Pſalms*; Five Books *of the Creature*; Five other Books *to ſhow that God permitted Sin, becauſe it is for Men's advantage*; which are all cited by *Facundus*, and in the Fifth Council; And Three Books of the Magick of the *Perſians*, directed to a *Suffragan* Biſhop of *Armenia*, mentioned by *Photius* in the 81ſt. Volume of his *Bibliotheca*; where he ſaith, That *Theodorus* in the Firſt of thoſe Three Books, explains that abominable Axiom of the *Perſians*, introduced by *Zarades*; whereby *Zarovas*, the God of Fortune, for the firſt principle of all things, from whom they ſuppoſe *Oromazus* to be deſcended, by whom they mean *the Evil Genius* or *Satan*; That when he had given an account of that Doctrine, which was as baſe as it is impious; he refuteth it in the ſame Book. In the Two laſt Books he treateth of the True Religion; and having begun with the World's Creation, he falls inſenſibly upon the Law of Grace.

The Fifth Council attributes to *Theodorus* of *Mopſueſta*, *Chariſius*'s Creed that was produced in the Council of *Epheſus*: But *Facundus* ſays, That it was none of his, and that it was an injury to him to aſcribe it to him.

Theodorus of *Mopſueſta* was charged with ſeveral Hereſies after his Death; and particularly, that he was *Neſtorius*'s Tutor; and that he taught in his Writings thoſe Errors, which ſince bear the Name of that *Hereſiarch*. This perſonal Accuſation occaſioned a great Conteſt, that was agitated with much heat in the beginning of the Sixth Century. *Juſtinian* cauſed this Author to be condemned in the Fifth General Council, in deſpite of *Vigilius*, who defended him. He would have obliged all the Biſhops to ſubſcribe that Condemnation; but ſome refuſed to doe it, and undertook to plead for *Theodorus*. *Facundus*, Biſhop of *Hermiana*, a City in *Africa*, proved one of his moſt zealous Defenders, and compoſed Twelve Apologetical Books for him; wherein he endeavoureth to juſtifie him fully of all the Accuſations that were formed againſt him. This is not a fit place to examine that Queſtion, which we ſhall handle at large hereafter, when we come to ſpeak of the Fifth Council, and of *Facundus*'s Books: And ſo inſtead of examining the Doctrine of

Theodorus

Theodorus Mopsuestenus, I shall only give some Remarks upon his Style and way of Writing. His Style, if *Photius* may be credited, is neither lofty nor clear; he is full of tedious Repetitions, but he brings strong Proofs, and hath the Scriptures very ready at command: This judgment of *Photius* is confirmed by the Fragments of his Writings that are extant: His Style is perplexed and diffuse, no clearness in it, but the Notions are solid and exact enough: He thought and spoke with ease: He despised allegorical and mystical Interpretations of Scripture; but insisted much upon Moral Heads, and made it his main business to set forth the History, and expound the Prophecies. *Theodorus of Mopsuestia.*

Here is a Catalogue of the Latin Fragments of this Author, set down in the Fifth General Council; and by *Facundus*, which may be consulted to judge both of his Doctrine and of his Style.

WORKS of THEODORUS *of* Mopsuesta, *cited by* Facundus, *by the Fifth Council,* col. 4. *by* Photius *and* Gennadius.

Commentaries upon the Holy Scripture.

Seven Volumes upon Genesis, 5. Conc. collat. 4. cap. 62. Photius cod. 25.

Upon the Psalms, Facund. l. 9. c. 1. p. 131, 132. l. 6. cap. 3. 5. Conc. c. 19. 23, 24.

Upon Job, 5. Concil. c. 63, 64, 65, 66, 67.

Upon the Canticles, 5. Concil. cap. 68, 69, 70, 71.

Upon the Twelve minor Prophets, Conc. 5. cap. 20, 21, 22.

Upon S. Matthew, Facund. l. 3. c. 4. p. 43. l. 9. c. 2. p. 132. Concil. 5. cap. 26. 40, 51, 52, 55.

Upon S. Luke, Conc. 5. c. 58.

Upon S. John, Facund. l. 9. c. 3. p. 135. Conc. 5. c. 13, 14, 15, 33, 34.

Upon the Acts, Conc. 5. c. 16.

Upon the Epistle to the Romans, l. 6. c. 3. p. 46.

Upon the Epistle to the Hebrews, Conc. 5. c. 32, 46.

Treatises against Hereticks.

Three Books of the Magick of the Persians, Photius, cod. 81.

Fifteen Books of the Incarnation. The 13th. is cited by *Facund.* l. 3. c. 2. p. 38. The 5th. the 6th. the 10th. the 12th. the 15th. l. 9. c. 3. p. 135, 136, 137, 138, 139. They are all cited l. 10. c. 1, *&c.* The 6th. p. 149. and 159. The 14th. is cited Conc. 5. c. 17. 54. The 1st. c. 25. c. 27. The 8th. c. 29. the 7th. c. 30. the 12th. c. 43, 47, 48. The 2d. cap. 49, 50. The 13th. in the 53. *Gennad.* c. 12.

Twenty-five Books against Eunomius. The 10th. is cited by *Facund.* l. 9. c. 3. p. 139. *Photius*, cod. 4.

Four Books against Apollinarius. The 3d. is cited by *Facundus*, l. 3. c. 2. p. 37. Conc. 5. c. 1, 2, 3, 9, 10, 11, 12. The 1st. is cited, l. 10. c. 1. p. 149. The 4th. is cited Conc. 5. c. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8.

Five Books of the Creature, Conc. 5. c. 56. and 61.

Five Books concerning God's permitting Sin, Conc. 5. c. 57, 58, 59, 60.

A Treatise to those who were to be baptized. Facund. l. 9. c. 3. p. 135. Conc. 5. c. 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42.

A Mystical Book, Fac. l. 3. p. 37. citeth the 13th. Book of this Work.

A Treatise of History and Allegory against Origen. Fac. l. 3. c. 5. p. 46.

Two Letters to Artemius, Fac. l. 3. c. 5. p. 45.

A Letter to Cerdon. Fac. l. 1. c. 1. p. 150.

Symbolum Charisii, Act. 6. Synodi Ephes. Fac. l. 3. c. 2. and 5. p. 39, and 44. Conc. 5. Act. 4.

PALLADIUS.

Palladius.

PALLADIUS, Originally of *Galatia*, *Evagrius* his Diſciple, left his Country at Twenty Years of Age, in the Year 388 (*a*), and went into *Egypt*, to learn of the Monks of that place the Exerciſes of the Monaſtick life. Being arrived at *Alexandria*, he addreſſed himſelf to *Iſidore* to be adviſed by him; who committed him to the Conduct of a Monk, who lived in a Cave near *Alexandria*. But *Palladius* not being able to undergo the Auſterities practiſed by that Monk, was forced to leave him; but nevertheleſs he continued three Years in the Monaſteries about *Alexandria*: afterwards he undertook to viſit thoſe of *Nitria* and *Thebais*, and he ſtay'd a great while in thoſe ſolitary places: But falling ſick of a dangerous Diſtemper, he returned to *Alexandria*, and put himſelf into the hands of the Phyſicians there, who adviſed him to go into *Paleſtine*, where the Air might agree with him better. From *Paleſtine* he came to *Bithynia*, where he was ordained Biſhop of *Helenopolis* in 401. Being one of S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Friends, when that Saint was condemned, he was obliged to retire to the *Weſt*, and returning to the *Eaſt* with the Deputies of the *Weſtern* Biſhops, he was put into Priſon, and ſent back with them. From the Biſhoprick of *Helenopolis*, he was tranſlated to that of *Aſpuna* (*b*); a City of *Galatia* under the Metropolitan of *Ancyra*. He was *Ruffinus* his Friend, and defended *Origen*, ſided with *Pelagius*, and oppoſed S. *Jerom*. He writ in the Year 421. an Hiſtory of the Life, Actions, Miracles, and Diſcourſes, of the holieſt Monks that he had ſeen in *Egypt*, *Libya*, *Thebais*, and *Paleſtine*. It is Dedicated to one *Lauſus*, wherefore it has had the Name of *Hiſtoria Lauſiaca*. This Relation, (as moſt other Works of this Nature) contains many extraordinary things. Among ſeveral Examples of ſound Vertue, and uſeful Reflections, one may find childiſh Sentences, Examples dangerous to be followed, enormous Auſterities, unreaſonable Practices, and raſh Undertakings: The Stile of this Hiſtory is flat, a meer Relation without Ornament or Order; it was Printed in Latin, in the *Lives of the Fathers* by *Roſweidus*, and in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*: The Greek was publiſhed by *Meurſius*, and Printed at *Amſterdam* in the Year 1616. It is Printed likewiſe in Greek and Latin, in the Supplement to the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, in 1624. *Cotelerius* added ſome Greek Supplements in the laſt Volume of the Monuments of the Greek Church, *Pag.* 117, 158.

This ſame *Palladius* is thought to be the Author of S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Life, and it is very likely. For, 1. The Stile of that work is like that of the *Hiſtoria Lauſiaca*. 2. *Palladius* Author of the *Hiſtoria Lauſiaca* was S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Friend, and perſecuted upon his Account. 3. It is certain, that the Author of S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Life was called *Palladius*, and that he lived in the beginning of the Fifth Century. But there is no *Palladius* known beſides this. 4. It is manifeſt, that the Writer of S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Life, was of the ſame party, and in the ſame Intereſt and Sentiments with *Palladius* of *Helenopolis*. 5. The Author of S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Life is called Biſhop of *Helenopolis*, in a Greek Catalogue of the Authors, that wrote S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Life mentioned by Sir *Henry Savile*. The Greek Title of that Dialogue in the *Florence* Manuſcript, which is Six hundred years old, beareth the Name of *Palladius* of *Helenopolis*; and it is obſerved in the Margin, that he was Biſhop of *Aſpuna*. Laſtly, *Dicdorus* of *Trimithus* ſaith, That the Author of S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Life was Biſhop in *Bithynia*. Yet ſome Conjectures ſeem to prove, that *Palladius* Author of S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Life, and *Paladius* of *Helenopolis* are two different Perſons: For, 1. The Writer of S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Life ſpeaks of the Voyage of *Palladius* of *Helenopolis* to *Rome*, as preceding his. 2. He ſpeaks as if he writ the Dialogue which relates that Life, whilſt *Palladius* of *Helenopolis* was detained Priſoner in the *Eaſt*: Laſtly, *Palladius* of *Helenopolis* was but Thirty nine years old when S. *Chryſoſtom* died, whereas the Author of the Dialogue makes *Theodorus* ſpeak of him as of an ancient Biſhop. Theſe Reaſons perſwaded *Bigotius*, that *Palladius* Author of that Dialogue, was not *Palladius* Diſciple to *Evagrius*. Yet it is eaſie to Anſwer, That *Palladius* feigned theſe things, after the Cuſtom of *Dialogiſts*, perhaps to hide himſelf the better, being unwilling to be known to be the Author of that Treatiſe. However, this Hiſtory is compoſed in the form of a Dialogue held at *Rome*, betwixt *Theodorus* Deacon of *Rome* and Biſhop *Palladius*. It contains S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Condemnation, the Hiſtory of his Life, and a Juſtification of the Accuſations that were brought againſt him. It is written with great Plainneſs, but with much Exactneſs and Truth. It was formerly tranſlated by *Ambroſius Camaldulenſis*, but his Verſion was not ſincere. *Bigotius* having ſince found a Manuſcript in the Library of *Florence*, which contained the Greek Original of that Dialogue, cauſed it to be Printed, with a new Verſion on the ſide, compoſed with all the Fidelity and Exactneſs that can be expected from ſo able a Man. This Volume is Printed in *Quarto* at *Paris* by *Martin*, *Ann.* 1680.

(*a*) *In the Year* 388.] What he ſaith in his Preface, and at the beginning of the *Hiſtoria Lauſiaca*, determines the Chronology of this Author's Life. He ſays at the beginning of the Hiſtory, that he went into *Egypt* under the Second Conſulſhip of *Theodoſius*, which was in the Year 388. And in the Preface, he ſaith, That he had been a Monk 33 Years, and 20 Years a Biſhop, and that he was 53 Years old. He was therefore 20 Years old when he left his Country to become Monk. He was Ordained Biſhop in 401, and wrote his Hiſtory in 421.

(*b*) *Biſhop of* Aſpuna] Socrates *Hiſt. Eccl. l.* 7. *c.*36. reckons him amongſt the tranſlated Biſhops, and ſaith, that he went from *Helenopolis* to *Aſpuna*.

P. INNO-

P. INNOCENT I.

POpe *Innocent* ſucceeded to Pope *Anaſtaſius* in the Year 402. and governed the Church of *Rome* till 417. This Pope being conſulted from all parts, upon divers Queſtions, both of Doctrine and of Diſcipline, was put upon writing of Letters, which contein very uſeful Rules and moſt judicious Deciſions. *P. Innocent.*

The firſt Letter, which ſhould have been one of the laſt, ſince it was not written before 416. is an Anſwer to *Decentius* Biſhop of *Eugubium* a City of *Umbria* in *Italy*, upon ſeveral Queſtions put to him by that Biſhop.

The Preface of that Epiſtle, ſetteth forth the advantage of the City of *Rome*. He pretends that if all Churches had held the Practices which they received from the Apoſtles, they had all agreed in the ſame Diſcipline, and that all the difference, which ſo much ſcandalizeth the People, is cauſed by the Deviation from the Apoſtles Tradition. Upon this Principle he concludes, That they ought every where to obſerve the Diſcipline which *Rome* received of S. *Peter*, and which it hath always kept. " Eſpecially, *ſaith he*, becauſe it is evident, that the Churches of *Italy*, " *Gaul*, *Spain*, *Africa*, *Sicily*, and other Iſlands that are between *Italy* and *Africa*, have been " ſetled by the Biſhops whom S. *Peter* or his Succeſſors ſent thither.

Tho' this Pope lays down theſe Maxims as indubitable, yet are they not without Difficulty; and it would have been hard for him to have proved them well: for what Evidence is there to juſtifie, that the Apoſtles ſetled all Points of Diſcipline themſelves? and how can we know that they eſtabliſhed them all after the ſame manner? On the contrary is it not certain, that S. *John* celebrated the Feaſt of *Eaſter* in the *Eaſt*, upon other days than *Sundays*, tho probably both S. *Peter* and S. *Paul* did the contrary at *Rome*? And had the Apoſtles ſetled the ſame Uſages, and Ceremonies in all the Churches which they founded, would it therefore follow, that there is a neceſſity of obſerving them? Do not all Men know, that Diſcipline may and is to alter according to the various Circumſtances of time? And what Proof is there, that the Church of *Rome* hath preſerved the Diſcipline ſetled by S. *Peter*, better than other Churches have kept that which was given them by other Apoſtles their Founders. Is there any certainty that the Churches of *France*, *Spain*, and *Africa*, were all founded by thoſe whom S. *Peter*, or his Succeſſors ſent thither? And Laſtly, where is the neceſſity to oblige them all to change their Rites and Cuſtoms, to embrace thoſe of the Church of *Rome*? Many ſuch Queries may be made upon this Principle of Pope *Innocent*, which could not eaſily be reſolved. But an *Italian* Biſhop his Suffragan, could not in reaſon propoſe ſuch Difficulties; he ought to conform to the Diſcipline of his Metropolis. He had often been at *Rome*, and preſent at the publick Service, and ſo might well be acquainted with the Ceremonies practiſed there. That was ſufficient to inſtruct, and oblige him to reform the Abuſes of his own Church: Yet he adviſed with Pope *Innocent*; and the Pope thought fit to make him an Anſwer, not ſo much to inſtruct him, as to teach, adviſe, and reprove with the greater Authority thoſe that receded from the Cuſtoms of the Church of *Rome*, and even to impoſe them if they would not yield to his Admonitions.

In the firſt Canon he declares, That the Bleſſing is not to be given before the Conſecration of the Holy Myſteries; That ſo it may be as a Sign and Token, that the People approve of the Conſecration of the Myſteries.

The Second enjoyns that thoſe who are to be recommended in the Service of the Euchariſt be not named, before Their offering be preſented.

The Third forbids Prieſts to confirm Children, becauſe they have not the Soveraignty of the Prieſthood: That they may Baptize, and Anoint the baptized with the Oyl that is conſecrated by the Biſhop, but not lay it upon their Foreheads, becauſe this is allowed to none but Biſhops, when they conferr the Holy Ghoſt: He declares that he cannot recite the words, for fear of diſcovering the Myſteries, if he would anſwer the advice that was required of him.

In the Fourth Canon he pretends to give an evident Reaſon of the *Saturday*'s Faſt, by ſaying, that as all *Sundays* are kept with joy in remembrance of the Reſurrection, and as they faſt every *Friday*, becauſe of the Paſſion of Jeſus Chriſt. So they ſhould faſt likewiſe upon *Saturday*, as being between the day of ſorrow and that of rejoycing, and the rather becauſe the Apoſtles mourned all that day. In a word, that ſince holy *Saturday* is a Faſting day, all other *Saturdays* ſhould be ſuch in remembrance of that Day. He obſerveth that in his time the Divine Myſteries were not celebrated either upon *Fridays* or *Saturdays*.

The Fifth Canon is obſcure enough. S. *Innocent* ſaith there, that it was to no purpoſe for *Decentius* to conſult him concerning the leavened Bread, which the Biſhop of *Rome* ſent every *Sunday* to the Pariſh-Prieſts in the City of *Rome*, after he had conſecrated it, becauſe his Cuſtom could not concern the Countrey Pariſhes, for as much as the Sacraments ought not to be carried far, *quia non longe portanda ſunt Sacramenta*: Wherefore, addeth he, we do not ſend them to Prieſts in diſtant Pariſhes, becauſe they have Power to conſecrate.

The Sixth declares, that a Prieſt may not lay hands upon an Energumen, without leave from the Biſhop, but that he may if the Biſhop gives him Commiſſion to doe it.

In

P. Innoc. I. In the Seventh it is enjoyned, that thoſe who have done Penance ſhould be reconciled upon Holy *Thurſday*, whether they were Guilty of great Crimes, or of leſſer Offences, except ſome Diſtemper requireth another time: And to judge of Repentance, regard muſt be had to the Pains, mourning and tears of the Penitent, and his Sin muſt be remitted, if it appears that he hath made a proportionable ſatisfaction.

The Eighth is about the Anointing of the Sick, ſpoken of in the Epiſtle of S. *James*. *Innocent* ſaith, that the words of the Apoſtle are without Queſtion to be underſtood of the Sick that are faithful, that theſe may be Anointed with the Oyl that is conſecrated by the Biſhop, and the uſe of this is not peculiar to Prieſts only, but all Chriſtians may anoint themſelves, and thoſe that belong to them in Caſe of neceſſity: that it is not neceſſary that the Biſhop ſhould make this Unction; that it ſhould not be adminiſtred to Penitents, becauſe it is a kind of Sacrament, and ſince other Sacraments are denied, they have no right to this.

He concludeth with an Exhortation to *Decentius*, that he ſhould cauſe the Diſcipline of the Church of *Rome* to be obſerved in his Church, and to inſtruct the Prieſts and Clerks under his Care well, that ſo they might diſcharge their Miniſtry worthily.

The Second Letter was written in 404. to *Victricius* Biſhop of *Rouen*, who likewiſe asked Queſtions about points of Diſcipline. It begins alſo with the Praiſes of the Roman Diſcipline; he exhorts him to ſend this Letter to his Brethren, that they might learn what Rules they were to follow.

This Preface is followed by Thirteen Canons.

The Firſt agreeable to the Deciſion of the Council of *Nice*, forbids a Biſhop to be ordained without the Conſent of the Metropolitan of the Province: declaring farther, that one Biſhop alone cannot Ordain.

The Second prohibits the admitting of thoſe into the Clergy, that have been Soldiers after they were baptized.

The Third allows a Synod of the provincial Biſhops to take Cognizance of all Cauſes relating to the Perſons of Clerks and Biſhops, according to the Decree of the *Nicene* Council; but he addeth, *Yet without prejudice to the Rights of the Roman Church*, to which great regard is to be had in all Cauſes. And if they be *cauſæ Majores*, devolved to the Holy See, they are not to be brought hither nor judged; before Judgment is given by the Biſhops of the Province.

The Fourth forbids to admit into Orders, a Perſon that has married a Widow, or a Woman that is divorced from her Husband.

The Fifth extends this Prohibition, even to thoſe that have married ſuch a Woman before Baptiſm.

He confirmeth the ſame Law in the Sixth, with reſpect to thoſe that have been twice married.

The Seventh forbids Biſhops to ordain Clerks of the faithful of another Church, except the Biſhop of that Church permits it.

The Eighth ordaineth, that the *Novatians* and *Donatiſts* be received by the ſole Impoſition of hands; becauſe that tho' they were baptized by Hereticks, yet were they baptized in the Name of Jeſus Chriſt. He addeth, That if any Catholicks being entred into their Sect, were baptized, and are willing to return to the Boſom of the Chuch, they muſt be put to a long Penance, before they be admitted.

The Ninth is concerning the Celibacy of Prieſts and Deacons.

The Tenth forbids the Monks that were ordained Clerks, to leave their way of living.

In the Eleventh, the Officers of the Emperor, and ſuch as are in publick Employments, are not to be admitted into Orders.

The Twelfth prohibits the admitting of thoſe Virgins that being ſolemnly conſecrated to God, Married, or were corrupted, to Penance, before the Death of the perſon with whom they have committed the Crime, *For*, ſaith he, *if a Woman, who during the Life of her Husband marrieth another is an Adultereſs, and is not admitted to do Penance before the Death of one of them, with how much more reaſon ſhould the ſame rigour be obſerved towards her, who being united to an immortal Husband, went over to an humane Marriage?*

The Thirteenth enjoyns a Penance of ſome time to the Virgins that Marry, after promiſing Virginity, tho' they had not ſolemnly been veiled by the Biſhop.

Pope *Innocent* finiſhes his Letter, ſaying, that if theſe Canons were obſerved by the Biſhops, there would be no more Ambition among them, Diviſions would ceaſe, Schiſms, and Hereſies would be ſtifled, and the Devil would have no occaſion to aſſault the Flock of Jeſus Chriſt, *&c.*

The Third Epiſtle of the ſame Nature with the two former, is written in 405. to *Exuperius* Biſhop of *Tholouſe*.

In the Firſt Canon of this Letter, he confirms *Siricius* his Law concerning the Celibacy Prieſts and Deacons; yet he forgiveth thoſe who thro' Ignorance obſerved it not, upon condition that they ſhall continue in that Order, and not be admitted to an higher. But he ordains that thoſe ſhould be degraded who violated it knowingly.

The Second Canon relates to Sinners, who ſtay till the hour of Death to deſire Penance: Pope *Innocent* ſaith, that they were dealt withal after two different manners. That the ancient Diſcipline was more ſevere, becauſe Penance was granted them without allowing them the Communion: but in his time, it was adminiſtred to dying Men, that they might not imitate the hard-

neſs

neſs of *Novatian.* Theſe laſt words with ſeveral others that are in the Text of that Canon, manifeſt that by the word *Communion*, is not to be underſtood *the Adminiſtration of the Euchariſt* : but *Abſolution.* P. *Innoc.* I.

The Third Canon exempts thoſe from Penance, that condemned any Perſons to Death, who put any to the Rack, or were obliged by their Office to condemn the guilty to any Puniſhment, becauſe the civil Powers, ſaith this Pope, are eſtabliſhed by God for the Puniſhment of Criminals.

The Fourth Canon gives a Reaſon why more Women do Penance for Adultery than Men. Pope *Innocent* ſaith, That the Chriſtian Religion puniſheth this Sin equally both in Men and Women, but Wives not being able to accuſe their Husbands of this Crime, the Biſhop cannot paſs Judgment upon ſecret Sins, whereas Husbands do more freely accuſe their Wives, and diſcover them to the Prieſts.

The Fifth excuſes thoſe who by their Office are obliged to demand the Death of a Criminal, or to condemn him.

The Sixth ordaineth, that thoſe ſhould be put out of the Church, both Men and Women, that Marry again after a Divorce; but this penalty is not to extend to their Kindred and Allies, except they contributed to that forbidden Marriage.

The laſt Canon contains a Catalogue of the Sacred Books, comprehending all the Books both of the Old and of the New Teſtament, which we now own for Canonical: He rejects the Acts publiſhed under the Names of S. *Matthias*, S. *James* the Leſs, S. *Peter* and S. *John*, S. *Andrew*, S. *Thomas*, and ſuch-like.

The Fourth Letter, without Date, is directed to *Felix*, Biſhop of *Nuceria.* Having commended that Biſhop for asking his advice about ſome Doubts; he tells him in the Firſt Canon, That thoſe are not to be admitted into Orders, who voluntarily have diſmembred themſelves. In the Second, That it is forbidden to Ordain ſuch as have been married twice, or have married Widows. In the Third, That thoſe muſt not be Ordained that have been Soldiers; that have pleaded at the Bar, or have born Offices at Court. In the Fourth, That thoſe of the Laity are to be choſen, who are Baptized, of approved Morals, who have ſpent their Time with Clerks, or in Monaſteries, and who have kept no Concubines. Laſtly, in the Sixth, he commands the Obſervation of the *Interſtitia*; [*i. e.* the Times between every Ordination, upon any promotion from leſſer to higher Orders,] that they Ordain no Man a Reader, an Acolyth, a Deacon or a Prieſt of a ſudden; that ſo having been long in the inferiour Degrees, his Behaviour and Conduct may be tried.

In the Fifth Letter, directed to Two Biſhops of *Abruzzo*, he bids them depoſe the Prieſts that were accuſed of having had Children ſince their Ordination, if they be convicted of *that crime:* He obſerves in the beginning, that a Biſhop ought not to be ignorant of the Canons.

The Sixth is to ſome Biſhops of *Apulia:* He enjoyns One Biſhop to be depoſed, though he had done publick Penance: He reproacheth them with allowing many things to be done in their Province contrary to the Canons, which might eaſily have been corrected, if Biſhops themſelves were not Authors of ſuch Diſorders.

The Seventh is directed to the Biſhops of *Macedonia* about Two Biſhops, *Bubalius* and *Taurianus*, who had cauſed the Judgment that was given againſt them to be re-viewed again, and falſely boaſted of having a Letter from P. *Innocent*, written in their behalf.

In the Eighth he exhorteth *Florentius*, Biſhop of *Tivoli*, to reſtore to his Brother Biſhop a Pariſh which he had taken from him.

The Ninth declareth, That a Man who married another Woman, while his Wife was in captivity, ought to return to the former; becauſe a Second Marriage cannot be lawfull, except the former Wife be dead, or ſeparated by Divorce.

The Tenth is a Letter of Complement to *Aurelius* and S. *Auguſtin.*

The Eleventh to *Aurelius* is touching the determining of *Eaſter*-Day the following Year.

The Twelfth directed to the ſame, is upon the choice which they ſhould make of Biſhops; he will have them to be choſen from the Clergy, and not from the Laity.

The Thirteenth is to *Juliana*, a Lady, whoſe Devotion he commendeth.

The Fourteenth to *Bonifacius*, and thoſe that follow, were written *Anno* 413, after *Alexander*, Biſhop of *Antioch*, had inſerted again the Name of S. *Chryſoſtom* into the Diptychs. *Innocent* writeth to *Bonifacius*, that he had admitted that Biſhop to his Communion, upon condition that he ſhould not diſturb thoſe that were Ordained by *Evagrius*, and that he ſhould put S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Name among thoſe Biſhops whoſe Memory was celebrated.

The Fifteenth is directed to *Alexander*, Biſhop of *Antioch*; wherein he congratulates their Reconciliation.

In the Sixteenth to *Maximianus*, he ſaith, that he had not yet communicated with *Atticus* of *Conſtantinople*, becauſe he had not performed the Conditions, without which there could be no peace.

The Seventeenth ſubſcribed by Twenty *Italian* Biſhops, is directed to the ſame *Evagrius*, whom he commendeth for re-uniting the remainders of *Paulinus* and *Evagrius*'s Party.

The Eighteenth to the ſame, conſiſts of Three Canons; in the firſt, he extolleth the Dignity of the Church of *Antioch*, that he may magnifie that of *Rome* the more; ſaying, That according to the Authority of the Council of *Nice*, which gives the Senſe of all the Biſhops in the World,

P. *Innoc.* I. the Church of *Antioch* had Juriſdiction over a whole Dioceſs; That this Authority was not granted to it, becauſe of the greatneſs of the City of *Antioch*, but becauſe it had been the firſt Seat of S. *Peter*; And that it deſerved that the moſt ſolemn Aſſembly of the Apoſtles ſhould be made there: So that it had not given place to the Church of *Rome*; but only for this reaſon, That the latter had the End and Conſummation of that which the former had but an occaſional enjoyment of: And by reaſon of this Dignity, he tells the Biſhop of *Antioch*, That as he Ordaineth the *Metropolitans* by an Authority peculiar to him, he ought not to ſuffer that other Biſhops ſhould be Ordained without his leave and conſent, by writing to the Biſhops that are afar off, and cauſing them that are near to come to him for Ordination.

In the ſecond Canon he ſaith, That two Biſhops are not to be made *Metropolitans*, when Towns are newly erected into *Metropoles* at the ſame time, upon the dividing of a Province into Two by the Emperour. He ſpeaketh afterwards againſt the Cuſtom of the Biſhops of the Iſle of *Cyprus*, who ordained Biſhops without conſulting with the Biſhop of *Antioch*.

In the Laſt he affirms, That the *Arians* returning to the Church, are to be admitted with impoſition of hands; but their Clergy are not permitted to continue in the Miniſtry of the Church.

The Nineteenth, directed to *Acacius* of *Berœa*, is upon the Reconciliation with *Alexander* of *Antioch*.

In the Twentieth, he writes to *Lucianus*, Biſhop of *Signi*, to ſtop ſome Meetings of the *Photinians* in his Dioceſs.

The Twenty-firſt, directed to *Martinianus*, a Biſhop in *Macedonia*, is written from *Ravenna*. He writeth to that Biſhop, that he ſhould not refuſe his Communion to ſome Clerks, who were Ordained by *Bonoſus*, but had abjured his Error. He ſaith, that he had already written a Letter to *Rufus*, and other Biſhops of *Macedonia*; wherein he gave his judgment, That they were to be received to the Communion, and left in poſſeſſion of their Churches.

This Letter is probably the Two and Twentieth, which conſequently ought to be ſet before the foregoing; it beareth date from the Year 414, and is directed to *Rufus* and other Biſhops of *Macedonia*. He tells them in the beginning, that he was much ſurprized by a Letter directed to the See of *Rome*, as the chiefeſt of all Churches, becauſe they conſulted him about things that had no difficulty; and concerning which, he had plainly declared his Opinion. One of thoſe things is the Ordination of ſuch as had married Widows. P. *Innocent* ſaith, That there is no diſpute that they ſhould not be Ordained; and affirms, that it was the practice of all, both *Eaſtern* and *Weſtern* Churches; Nay, he would have thoſe to be degraded, who are found to be in Orders. The Second is concerning thoſe, who having loſt a former Wife, being yet unbaptized, had married a Second after Baptiſm. Some were of opinion, that this kind of Bigamy did not hinder them from being admitted into Sacred Orders. P. *Innocent* alledgeth ſeveral Reaſons to prove that ſuch a practice is not to be followed.

The Third Rule is touching the Ordinations by Hereticks. P. *Innocent* ſcruples not to alledge the ſame paſſages, and the ſame expreſſions, uſed by S. *Cyprian*, to prove the invalidity of their Baptiſm, to ſhow the nullity of their Ordination: For he ſaith, That as many as are thus Ordained, having their Heads wounded with the Impoſition of Heretical Hands, had need of Penance for their remedy; and that ſuch as need Penance, ought not to be Ordained: That Hereticks having not true Orders, cannot conferr Orders: That they cannot make thoſe on whom they lay their Hands, partakers of any thing but of the Condemnation that themſelves are ſubject to. After this Obſervation, he refutes the falſe Principle of ſuch as believed, that a lawfull Biſhop's Ordination remitted all Sins. He ſaith, that the cuſtom of his Church was, to grant Lay-communion, after a ſingle Impoſition of Hands, to thoſe who, having been baptized by Hereticks, deſired to enter into the Church; but that thoſe were obliged to doe Penance, who returned to the boſom of the Church, after they had quitted it, to enter into a Sect of Hereticks. He blameth thoſe who not only doe not put them under Penance, but alſo ſuffer them to continue in their Miniſtery.

Afterwards he frames ſome Objections againſt this Rule. The Firſt is the Law made by *Anyſius*, concerning thoſe whom *Bonoſus* Ordained; whereby he permitted, that they ſhould be received into the Church with their Orders. P. *Innocent* anſwers, That this example is of no conſequence, becauſe they made uſe of this Condeſcenſion in favour of thoſe that were Ordained by *Bonoſus*, to prevent ſeveral Biſhops from perſiſting to follow his Party. That this particular Exigency of the Church obliged them to tranſgreſs the Rules; but when the Neceſſity ceaſeth, they ought to return to the Law.

The Second Objection is grounded upon the Canon of the Council of *Nice*, which permits the receiving of the *Novatians*. P. *Innocent* ſaith, That this Canon relates to *Novatians* only, and is not to be extended to other Hereticks. He adds, That in this Canon the buſineſs is about Baptiſm; and that the Council ordains that the *Paulianiſts* ſhould be re-baptized, becauſe they baptized not in the Name of the Holy Trinity; whereas the *Novatians* baptized as the *Catholicks* did, in the Name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt. And Laſtly, He declareth that this Rule concerneth thoſe that were baptized by Hereticks; but as to thoſe who were baptized in the Church, and embraced an Heretical Sect, if they recover from their Apoſtaſie, they ought undoubtedly to be put to publick Penance; and having done Penance, they can never

come

come into the Clergy. Whence he concludes, That thoſe who left the Church after *Bonoſus* was condemned, to joyn with him, and received Orders from Hereticks, are not to keep their Dignity, nor to be Ordained, when they return again to the Church. Wherefore he exhorteth the *Macedonian* Biſhops to reform that abuſe; telling them, That they ought not to allow that in time of Peace, which Neceſſity commanded to be done in time of Trouble; That it often happens that a fault remains unpuniſhed, becauſe a whole People is guilty of it. Upon ſuch occaſions, what is paſt muſt be left to God's Judgment, and care muſt be taken to prevent the like diſorders for the time to come. All this is the conſequence of the ſame Third Canon, though it be divided into Four. P. *Innoc.* I.

The Laſt Canon is concerning a Biſhop, one *Photinus*, who had been condemned by the See of *Rome* with too much rigour. P. *Innocent* approves of the Admonition of the *Macedonian* Biſhops; but ſaith, That the See of *Rome* was miſ-informed and deceived by the Calumnies of his Enemies. He owns him for a Biſhop, and commends the others for informing him better, and deſireth them to ſhew kindneſs to a Deacon called *Euſtathius*.

The Twenty-third Letter is directed to the *Spaniſh* Biſhops that were aſſembled in Council at *Toledo*. It is about particular affairs of the Churches in that Kingdom. The Firſt Canon takes notice of a kind of Schiſm among the Biſhops of *Bætica*, and of other *Spaniſh* Provinces, who had given the Communion to thoſe of *Gallicia*. P. *Innocent* proves that *Lucifer*'s Severity was not to be imitated, in refuſing to admit converted Hereticks; but, on the contrary, that all poſſible means ſhould be uſed to cauſe them to return into the boſom of the Church.

The Second Canon is againſt two Biſhops who ventur'd to Ordain out of their Dioceſſes.

The Third Canon is concerning one Biſhop *John*, who by his Deputies had approved the Condemnation of *Symphoſius* and *Dictinius*. P. *Innocent*'s Opinion is, That his Caſe ought to be examined, as well as that of the others, to know whether he had acted with Sincerity.

In the Fourth he ſpeaks of irregular Ordinations practiſed in *Spain*, contrary to the Canons: He ſays, That they are ſo many, that it were impoſſible to apply a Remedy; and ſo he thinks it convenient to leave what is paſt to God's Judgment: But for the future to eſtabliſh a Rule, That whoſoever ſhall Ordain contrary to the Canons, ſhall be deprived of the Sacerdotal Dignity, together with thoſe that received Orders.

The Fifth is concerning a buſineſs of *Patruinus*, Biſhop of *Merida*, which, he ſaith, ought to be examined, and thoſe puniſhed that complain of his Ordination, if they had unjuſtly accuſed him.

The Sixth containeth Rules to be obſerved in the choice of fit perſons to be Ordained.

To underſtand well the Three following Letters of Pope *Innocent*; it is to be noted, That the Biſhops of *Africa* and *Numidia* having condemned both *Pelagius* and *Cœleſtius* in the Councils of *Carthage* and *Numidia*, aſſembled in the Year 416, wrote to Pope *Innocent*, to give him an Account of the Sentence which they pronounced againſt both thoſe Hereticks, and their Doctrine, that ſo they might add to their judgment the Authority of the See of *Rome*; and ſo much the rather, becauſe *Cœleſtius* had thought fit to appeal, and it was reported that P. *Innocent* countenanced them. And for this reaſon *Aurelius* and Four more of the principal Biſhops wrote another familiar Letter to him concerning ſome diſadvantageous Reports that had been raiſed againſt him about that buſineſs.

In the Three following Letters, P. *Innocent* anſwereth the other Three that were brought to *Rome* by Biſhop *Julian*; theſe are dated the 27th. of *January*, 417.

The Firſt is directed to *Aurelius* and the Biſhops in the Council of *Carthage*. He commends them at firſt for their Courage in condemning Error, and for their reſpect to the See of *Rome*, in conſulting with it about what they had decided. From which he takes occaſion to exalt the Authority of the See of *Rome*; affirming, That it is of Divine Right to have its Opinion in Eccleſiaſtical Matters, before any thing be determined in the Provinces concerning them. It is probable that the *African* Biſhops did not own that Right, ſince they had definitively judged the Caſe of *Pelagius* and *Cœleſtius*, before they acquainted him with it; and they did not write to him as to a Judge, that might diſanull what they had done, but only to get his Approbation of their Deciſions, as a thing which he could not refuſe to doe without being ſuſpected of Hereſie. And indeed this Pope who was ſuppoſed to favour *Cœleſtius*, having known his Errors could not forbear declaring againſt them; and commending the *African* Biſhops, who had condemned their Authors. He ſubſcribes to their Judgment, and proves by ſeveral Reaſons the Neceſſity of the Grace of Jeſus Chriſt. The Firſt is taken from Prayer, which ſuppoſeth that we owe to God's Help, and not to our Free-will, the good that we doe. He ſays, That Man being fallen by the Abuſe of his Free-will, muſt be raiſed again by the Grace of Jeſus Chriſt. That our Saviour not only delivered him from Sins paſt, but that knowing his weakneſs, he alſo prepared him Helps and Remedies to preſerve him for the future; and that we muſt of neceſſity be overcome, if we be not ſuccoured by him, who alone can make us Conquerors. *Neceſſe eſt, ut quo auxiliante vincimus, eo iterum non adjuvante, vincamur.* By which Principles he condemneth all thoſe who affirm that there is no need of God's Grace to doe good, and judgeth them unworthy of the Church's Communion: He ſaith, that refuſing to others God's Succour, they are bereaved of it themſelves, and ought to be cut off from the Church as rotten Members. He ſaith further, That if they acknowledge their Error, and admit of God's Grace, being ſincerely converted, it

is

P. *Innoc.* I. is the Biſhop's Duty to help them, and not to deny them the Grace which the Church grants to thoſe that are fallen, by admitting them to the Communion of the Church.

He ſpeaks much to the ſame purpoſe in that Letter which follows, directed to *Silvanus Valentinus*, and other Biſhops, who had been preſent at the Council of *Milevis*. He ſeems to reſtrain that Maxim which he eſtabliſhed, of referring all Church-affairs to the See of *Rome* only to Matters of Faith: *Præſertim quoties fidei ratio ventilatur.* He refutes particularly the *Pelagian* Error concerning Children dying before Baptiſm, whom they pretended to have a ſhare of Eternal life.

The Third Letter of *Innocent* upon that Subject is his Anſwer to the Five Biſhops, who writ to him, upon the ſuſpicion of his Siding with *Pelagius*. He tells them, that by his Two former Letters he ſufficiently diſcovered his Opinion concerning the Doctrine of that Heretick; That as to his Perſon, he had received certain Acts, by which it appeared, that he had been heard and abſolved ſince the Council; but that he did not believe them, becauſe it was plain from the Acts themſelves, that he had not clearly abjured his Errors: He concludes with aſſuring them, That he had read *Pelagius* his Book which they ſent him, and that he had found it to be full of Blaſphemies; that he met with nothing in it that pleaſed him, or rather that he met with nothing there that did not diſpleaſe him.

With this Letter there was a ſhort Letter directed to *Aurelius*, but there is nothing remarkable in it.

Theſe Letters ſhould be put laſt, being written but a little before the Death of P. *Innocent*, which was upon the 12th. of *March* of the ſame Year, and long after thoſe that follow about the buſineſs of S. *Chryſoſtom*, written in 404.

The Twenty-eighth is a Letter of Conſolation to S. *Chryſoſtom*, ſoon after his Baniſhment.

The Twenty-ninth is directed both to his Clergy and People upon the ſame Subject. The Thirty-firſt to *Theophilus*, which is in Greek in *Palladius*, is the firſt of the Three. In the ſame Author there is another directed likewiſe to *Theophilus*.

The Thirtieth Letter to the Emperor *Arcadius*, as well as the pretended Anſwers of that Emperor to *Innocent*, and to his Brother *Honorius*, are ſpurious, grounded upon the Fable of *Arcadius* and *Eudoxia*'s Excommunication. He that forged them, ſuppoſeth, That this Empreſs outlived S. *Chryſoſtom*; but it is certain from *Eunapius*, who is quoted by *Photius*, Vol. 77. of his *Bibliotheca*, that ſhe died ſoon after S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Baniſhment, and three Years before his Death.

The 32d. 33d. and 34th. Letters of P. *Innocent*, are written about the Perſecutions exerciſed by *John* of *Jeruſalem* againſt S. *Jerom*.

This Pope was skilfull in the Eccleſiaſtical Laws: He often ſpeaketh in commendation of the *Nicene* Canons: He was very zealous for the Grandeur of the *Roman* Church, and inſiſted much upon her Rights and Privileges. He writes indifferently well, and he giveth ſuch an Air to his Notions and Reaſonings as recommends them, though they have not always that ſolidity and exactneſs that might be expected. The Chronological Order of his Letters, which ought to have been obſerved in the Printing of them, is as follows:

In the Year 404.

A Letter to Victricius, *Biſhop of* Rouën, February 15. *which is the*	II.
A Letter to Theophilus	XXXI.
A Letter to S. John Chryſoſtom	XXVIII.
A Letter to the People of Conſtantinople	XXIX.

In the Year 405.

A Letter to Exuperius, *Biſhop of* Tholouſe, February 20.	III.

In the Year 413.

A Letter to Boniface	XIV.
A Letter to Alexander	XV.
A Letter to Maximian	XVI.
A Letter to Alexander	XVII.
A Letter to Acacius *of* Beræa	XIX.
A Letter to Alexander	XVIII.

In the Year 414.

A Letter to the Biſhops of Macedonia, December 13.	XXII.
A Letter to Marcian	XXI.

In the Year 416.

A Letter to Decentius, *Biſhop of* Eugubium, March 17.	I.
A Letter to Aurelius, June 1.	XII.
A Letter to John *of* Jeruſalem	XXXII.
A Letter to S. Jerom	XXXIII.
A Letter to Aurelius	XXXIV.
A Letter to a Council at Toledo	XXIII.

In the Year 417. *Jan.* 27.

A Letter to the Council of Carthage	XXIV.
A Letter to the Council of Milevis	XXV.
A Letter to Five Biſhops	XXVI.
A Letter to Aurelius	XXVII.

LETTERS without Date, the Time whereof is not known.

A Letter to the Biſhop of Nuceria	IV.
A Letter to Maximus *and* Severus, *Biſhops of* Abruzzo	V.
A Letter to Innocent, Agapetus, Macedonius *and* Marianus, *Biſhops of* Apuleia	VI.

A Let-

A Letter to Rufus, Gerontius, *&c. Bishops of* Macedonia VII.
A Letter to Florentius, *Bishop of* Tivoli VIII.
A Letter to Probus IX.
A Letter to Aurelius *and to S.* Austin X.
A Letter to Juliana XIII.
A Letter to Laurentius XX.
A Supposititious Letter to Arcadius XXX.

P. Innoc. I.

Saint JEROM.

S. Jerom.

SAint *JEROM* was Born in the Town of *Strigonium* (*a*), Situated upon the Borders of *Pannonia* and *Dalmatia*. He came into the World about the 345 Year of Jesus Christ (*b*). His Father *Eusebius* (*c*) took very great Care of his Education: And having made him learn the first Principles of Languages in his own Countrey (*d*), he sent him to *Rome*, where he had for his Tutor the famous *Donatus* (*e*), under whom he made a wonderfull Progress in Philological

(*a*) *The Town of* Strigonium.] This Town is called *Strigonium* by Pto'omy; some confound it with *Strigonium* in *Istria*, others will have it to be different.

(*b*) *About the* 345 *of Jesus Christ*.] The Chronology of S. *Jerom*'s Life is much disputed; Some say, that he was born under the Empire of *Constantine*; according to some, in the 25th. Year of that Emperor's Reign; and according to others in the 31st. that is, in the 331, or in 337. *Prosper* observes in his *Chronicon*, that he died when *Theodosius* was the Ninth time Consul, and *Constantius* the Third, which is in the Year 420; and that he lived 91 Years. If this be so, the Year of his Nativity should be 329 *Paulus Diaconus, Sigebert, Bede*, and the Writers of the Martyrologies, give him 98 Years; which would set the time of his Birth yet seven Years higher, if we depend upon *Prosper*'s Epocha for the time of his Death. *Baronius*, on the contrary, computes that he lived but 78 Years; so that if S. *Jerom* dy'd in 420, he was born, according to that Author, in 342. Lastly, Others affirm, That he was born in 348, or 350; and that he dy'd in 427. All that can be done in this diversity of Opinions, is to find out those which agree best with what S. *Jerom* hath written of himself, and with the Circumstances of his Life. He saith in his Commentary upon the Prophet *Habakkuk*, Chap. 3. That he was a Child, a Student in Grammar, when *Julian* the Emperor was killed. *Being*, saith he, *yet a Boy*, PUER, *and in Grammatical Exercises, at the time that all the Cities of the World were polluted with the Blood of Victims; in the greatest heat of Persecution, on a sudden came the news of* Julian's *Death*. This expression, *Dum adhuc essem puer*, might intimate that S. *Jerom* was then but 10 or 12 Years old, if S. *Jerom* did not often use the same word to signifie an older Age; for in the Apology to *Pammachius*, he hath the same word when he speaks of his Age when he was at *Rome*. *Dum essem puer Romæ, & liberalibus studiis erudirer, &c.* Now it is certain that he was then above 12 Years of Age. In a Letter to *Nepotian*, speaking of the Time of his retiring, he saith that he was then *adolescens, imo penè puer*. And yet he was then 30 Years old at the least. In the 15th. Chapter of his Commentary upon *Isaiah*, making mention of the Earthquake that happened under the Consulship of *Valens* and *Valentinian. anno* 365, he saith that *he was a Boy*, and yet he must be then above 24 Years old. Lastly, In his Preface to the Commentary upon *Obadiah*, he saith, That he had formerly made a Commentary upon that Prophet, being yet a Child: *Quid igitur condemnamus, in quibus pueri lusimus?* *Baronius* affirms, that S. *Jerom* saith in the same place, that he was 30 Years old when he writ his first Commentary upon *Obadiah*, and that 30 other Years were gone since: If it is certainly so, there could be no difficulty to fix the Epocha of S. *Jerom*'s Nativity; but he doth not say positively that he was 30 Years old, when he made that first Commentary. It is certain that S. *Jerom* was ordained Priest by *Paulinus*, before the Peace was concluded with *Meletius*, and consequently before the Year 378; but he could not be then less than 30 Years of Age. When he came to *Rome*, three Years before the Death of Pope *Damasus*, in 382, he must have been 40 Years old at least. In 392 he composed his Treatise of Ecclesiastical Writers, and he must needs have been then above 50. He began to grow in Years, when he had some differences with S. *Augustin*; and he treateth that Saint, who was born in 355, as a person much younger than himself. All these things give us Reason to believe, that S. *Jerom* was born in the Year 340, or 342; That he compleated his Studies at *Rome* in the 25th. Year of his Age, or thereabouts, towards the Year 365; That he went into the Solitudes of *Syria* at 30, in 370, or 371; That he was ordained Priest at 35, in 375; That he came to *Rome* in 382, and went from thence in 385; That he retired to *Bethlehem* in 386, or 387; That he composed his Treatise of Ecclesiastical Writers in 392, where he mentioneth the Books that he had wrote before; That he writ Letters and Treatises after the Taking of *Rome*, in the Year 412; That he died about 420, Aged 78, or 80 Years.

(*c*) *His Father* Eusebius.] He was of a good Family, and sufficiently rich. S. *Jerom* says, that he had a great Family. The Name of his Mother is not known. His Aunt by the Mother's side was called *Castorina*. S. *Jerom* wrote to her the 36 Letter. He had a Sister that vowed Virginity, and a Brother much younger than himself, called *Paulinianus*.

(*d*) *The first Principles of Languages*, &c.] He gives this Account of his first Studies, in his Apology against *Rufinus*. *Memini me puerum curritasse per cellulas Servulorum, dum feriatum duxisse lusibus, & ad Orbilium sævientem de aviæ sinu tractum esse captivum.*

(*e*) *The famous* Donatus.] He that writ Commentaries upon *Virgil* and *Terence*, as S. *Jerom* assures us, in the first Book against *Rufinus*, where he calleth *Donatus* his Tutor, as well as in his *Chronicon*.

S. *Jerom.* Learning (*f*). But that he might make himſelf yet more perfect, having been baptized at *Rome* (*g*), he reſolved to go into *Gaul*, where were at that time many able Men, who made Learning flouriſh. Having performed that Journey with *Bonoſus* his ancient Companion (*h*), and collected all the curious things he could meet with in *Gaul*, he returned to *Rome*, where he raiſed a very fine Library, deſigning to ſpend the reſt of his Life in Studies and Retirement: But finding that neither *Rome*, nor his Native Countrey were fit Habitations for ſuch as intended to lead that ſort of Life, he reſolved to withdraw into a far Countrey, and ſo leaving his Countrey, his Kindred and Eſtate, carrying only his Library, with a Summ of Money to bear the Charges of his Journey, he departed from *Italy* with *Heliodorus* (*i*), *Evagrius*, *Innocent*, and *Hylas*, to go to the *Eaſt*. *Evagrius* left him at *Antioch*, but *Heliodorus*, *Innocent*, and *Hylas* accompanied him to the place of his Retirement. He went firſt to *Jeruſalem*, and there ſtaid ſome time, afterwards he went thro' the Provinces of the leſſer *Aſia*; and, Laſtly, having tarried ſome time at *Antioch*, he went into the diſmal Solitudes of *Syria*, that were uninhabited, unleſs it were with a few Monks. He ſpent there Four years in Study, and Exerciſes of Piety: He learned the Rudiments of the Hebrew Tongue, and began to write Commentaries upon the Scripture. *Heliodorus* ſoon left him, *Innocent* and *Hylas* died in that Deſart, and himſelf was taken very Sick, and being forced at laſt to quit it, he returned to *Antioch*. That Church was then divided by the Factions of *Meletius*, *Paulinus* and *Vitalis*, who all aſſumed the Title of Biſhop of that City. S. *Jerom* made no difficulty what ſide to take. His Baptiſm made him a Son of the Church of *Rome*, and ſo he was obliged to own him, whom that Church acknowledged for lawful Biſhop of *Antioch*. Having therefore written upon that Subject to *Damaſus*, who was then Biſhop of *Rome*, and having received an Anſwer in favour of *Paulinus*, he embraced his party, and was ordained Prieſt by him, but upon condition that he ſhould not quit that kind of Life which he had embraced, nor be obliged to perform any of the Functions of his Miniſtery (*k*): This Ordination was about the Year 375. before the Peace was concluded betwixt *Meletius* and *Paulinus* in 378. S. *Jerom* might be about 35 Years old at that time. As he would not enter into Orders, but upon condition not to be compelled to Exerciſe the Functions of his Miniſtery, ſo he did not think himſelf obliged to have his Name regiſtred, nor to reſide in the Church of *Antioch*; he left it therefore to go to *Bethlehem*, which he choſe for his conſtant Habitation. Yet he did not ſtay there long, but went to *Conſtantinople*, where he converſed with S. *Gregory Nazianzen*, whom he calls his Maſter, and of whom he profeſſes to have learned to expound the Holy Scripture. Having tarried ſome time with this Saint, he had a Call to *Rome* about the Affairs of the Church, with *Paulinus* and S. *Epiphanius* (*l*), whoſe intereſt he had Eſpouſed againſt thoſe of the *Eaſt*; this Journey was in all probability undertaken after the Death of *Meletius* in the Year 382. *Damaſus* taking notice of S. *Jerom*'s merit, kept him with him, that he might have a Man that was able to anſwer all Queſtions propoſed from all parts. S. *Jerom* did not only diſcharge the parts of that difficult Employment moſt worthily, but compoſed ſeveral Books beſides. He was likewiſe charged with the conduct of the moſt conſiderable Ladies of the Town (*m*), by which means he got many Friends

(*f*) *A wonderful Progreſs in Philological Learning.*] He learned the Latin and the Greek Tongues perfectly, and got an exact knowledge of profane Authors: He exerciſed himſelf in publick pleadings and frequented the Bar, as he confeſſeth in the Second Chapter of his Commentary upon the Epiſtle to the *Galatians*.

(*g*) *Having been baptized at* Rome.] He ſays ſo poſitively in two Letters to *Damaſus*, which are the 57th, and 58th, where he obſerves, That he took the Robe of Chriſtianity in the City of *Rome*.

(*h*) *With* Bonoſus *his ancient Companion.*] S. *Jerom* ſaith in his Letter to *Ruſinus*, that they had been bred together, had ſtudied together, and that they went together to *Rome*, and travelled together into *Gaul*; but he followed not S. *Jerom* in his Journey into *Syria*, but retired into a Deſart Iſland of *Dalmatia*.

(*i*) *He departed from* Italy *with* Heliodorus.] He would not continue in his Native Countrey for ſeveral Reaſons, but particularly, becauſe of the diſorderly Behaviour of *Lupicinus* the Biſhop; nor at *Rome*, by reaſon of the tumult of that great City, that diſturbed his reſt.

(*k*) *He was ordained Prieſt by* Paulinus, *but upon condition that he ſhould not quit that kind of Life, which he had embraced, nor be obliged to perform any of the Functions*, &c.] He ſays in his Apology to *Pammachius*, that he told *Paulinus*, *Si ſic Preſbyterum tribuis, ut Monachum nobis non auferas, tu viderù de judicio tuo.* S. *Epiphanius* writing to *John* of *Antioch*, ſays that S. *Jerom* and *Vincentius*, two Prieſts would perform no Functions of their Miniſtery, refuſing ſo much as to offer the Sacrifice. *Cum ſancti Preſbyteri Hieronymus & Vincentius propter verecundiam & humilitatem, nollent debita nomini ſuo exercere Sacrificia, & laborare in hac parte Miniſterii, qua Chriſtianorum præcipua ſalus eſt.*

(*l*) *He was called to* Rome *with* Paulinus *and* S. Epiphanius.] He ſays ſo himſelf in his 16th, and 27th Epiſtles. He came thither in 382, and went away three years after, as he obſerves in the Letter to *Aſella*; he ſpeaks in the 11th Letter, and in his Apology to *Pammachius* of the Letters, and Anſwers which he writ in *Damaſus*'s Name.

(*m*) *He was charged likewiſe with the conduct of the moſt conſiderable Ladies of the Town.*] Theſe Ladies are become famous by S. *Jerom*'s writtings; their Names are *Marcella*, who being left a young Widow, and having been but ſeven Months with an Husband, refuſed to Marry a Man of the firſt quality called *Cerealis*, to continue in Widowhood. Her Mother *Albina*, who came alſo to hear S. *Jerom*. *Melania* is not leſs famous by the Praiſes of S. *Jerom*, than by thoſe of *Ruſinus*. *Aſella*, *Marcellina*, and *Felicitas*, are alſo of the number of thoſe whom he commended: but his greateſt Affection appeared to be for *Paula* and her Daughters, *Bleſilla*, *Euſtochium*, *Paulina*, *Ruffina*, and *Toxotium*.

S. *Jerom.*

Toxotium. This is what he ſaith himſelf in his Letter to *Aſella*, of the Eſteem, which he had gotten among the Women. *I have*, ſaith he, *dwelt three years at* Rome, *I was often encompaſſed with great numbers of Virgins and Women, I often expounded the Holy Scripture to them, This reading made them conſtant, and their Aſſiduity begot a kind of Familiarity, upon which an ill Opinion was conceived of me*, and yet he was not able to prevent wholly evil ſpeaking. The Clergy of that City, whoſe manners he reproved, found fault with his Carriage, accuſed him of too much Familiarity with *Paula*, and they ſuborned a Footman to tax him with diſorder; but the Fellow being impriſoned, and put to the Rack, diſowned all that he had ſaid before.

and much credit. But as he ſeverely reproved the Miſ-demeanours of the Clergy, and the Vices of the people, ſo he got many Enemies, who endeavoured to render his Behaviour ſuſpected. After *Damaſus* his Death, S. *Jerom* who this whole three Years that he was at *Rome*, longed for his Solitude, took Shipping in *Auguſt*, 385. to go back to *Bethlehem*, with a great many Perſons that accompanied him. He paſſed thro' *Cyprus*, where he ſaw S. *Epiphanius*; from thence he went to *Antioch*, where *Paulinus* received him courteouſly; and from *Antioch* he went to *Jeruſalem*, and then into *Egypt*, where he ſtay'd ſome time with *Didymus*. Afterwards he viſited the Monaſteries of *Nitria*, and finding the Monks there adhering to *Origen*'s Opinions, he returned to *Bethlehem*, whither the Ladies *Paula*, *Euſtochium*, and *Melania* came ſoon after. He continued ſome time in that place in a little Cell. But the number of thoſe that embraced that kind of Life being increaſed, *Paula* built there a Church and four Monaſteries, one for Men, and three for Women. S. *Jerom* then enjoying perfectly that Quietneſs which he ſo much deſired, continued his Labours, and there compoſed the greateſt part of his Works upon the Scripture. His reſt was ſomewhat diſturbed by the Quarels which he had with *Rufinus*, and with *John* of *Jeruſalem*, upon the Account of *Origeniſm*; yet he went on with writing, and defended himſelf with a great deal of Vigour. He died very old in the Year of Chriſt, 420.

This Saint wrote great numbers of Books, full of profound Learning, and written with great Purity and Eloquence. In our Accounts, and Abridgments, we ſhall follow *Marianus Victorius*'s Order, that he uſes in the Edition which he publiſhed of S. *Jerom*'s works.

The Firſt Volume contains the Letters which S. *Jerom* writ, either to exhort his Friends to Vertue, or to inſtruct them, or to commend them in *Panegyricks*, or funeral Orations.

The Firſt, directed to *Heliodorus*, was written by S. *Jerom* from his Solitude, ſome time after this Friend left him to return into his own Countrey. He exhorts him to come back again, by repreſenting the great Advantages of a retired Life, with great force and Fineneſs, and by anſwering all the Reaſons that might keep him from embracing it with abundance of Art. This Treatiſe is a Maſter-piece of Eloquence in its kind; nothing can be more florid, more agreeable, or more moving. " This Letter, *ſaith he*, whereof you will find ſome lines blotted with my tears, will put " you in mind of the tears I ſhed, and of the Groans I uttered at your going from me. You " then endeavoured by your Careſſes, to ſweeten the contempt that you caſt upon my Intreaties. .... " I was not able to ſtop you at that time, and now I ſeek after you now you are abſent .... " No, I will uſe no more Intreaties, I will employ no more Careſſes: Love that feels its ſelf of- " fended ought to turn into Anger: You who regarded not my Supplications, will perhaps hear- " ken to my Reproaches. Nice Soldier, what are you doing in your Father's houſe? .... Re- " member that day wherein by Baptiſm you liſted your ſelf a Soldier of Chriſt, then you took " an Oath of Fidelity to him, that you would ſpare neither Father nor Mother for his Service .... " Tho' your little Nephew ſhould hang about your Neck, tho' your Mother ſhould tear her hair, " and rend her clothes to ſhow you the Boſom that carried you, to oblige you to ſtay; and " tho' your Father ſhould lie down upon the Threſhold of the Door to ſtop you, ſtep over your " Father, and follow the Standard of the Croſs with dry Eyes: It is great mercy to be cruel on " ſuch occaſions. I know you will tell me, we have not an Heart of ſtone, nor Bowels of iron... " The love of God, and the fear of Hell break all Chains. The Scripture, you will ſay, Com- " mands us to obey our Parents: Yes, but whoſoever loveth them more than Chriſt, loſeth his " his own Soul. But this, you will ſay, is to be underſtood, when they perſecute us to make " us deny Chriſt. You are miſtaken, Brother, if you ſuppoſe that a Chriſtian can be without Per- " ſecution: He is then moſt violently Aſſaulted, when he thinks himſelf moſt ſecure. Satan our " Enemy is always like a Lyon ſeeking to devour us; ... On the one ſide Pleaſures court us, on " the other Covetouſneſs torments us .... You are not allowed to enjoy your own Eſtate, you muſt " renounce all for Jeſus Chriſt. If you will be Heir to the Goods of this World, you cannot be Co- " heir with Jeſus Chriſt. Do you know the meaning of the word *Monk*? Why do you remain in " the World, you that ought to be alone? ... But what! you will anſwer me then, are all thoſe " that live in Cities no Chriſtians? You are not in the ſame condition with others. Hear the " words directed unto you by our Saviour; *If you will be perfect, ſell all that you have, give it* " *to the poor, and come and follow me.* Have you vowed perfection? A perfect Servant ſhould " have nothing but Jeſus Chriſt. So that if you be deſirous of this World's Goods, you are no " longer in that State of perfection which you have embraced. Perhaps you will alledge the Ex- " ample of thoſe Churchmen who live in Cities; ſhall I find fault with their Reſolutions? " God forbid, that I ſhould ſpeak evil of thoſe that ſucceed the Apoſtles, who conſecrate the " Body of Jeſus Chriſt with their Sacred mouths, who make us Chriſtians, and who holding " the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven in their hands, judge, if I may ſo ſay, before the day of " Judgment,

S. *Jerom.* " Judgment, and are the Guardians of the Virginity of the Spouſes of Chriſt. It is not with " Monks as with Secular Church-men: Theſe feed the Sheep of Chriſt, and we receive from " them the ſpiritual Food: they live of the Altar, and we ſhould be guilty if we did not bring " our Offerings to the Altar. I am not permitted to ſit down before a Prieſt, and if I ſin he " may deliver me to Satan; if you are ſollicited to take Orders, I ſhall rejoyce with you for your " Exaltation, but ſhall fear a fall ... for as he who worthily diſcharges his Miniſtery, acquires a " degree of perfection; ſo he on the contrary that comes to the Altar unworthily, is guilty of the " Body and Blood of Chriſt. All Biſhops are not Biſhops. If the Example of S. *Peter* com- " forts you, let that of *Judas* terrifie you. If you admire *Stephen*'s Sanctity, let the Fall of *Ni-* " *cholas* fright you. It is not the Eccleſiaſtical Dignity that makes good Chriſtians.... " It is not eaſie for all men to have S. *Paul*'s Graces, nor S. *Peter*'s Holineſs, who now " are reigning with Chriſt. If a Monk falls, a Prieſt may pray for him, but who ſhall pray " for the fall of a Prieſt? S. *Jerom* having thus far proſecuted his reaſonings, endeth with theſe Acclamations. " Imitating, *ſaith he*, thoſe Pilots, who happily ſteered their Ship between Rocks " and Banks of Sand! O Wilderneſs, *he cryes out*, always covered with the Flowers of Jeſus Chriſt! " O Solitude, where the Stones that are made uſe of to build the City of the great King, ſpoken " of in the *Revelations*, are to be found! O happy Retirement, where Men may have familiar " Converſation with God! What do you do, Brother, in the World? how long will you " dwell under the ſhadow of Houſes? till what time will you be in the Priſon of ſmoaking " Cities? What are you afraid of in theſe ſolitary places? Is it Poverty? but Jeſus Chriſt calleth " the poor Happy. Do's labour aſtoniſh you? Can he that ſtrives in the publick Exerciſes be " Crowned before he has fought? Do you think of your Diet? a lively Faith fears not hunger. " Do you dread lying upon the naked ground, with your Bodies worn out with Faſting? Re- " member that Jeſus Chriſt reſts there along with you. Are you Scared with the extent of this " hideous Solitude? Paradiſe is open to you. Theſe are ſome of the Arguments which S. *Jerom* " uſes to perſwade *Heliodorus* to return to his Retirement.

The Second Letter to *Nepotian Heliodorus* his Nephew was compoſed by S. *Jerom* long after the Firſt, as he ſays himſelf at the beginning. " Being, ſaith he, yet young, when I ſtruggled with the " Firſt motions of youth, by the Auſterities of Solitude; I write to *Heliodorus* your Uncle a " Letter of Exhortation, full of Complaints and Tears, to ſhow how ſorry I was for the ab- " ſence of my Friend. I plaid then ſuitably to my Age, and uſed all the Flowers of Rhetorick " with which my ſelf at that time was full. But now I am Old, and my Forehead is full of " wrinkles, and my Chin covered with a white Beard, I can no longer do what I could do then. And yet, he Diſcourſes here after a manner youthful enough, producing ſeveral Examples taken out of Eccleſiaſtical and prophane Hiſtory, to ſhew that old Men have not the ſame heat nor vigour that young Men have. He addeth, " Expect not therefore from me youthful Declama- " tions, florid Sentences, ſweet Words, poignant or acute Expreſſions at the end of my Periods, " to draw the applauſe of thoſe that hear us; I beg of God only the lights of his Wiſdom.... " Hearken then, as S. *Cyprian* ſaith, to a Diſcourſe that hath more Strength than Sweetneſs; " Hearken to him that is your Colleague, and your Father by his age.... I know that your " holy Uncle *Heliodorus*, who is now a Miniſter of Jeſus Chriſt, has taught and do's teach you Ho- " lineſs, and that his Life is an example of Vertue to you: But take from me beſides theſe ſmall " Directions, and joyning this Treatiſe to that which I writ before to your Uncle, learn of this how " to be a perfect Church-man, as the former may inſtruct you, how to be a good Monk. Theſe are the main Precepts which S. *Jerom* giveth to a Church-man in this excellent Letter. " A " Clerk, *ſaith he*, that ſerveth the Church of Jeſus Chriſt ought to begin with the knowledge of " what his Name ſignifies; and then Labour to be what is ſignified by it. The Greek word " Κλῆρος ſignifieth a *Lot* or a *Portion*: therefore the Name Clerk is given to Church-men, either " becauſe they are conſecrated to the Lord, or becauſe the Lord is their Portion, but whoſoever " belongeth to the Lord, or hath the Lord to his Portion, ought to live as one that poſſeſſeth the " Lord, and in whom the Lord dwelleth: he is to poſſeſs nothing but the Lord.... And ſo " indeed, in ſerving at the Altar, I ought to live of the Altar: but ought to be content with " with what is neceſſary for Food and Raiment; and ſtript of all things, I ought only to follow the " Croſs.... I conjure you therefore, and I admoniſh you, let not Intereſt make you enter into " Chriſt's Service, neither heap up greater Riches in the Eccleſiaſtical State than you did when " you were in the World, leaſt they ſay unto you: *Their lot will do them no good:* We ſee ſome " men wealthier ſince they have been Monks, than they were before: ſome Clerks have Riches " while they ſerve poor Jeſus Chriſt, which they had not while they ſerved the rich Devil: ſo " that the Church groans to ſee them rich in her Boſom, that were Beggers whilſt they were in " the World. You muſt ſet the Poor and Pilgrims at your Table, and Jeſus Chriſt will be one " of the Gueſts. Avoid thoſe Clerks as a plague who make Merchandice of the Church's Goods, " who become rich and proud, tho' they were poor and contemptible enough before.... Let " Women never come near your Houſes, or at leaſt but ſeldom; have no Familiarity with the " Virgins conſecrated to God, either be acquainted with none, or love them all equally: Dwell not " in the ſame Houſe with them. Truſt not your paſt Chaſtity: you are neither holier than *David*, " nor ſtronger than *Sampſon*, nor wiſer than *Solomon*. Viſit not Women alone, ſpeak not with them " face to face: but avoid whatſoever may beget evil Suſpicion.... This is a thing ſhameful for

" us,

" us. The Priests of false Deities, Comedians, Actors, and the basest of men may be Legatees, " only Clergy men and Monks cannot, the Law forbids them; and a Law that was not made " by Emperors who were Enemies to Religion, but by Christian Princes. Yet I complain not of " this Law, but I am sorry that we deserved it.... The Law was enacted out of a prudent " foresight, and yet it is not strong enough to suppress Covetousness. We elude the Law by " Trustees.... The Glory of a Bishop is to give ease to the Misery of the Poor, and it is his " greatest disgrace to apply himself to increase wealth. S. *Jerom* describes here the Lewdness of some Clergy-men, and the baseness of others to ingratiate themselves with rich Men, that they might make them their Heirs. He adds afterwards, That a Bishop ought to do what he preaches; that his mouth, his hands, and his mind are exactly to agree together. He recommends to Priests Submission to their Bishops, and that they should honour them as their Fathers. But at the same time he warneth Bishops, to remember that they are Priests and not Masters: *Sacerdotes se esse noverint, non dominos*; And that they are to use Church-men as Church-men, if they themselves would be honoured as Bishops. He blames the Custom of some Churches where Priests were not permitted to speak before their Bishop. He would have a Preacher to excite the tears of his Auditors, rather than their applause. He says, That his preaching ought to be neither Declamatory nor Satyrical, but that he ought to expound the Mysteries of our Religion, and the Morality of the Gospel, with Clearness and Gravity. Afterwards he goes to the manner how Church-men ought to be habited. No Clergy-man in his Opinion should affect either black or white Garments, but avoid Neatness and Slovenliness: theone is a Mark of Effeminateness, and the other is often the effect of a foolish Vanity. As to Alms-deeds, S. *Jerom* complains that in his time some Bishops and Ecclesiasticks distributed small Alms to the poor, to enrich themselves, by appropriating to themselves considerable Sums under that pretence of those Alms. He tells the Bishops that they ought to take special care whom they intrusted with the Dispensation of Alms. He reproves those who were very careful to see Churches well built, sumptuously adorned with Marble and Gold, and the Altars covered with precious Stones, but took no care to make a good choice of Ministers of Jesus Christ. He forbids Church-men, and particularly Bishops to make any Feasts for Lay-men, but recommends to them Sobriety. Yet he desires them not to proceed to Excess in their Fasts, but that such as they shall observe should be pure, chaste, moderate, simple, and without Superstition. He laughs at those, who refusing to eat Oyl upon Fast-days, inquired after Dainties and Meats not easie to be had; and at those, who forbearing to drink Water or to eat Bread, drank the Juice of pleasant Herbs. He declaims against those Ecclesiasticks, that affected to make a shew of their Mortifications and good Works, to get Glory to themselves. Lastly, he recommends to Clergy-men Charity, Prudence, Discretion, and Modesty. He takes notice at the latter End, that he writes this Letter in his Retirement at *Bethlehem*, Ten years after the Book of *Virginity*, which he wrote at *Rome*. This shews that this Letter is of the Year 393. S. *Jerom.*

Nepotian to whom this Letter was written, dying not long after, S. *Jerom* writ the Third Letter to his Uncle *Heliodorus*, to comfort him for the Death of his Nephew, of whom he makes a *Panegyrick*. This Letter which is not less florid or less eloquent, is full of Historical passages, collected with much Affectation: He produces the examples of several Heathens who despised Death: and shows that it ought less to be feared by a Christian. That *Heliodorus* ought to be comforted, since *Nepotian* was in possession of eternal Happiness. Then he sets forth his Vertues, together with the misfortunes and Miseries of this Life, whence he concludes, that we are to esteem those Happy, who are out of this World. There he makes an elegant Comparison, betwixt the power of Kings and Bishops. *A King*, says he, *Commands men that are obliged to obey whether they will or no; whereas the Bishop hath Dominion over those only that are willing to obey. The Prince brings men under by Terror: The Bishop is bound to serve those that are under his Conduct. The former protects the Bodies which must die; but the latter takes care of Souls to give them eternal Life. All the faithful have their Eyes upon their Bishop, his Family and conduct is observed by every Body, he is to be an example to the whole Church: and there is none but thinks he can do what he does.*

Besides, there is in that Letter, an excellent Portraicture of the uncertainty of this Life. *We die daily*, saith he, *We alter continually, and yet we are so foolish, that we live as if we were to abide eternally. The time I spend in dictating, writing, reading over again, and correcting, is so much time towards the shortning of my Life. The stops, and Letters of my* Amanuensis, *are so many moments to lessen the length of my Life; the only thing that turns to account, is the love which we have for Jesus Christ. Charity never comes to an end, but lives for ever in the Heart,* and by it *our Brother* Nepotian *is still present with us after his Death; it is that which unites us, tho' we be separated by a vast space of Land, or Sea.*

The Fourth Letter is directed to one *Rusticus* a Western Monk, to whom S. *Jerom* gives Rules for that kind of Life, which he was to follow. It begins with this Sentence, *None is more happy than a Christian, seeing he hath a Promise of the Kingdom of Heaven: None is to Fight more, since he is in danger of his Life; none is stronger, since he overcometh the Devil:* And then he exhorts *Rusticus* to persevere with Zeal in that profession which he had embraced. He enjoyns him to be respectful to his Mother, but not to be too much tyed to her, nor to hold any Conversation with other Women. He adviseth him to renounce all these things, and to withdraw from the

S. Jerom. World. He warneth him not lightly to take upon him Holy Orders, or to affect to be a Maſter before he had been a Diſciple; and to chuſe rather, to live in a Monaſtery, than to be an Hermit in a Solitude; and he repreſents the Inconveniencies of that kind of Life: "Commonly, ſaith "he, an Hermit becometh proud; he thinks himſelf to be ſome Body, and forgetteth what he "is; he eats what he pleaſes, ſleeps as much as he will, fears no Body, and you ſhall find him "oftner in the Town, than in his Cell. Not, ſaith he, That I find fault with a ſolitary Life, "which I have ſo often commended: but I would have theſe Soldiers come out of Monaſteries "where they have learned their Exerciſes, leaſt the ſevere beginnings of Solitude ſhould amaze "them. S. *Jerom* recommends to him afterwards the Vertues and Exerciſes of a right Monk, and particularly, working with his hands, Reading and Meditation upon the Holy Scriptures, Prayer, Obedience to Superiours, Chaſtity, Faſting, &c. He blames the Monks that live like Secular, and obſerves, that they uſed to chuſe Monks to make them Church-men. He tells *Ruſticus*, That he ought not to begin to write early, but Practiſe long before he undertook to teach. At the end of this Letter he praiſes two Biſhops of *Gaul*, *Proculus* Biſhop of *Marſeilles*, and *Exuperius* Biſhop of *Tholouſe*; what he ſaith of the latter is very remarkable. *This Holy Biſhop*, ſaith he, *imitates the Widow of* Sarepta; *he feeds others, and ſtarves himſelf; his face is pale with faſting; nothing but other Mens hunger troubles him; He has given all his Eſtate to the poor, and yet there is none richer than he; He carries the Body of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt in an Oſier Basket, and his precious Blood in a Glaſs Veſſel; one may ſay, That he drove Covetouſneſs out of the Temple of the Lord. Follow*, ſaith he, to *Ruſticus*, at the latter End of the Letter, *the ſteps of this good Biſhop, and of other Perſons who imitate his Vertues, thoſe Saints whom the Paſtoral Dignity has made poorer and more humble. And if you deſire to embrace a condition more perfect, get out of your Country, as* Abraham *did, leave your Kindred, and get you to an unknown place. If you have any Goods, ſell them, and diſtribute the price of them to the Poor. If you have none, you are diſcharged of a great Burden. Strip your ſelf of all things to follow Jeſus Chriſt only.* Nudum Chriſtum nudus ſequere. *It is hard, I confeſs, it is Great, and it is Difficult, but the recompence is Infinite.* He mentions in this Letter, that which he had written to *Nepotian*, and ſo this was written after the Year 393, perhaps in 394.

In the Fifth to *Florentius*, who came to *Jeruſalem*, he commends the Charity of that Holy man: He ſent him a Letter to be delivered to *Rufinus*, who was to go from *Egypt* to *Jeruſalem* with *Melania*, where he ſpeaks as much to the advantage of that Presbyter, as he ſpoke afterwards ſince to his Diſparagement. *I would not*, ſaith he to *Florentius*, *have you judge of me by his Vertues, you ſhall ſee in him the viſible marks of Holineſs, I am but dirt and aſhes, and I think my ſelf Happy if my weak Eyes can but behold his Vertues; he his pure and white as Snow, but I am all over covered with Sins.* S. *Jerom* writ this Letter from the Solitudes of *Syria* about the Year 372.

Florentius having anſwered S. *Jerom*, this Saint wrote again a Sixth Letter, to tell him, that having read his, he was tempted to go to *Jeruſalem*, but he durſt not quit his Solitude. He prays him to deſire of *Rufinus* the Commentary upon the *Canticles* that was compoſed by *Rheticius* Biſhop of *Autun*, that he might take a Copy of it; and to tell him, that an Old man one *Paulus*, deſired the Copy of *Tertullian* which he had lent him: He intreats him likewiſe that he would cauſe ſome Books to be tranſcribed for him, which he had not, of which he ſent him a *Memorandum*: and ſend him S. *Hilary*'s Commentary upon the *Pſalms*, and his Book of Synods, which himſelf had Copied with his own hand at *Triers*: and in requital he profers to communicate to him the Books which he had in his own Library.

The Seventh is directed to *Læta* Wife of *Toxotius Paula*'s Son. This Lady had a young Daughter called *Paula*, whom her Grand-mother deſigned for a Religious Life. S. *Jerom* writes this Letter to the Mother of this little Girl, to teach her how ſhe ſhould breed her up, and exhorts her to ſend her as ſoon as ſhe could to his Monaſtery at *Bethlehem*. Her Grand-father was a Prieſt of *Jupiter*, but the reſt of the Family were Chriſtians. This made S. *Jerom* ſay pleaſantly, that it was a ſurprizing thing that this Old man ſhould make much of a Girl that ſung the Praiſes of Jeſus Chriſt, and be compaſſed about with a Family of Chriſtians, which gave him hopes that he would be converted: *For*, ſaith he pleaſantly, *I fanſie that* Jupiter *himſelf might have believed in Jeſus Chriſt, had he had ſuch a Family as yours*; what he ſays afterwards is more ſerious. *Tho' he laughs at my Letter, and calls me Fool and Senſleſs, yet I deſpair not of his Converſion, his Son-in-Law did the ſame, before he embraced the Faith of Jeſus Chriſt. No man is born a Chriſtian, but becomes one afterwards..... It is never too late to be converted.*

It will not be thought amiſs, that I ſhould ſet down here ſome of thoſe Precepts which S. *Jerom* gives for the Education of a young Woman, to ſhew that it is no new thing to ſee retired Perſons, and thoſe that are furtheſt from the commerce of civil Life, teach the People of the World how to breed their Children. It is ſtrange that ſuch as have Children to bring up, ſhould be obliged to do it well, and to have recourſe to thoſe that have made a vow never to have Children, or a Family themſelves. "Thus, ſaith S. *Jerom*, is that Virgin to be Educated, whoſe "Soul is deſigned to be the Temple of God. Let her not hearken to, let her not learn nor diſ"courſe of any thing, but what is proper to inſpire the love of God. Let her never hear filthy "Talk, nor learn profane Songs, but let her Voyce be betimes accuſtomed to the ſinging of *Pſalms*: "Let no Boys come near her, her Maids and Governeſſes ſhould be wiſe, and kept from the "Company of diſorderly People, leaſt they teach her more evil than they have learned them-

"ſelves.

" ſelves. Let them teach her to read with *Box* or *Ivory* Letters, whereof ſhe may remember the Names..... She ought to be made to love Study and Labour, either by promiſing her Reward, or by provoking her by Example. If ſhe be of a ſoft Temper, reprove her not too fiercely; ſhe ought to be encouraged with Commendation to raiſe in her mind a Deſire to excel others, and ſome trouble to ſee her ſelf out-done. Above all, have care that ſhe be not diſguſted with Study, leaſt ſhe come to hate it when ſhe becomes older. Let her read the Sentences of the Holy Scripture, and chuſe for her an able Maſter, a Man of a good Life, who may take pains to teach her to read. Deſpiſe not theſe beginnings as inconſiderable, for the reſt depend upon them. The beginnings of Reading and Pronunciation are not taught alike by a skilful, and by a wary Man: Do not let her uſe her ſelf to ſpeak her words by halves, nor to take Pleaſure in handling of Gold or Purple: The one will hurt her Speech, and the other her Manners. Let her not learn that in her Infancy, which ſhe muſt forget afterwards..... Evil is eaſily imitated, and we often take up their Vices, whoſe Vertues we cannot reach: Her Nurſe ſhould be ſober, no Tatler, nor given to Wine..... Let her clothes be modeſt, convenient for the State for which you deſign her: Let not her Ears be bored, nor her Face us'd to Painting: ſhe ſhould not have her Hair dyed fair, nor her Garments adorned with Gold, Pearls or Jewels, unleſs you deſign her for Hell fire.... When ſhe grows older, let her follow her Parents to the Church, but never go out to return to the Pomps of the World. Let her keep to her Chamber, and never appear at Feaſts, or publick Meetings: but ſhe ought not to uſe too much Abſtinence till ſhe comes to the Age of ſtrength, leaſt ſhe prejudices her Health. Let her take that which helps neceſſity, but not what feeds Luxury: Let her not be at Muſick-Meetings, nor hear muſical Inſtruments, but learn and repeat daily Sentences out of the Holy Scripture; She ſhould never go abroad without her Mother, nor grow very Familiar with any one of her Servants; provide her a wiſe, prudent and vertuous Governeſs, that may ſhow her the way to riſe in the Night to ſing *Pſalms*, to rehearſe the morning Hymns, and at *Tierce*, *Sext*, *Nones*, and *Veſpers*. Let her pray, and work Night and Day; let her learn to handle the Diſtaffe, to turn the Wheel and ſpin Wooll; Let her not meddle with Embroidering either of Gold or Silver; let her be modeſtly cloathed, and ſoberly fed; ſhe ſhould not faſt exceſſively, but obſerve Lent regularly, and take no pleaſure in Baths. S. Jerom.

To theſe moral Precepts, S. *Jerom* adds an Inſtruction for the Studies of young Girls, and adviſes them to read all the Canonical Books, both of the Old and New Teſtaments, not excepting the *Canticles*. He adviſes them not to read the *Apocrypha*, but the Books of S. *Athanaſius*, and of S. *Hilary*. He concludes by exhorting *Læta* to ſend her Daughter to the Monaſtery at *Bethlehem*. This Letter is written from the Solitude of *Bethlehem*, about the Year 400.

The Eighth Letter was written in the Year 411. after the taking of *Rome* by the *Goths*, it is directed to a Virgin of the Firſt quality, one *Demetrias*, who was retired into *Africa*, and there had embraced a Religious Life. S. *Jerom* having commended her Grand-mother *Proba*, directs her how to maintain her Virginity, by recommending to her ſeveral Exerciſes of Piety, as reading of the Holy Scripture, renouncing the Pomps of the World, exerciſing Penance, moderate Faſting, Obedience, Humility, Modeſty, Alms-deeds, Prayers at all hours of the day, and working with her hands. He adviſes her to ſtick to the Faith of Pope *Innocent*, and to beware of the Errors of the *Origeniſt*'s, and tells her, that ſhe ſhould chuſe rather to dwell in a Nunnery with other Virgins, than to live alone. But he would have her avoid the Company of the Ladies of the World. He finiſhes his Letter with Commendations of Virginity. It is to be noted, that in thoſe days Virgins conſecrated to God might go out of their Cloyſters, but S. *Jerom* adviſes them to do it ſeldom. He calleth Penance, *a Second Plank after Shipwrack*. He obſerveth that Faſting is not properly a Vertue, but the ground of all Vertues; that Chaſtity is a degree to arrive at Perfection, but if it be ſingle, it is not enough to merit the Crown of Heaven. He admoniſhes Virgins not to be lifted up, becauſe of the perfection of their State, but to humble themſelves under the mighty hand of God, who reſiſteth the Proud, and giveth Grace to the humble. *But*, ſaith he, *what is of Grace is no recompence for Works, but a Free-gift, wherefore the Apoſtle writeth, that the good which Man doth is not to be attributed, either to his Will or Labour, but to the mercy of God; and yet to will, or not to will, is in our Power; but what depends upon us, doth not do ſo without God's help. Velle & non velle noſtrum eſt, ipſumque quod noſtrum eſt, ſine Dei miſeratione noſtrum non eſt.* At laſt he exhorts Virgins, rather to beſtow their Eſtates upon the Poor, than to beautifie Churches.

The Ninth Letter is directed to a Lady of Quality, one *Salvina*, who had loſt her Husband *Nebridius*, Son to the Empreſſes Siſter. Tho' S. *Jerom* knew her not, yet he writ to her at the requeſt of one of her Friends called *Avitus*. He begins his Letter with Commendations of *Nebridius*, whoſe Vertues were the more to be admired, becauſe he had ſpent his Life at Court, and in great Employments; and then adviſes his Widow to render to her Children, what ſhe owed her Husband, by giving them a good Education, exhorting her earneſtly to continue a Widow, and giving Rules for her Behaviour. He exceedingly blames Second Marriages, and looks upon them rather as tolerated to prevent a greater Evil, than permitted as a good. He obſerves in that Letter, that Riches do not hinder a Man from being ſaved, provided he makes good uſe of them; as Poverty doth not make a Man holy or juſt, if he doth not avoid Sin. He calls Penance the Remedy of the miſerable: He ſays that men ſhould have a care of Sinning, out of hopes

S. *Jerom.* hopes of riſing again by Repentance; that ſuch Wounds ſhould be prevented, as cannot be cured without Pain; that it is a far greater advantage to enter the Haven of Salvation with a ſound Veſſel full fraught with Merchandices, than to be forced to ſwim upon a Plank, in danger of being broken againſt the Rocks, and the Waves of an agitated Sea. *Salvina* or *Silvina*, to whom this Letter was written, was the Daughter of that *Gildo* Governour of *Africa*, who going about to uſurp the Empire, after *Theodoſius* his Death, periſhed *Anno* 398. She was a Widow, and dwelt at *Conſtantinople* when S. *Chryſoſtom* was expelled from thence, as we learn from *Palladius*, who tells us, *That S.* Chryſoſtom *before he went away, entred into the Baptiſtery, and called to him* Olympias, *the Deaconneſſes*, Procla, Pentadia, *and* Silvina, Nebridius's *Widow*: So that S. *Jerom*'s Letter might be written about the Year 400. not long after the Death of her Husband.

The Tenth is written to another young Widow named *Furia*, of the Race of the *Camilli*. He diſſwades her from Marrying a ſecond time, tho' ſhe had had no Children by her firſt Husband; he tells her, that in this particular, ſhe ſhould not regard neither the Remonſtrances, or threatnings of her Father, but he recommends to her, that ſhe ſhould be ſober, modeſt, conſtant in reading and praying, that ſhe ſhould give Alms, avoid the World, deſpiſe its Pomps, *&c.* Laſtly, he repreſents the inconveniencies of a Second Marriage very livelily, and ſays at the latter end of the Letter, that he writ it two Years after his Books againſt *Jovinian*, that were compoſed, ſometime before the Year 392. and ſo this Letter is of 394.

The following Letter to *Ageruchia*, is upon the ſame Subject: He does ſpeak there with leſs Zeal againſt Second Marriages, than in the foregoing; and yet he profeſſes not to condemn them. He ſays that he had ſeen at *Rome* a Woman buried by her Twenty ſecond Husband, and a Husband who had buried Twenty Wives. At the end of this Letter he Diſcourſes againſt ſuch as are too much in love with this Life, and the good things of this World. *Men*, ſays he, *build as if they were to live for ever, and they live as if they were ſure of Life next day. There is none ſo aged but promiſes to himſelf, That he ſhall live one year more, and ſo forgets what he is: and when he is come to the age that he deſired, yet does he not think himſelf near Death, and flatters himſelf with the Life of many years to come.* He concludes this with a Deſcription of the pitiful condition, the *Roman Empire*, was reduced to by the Incurſions of the *Barbarians*, eſpecially in *Gaul* and *Spain*, which made him afraid of *Rome* it ſelf. This ſhews, that this Letter was written ſome time before the taking of *Rome*, which happened in 410.

In the Twelfth Letter S. *Jerom* preſcribes to *Gaudentius* ſome Rules for the Education of his Daughter *Pacatula*, whom he deſigned for a Religious Life: It contains ſuch Precepts as are in the Letter to *Læta*; there he bewails the misfortune of the taking of *Rome*, in 410.

The Thirteenth is directed to *Paulinus* afterwards Biſhop of *Nola*, who intending to be a Monk, addreſſed himſelf to S. *Jerom*, as a Perſon perfectly well skilled in the Exerciſes of a Monaſtical Life, to ask his advice how he ſhould behave himſelf. This Father having with great Humility anſwered *Paulinus* his Complements, for his living ſo long ſolitary in the Wilderneſs of *Bethlehem*, Counſels him to retire out of Cities, if he reſolved to embrace a Monaſtick State.

In this Separation from the World, he chiefly places the difference between a Monaſtical, and an Eccleſiaſtical State. *If*, Says he, *you will enter upon the Miniſtery of the Church, and perform the Functions of the Prieſthood, if you are pleaſed with the Epiſcopal Dignity; then keep in Towns, and work out the Salvation of your own Soul by ſaving others: but if you would be a Monk, that is, live Solitarily, what do you do in Towns, which are no Habitations for Monks, but for thoſe that love the World? .... Prieſts and Biſhops ought to imitate the Apoſtles and Apoſtolical Men, to ſucceed them in their Vertue, as they do in their Dignity; as for us, we have for our Commanders, The* Pauls, *the* Antonies, *the* Julians, *the* Macarii, *the* Hilarions; *and to come to the Scripture it ſelf,* Elias *is the firſt of our Order,* Eliſha *is one of us, the Sons of the Prophets that dwelt in the Fields and Deſart places, and upon the Banks of* Jordan, *they are our Maſters. The Sons of* Rechab, *who drunk neither Wine nor Sider, are alſo of this Number.* S. *Jerom* having exalted the Monaſtical State by theſe Examples, preſcribes ſeveral Rules to *Paulinus* for the Exerciſes which he was to follow in his Retirement. He thanks him afterwards for the Books that he ſent him, in Commendation of *Theodoſius*, and having commended it, he exhorts *Paulinus* to apply himſelf to the reading of the Holy Scripture, telling him that if he had but that Foundation, nothing would be more learned, more ſweet, or more acceptable, and better written than his Works. From thence he takes occaſion, to deſcribe the Stile and Character of the Latin Eccleſiaſtical Authors. *Tertullian*, ſaith he, *is full of Sentences, but his Elocution is hard.* S. Cyprian's *Stile is ſmooth, and like the running waters of a Fountain, which paſſes away quietly, and without Agitation; but having wholly apply'd himſelf to the teaching of Vertue, and being buſy'd by Perſecutions, he writ nothing upon the Holy Scripture: The glorious Martyr* Victorinus *can hardly tell his meaning.* Lactantius *is like a River of a* Ciceronian *Eloquence; would to God he could as eaſily have confirmed our Doctrine, as he overthrows that of other Mens.* Arnobius *his Stile is uneven, without method or order.* S. Hilary *hath an high and ſwelling Stile, like the* Gallick *Tragedies, but intermixing that way of writing with* Grecian *Flowers, he often writes long Periods and very intricate, which can neither be read nor underſtood by Men of ordinary Capacities.* And having thus ſet forth the Character of thoſe ancient Authors, he giveth that of *Paulinus* in theſe Terms: *You have,* ſaith he, *a great deal of Wit, a wonderful abundance of Expreſſions, a natural pureneſs, and rare prudence. If you add to that Eloquence, the Study and underſtanding of the Scripture,*

Scripture, I ſhall quickly ſee you the firſt of our Authors. And to this he exhorts him. This Letter was written before *Paulinus* was ordained, and after his Converſion about the Year 380. S. *Jerom.*

The Fourteenth Letter to *Celantia,* is not like S. *Jerom*'s Stile. It is thought to be written by *Paulinus* Biſhop of *Nola.* It contains very uſeful Inſtructions, and Precepts for a Lady, to lead a Chriſtian Life in the midſt of Honours, Riches, and the Perplexities of managing her Family.

The Fifteenth Letter to *Marcella,* is in Commendation of one *Acella* a Virgin.

The Sixteenth directed to a Virgin, named *Principia,* is the Panegyrick of *Marcella,* a *Roman* Lady, Daughter of *Albina,* who being left a Widow ſeven Months after Marriage, reſolved to continue ſo, though ſhe was courted by the Conſul *Cerealis,* and was the firſt of the *Roman* Ladies that embrac'd a Religious Life. S. *Jerom,* after a deſcription of her Vertues, commends her for procuring the Condemnation of *Origen*'s Books, and for the Courage which ſhe ſhewed when *Rome* was taken; he obſerves that ſhe died quickly after, and that he writ this Panegyrick two Years after her Death; which ſhews, that this Letter was written in 412 or 413.

The Seventeenth Letter is from *Bethlehem,* in the Name of *Paula* and *Euſtochium,* to *Marcella,* whom they invite to come to them, and to viſit the holy Places. It may have been written about the Year 400.

The Eighteenth is written in S. *Jerom*'s Name to the ſame Lady, and upon the ſame Subject.

The Nineteenth is a handſome Letter of Thanks to *Euſtochium,* for a Preſent of ſome Fruits that ſhe ſent him upon S. *Peter*'s Day.

The following Letter to *Marcella* is likewiſe to thank him for ſome Preſents, which that Lady had ſent him from *Rome.*

The Twenty-firſt is written to an Old Man of *Spain* of 100 Years of Age. S. *Jerom* congratulates with him, that God had given him a fine Old Age, freed from the ordinary infirmities, common to perſons of thoſe Years; he commends his Vertues, and deſires of him the Commentaries of *Fortunatianus,* the Hiſtory of *Aurelius Victor,* and *Novatian*'s Letters, and tells him that he would ſend him the Life of the Bleſſed *Paul* the firſt *Hermite.* This Letter may have been written in S. *Jerom*'s firſt Retreat.

The Two and Twentieth is a Treatiſe of *Virginity* to *Euſtochium.* Having ſpoken of the Excellency of it, of the Difficulty of preſerving and the Danger of loſing it, he lays down Precepts which a Virgin is to obſerve to keep her ſelf pure. He forbids her to drink Wine; he bids her avoid dainty Fare, Effeminateneſs, Pleaſures and ſuperfluous Ornaments; he recommends Solitude to her, and the Reading of the Holy Scripture, Prayer, Renouncing of the Things of this World, Faſting, Humility, and other Chriſtian Vertues. He ſpeaks againſt ſome Clergy-men who kept devout Siſters in their Houſes; *And who* (ſaith he) *under pretence of Spiritual conſolation, entertained a carnal commerce.* He blames thoſe alſo that courted Ladies; and to pleaſe them, condeſcended to do ſeveral things unworthy of their Character. To diſſuade *Euſtochium* from reading prophane Books, he tells her, That being once too earneſt in reading *Cicero, Plautus,* and other prophane Authors, he fell into a violent Fever, and by it into a kind of Agony, and then was caught up in the Spirit to the Tribunal of Jeſus Chriſt; where having been ſoundly whipt for reading prophane Authors too much, he was forbidden to read them any more: He aſſures *Euſtochium,* that this Story is not a Dream, and calls the Tribunal where he appeared, and the Judgment that was given againſt him to atteſt the Truth of what he ſays: Yet when *Rufinus* upbraided him afterwards, that for all that he had not given over reading prophane Books, he laughs at his Simplicity, and jeſts upon him for taking a Dream for a Truth. Declaiming againſt Covetouſneſs, he ſays, that a Monk of *Nitria* having got together One hundred Pence which were found in his Cell after he was dead, they buried him with his Money, and with this Imprecation; *Let this Money periſh with thee.* He obſerves upon that occaſion, that there were Five thouſand Monks in the Solitudes of *Nitria,* dwelling in ſeparated Cells; and that there were three ſorts of Monks in *Egypt,* namely the *Cœnobites,* who lived in common; the *Anchorets,* who dwelt alone in the Wilderneſs; and thoſe that were called *Remoboth,* who lived Two and Two together, and maintained themſelves after their own way, with the work of their own hands. He blames this laſt ſort, and deſcribes the manner of living of the *Anchorets* and *Cœnobites* at large. After this digreſſion, he concludes with commending the Purity of *Euſtochium.* In all likelihood this Treatiſe was compoſed at *Rome* about the latter end of *Damaſus*'s Pontificate, about the Year 385.

The Two and Twentieth is written to *Marcella* upon the Recovery and Converſion of *Bleſilla,* *Paula*'s Daughter, and Siſter of *Euſtochium.* This young Widow, after the Torment of a violent Fever for Thirty days together, had embraced a Solitary life. S. *Jerom* commends her for that generous Reſolution, and confounds thoſe that blamed her. One may find in that Letter a handſome deſcription of the Habit of thoſe ancient Nuns. S. *Jerom* ſpeaks there againſt the Finery of Women. This Letter was written at *Rome* about the Year 383.

The next was written much about the ſame time; it is directed to *Paula,* concerning the Death of an Holy Nun, one *Lea.* S. *Jerom* ſhews, that they ought to rejoyce for her Death, becauſe ſhe enjoy'd Happineſs. He commends her Vertues, and comparing her Death, with that of one deſigned to be Conſul, which happened at the ſame time; he ſhows the vaſt difference betwixt a poor Righteous Man's death, and that of a great, rich, and impious Lord.

S. Jerom. The Four and Twentieth is a Letter of Conſolation to *Paula*, upon the Death of her Daughter *Bleſilla*, who departed this Life four Months after her Converſion: S. *Jerom* ſhows, that we ſhould not mourn for Chriſtians who die in a State of Grace, but rather rejoyce for their Happineſs. He reproves *Paula* ſeverely, becauſe ſhe had given way to exceſſive Grief. This Letter may paſs for an exact Pattern of Elegant and Chriſtian Conſolation. It was compoſed at *Rome* about the Year 384.

The Five and Twentieth is likewiſe a Conſolatory Letter to *Pammachius*, upon the Death of his Wife *Paulina*, who was alſo one of *Paula*'s Daughters. He ſaith but little of *Paulina*'s Death, but enlargeth much in Commendation of *Pammachius*, who left the World after his Wife's Death, and had beſtowed great part of his Eſtate upon the Poor, and built an Hoſpital for Strangers in the Port of *Rome*. S. *Jerom* ſays at the latter end of this Letter, that ſo great a number of Monks flocked to his Monaſtery at *Bethlehem*, that he was obliged to ſend his Brother *Paulinianus* to ſell the reſt of the Eſtate which he had in his own Country, to enable him to ſupport his Undertaking. This informs us that this Letter was written at *Bethlehem* in 398.

The Twenty-ſixth is a Funeral-Sermon for the famous *Paula*, whoſe Life he deſcribes, and makes her Panegyrick. It is directed to her Daughter *Euſtochium*. He ſets down at the latter end ſome Epitaphs which he put upon the Grave and upon the Cave where that holy Lady was buried in *Bethlehem*, and he ſays that ſhe died *Febr.* 22d. and was buried the 24th. under the Seventh Conſulſhip of *Honorius* and *Ariſtænetus*: That is, after our way of reckoning, the 404th. Year ſince the Nativity of our Saviour: And this proves that Funeral Oration to be of that ſame Year.

The Seven and twentieth Letter to a *Spaniard*, one *Lucinius* is very remarkable. S. *Jerom* exhorts that Man who had embraced a Monaſtical Life with his Wife's Conſent, to proſecute the deſign which he had to come to *Jeruſalem*. He tells him, that he had given Copies of his works to thoſe whom he ſent to him; That he had not tranſlated *Joſephus* his Books, nor the Writings of S. *Papias*, and S. *Polycarp*; That he tranſlated only ſome Treatiſes of *Origen* and *Didymus*; That he had corrected the Verſion of the Septuagint, reſtored the Greek of the New Teſtament, and that he ſent to him part of the Canonical Books, which he reviſed and made conformable to the truth of the Hebrew. He afterwards anſwers two Queſtions, which *Lucinius* had put to him about *Saturday's* Faſt, and a frequent Communion. That Anſwer is too conſiderable not to be tranſlated here. *As to what you ask me concerning the* Saturday's *Faſt, whether it ought to be kept; and about the Euchariſt, whether it ſhould be received every day, as is Cuſtomary in the Churches both of* Italy *and* Spain, *we have upon that Subject a Treatiſe of* Hippolytus, *a very Eloquent man, and ſeveral Authors have occaſionally treated of that Matter; for my part, this is the advice I think ought to be given in that Point;* **That Eccleſiaſtical Traditions, not contrary to the Faith, ought to be obſerved after the ſame manner, that we received them from our Anceſtors: And I am perſwaded, that the Cuſtom of one Church is not to be aboliſhed, becauſe of a contrary one in uſe in another Church.** *Would to God that we could faſt every day: Do we not read in the* Acts of the Apoſtles, *that both S.* Paul, *and they that were with him faſted in the days of* Pentecoſt, *and even upon* Sunday's: *Yet for all that they ought not to be accuſed for* Manichees, *becauſe they did it out of a Spiritual good, before which a Carnal one is not to be preferred. As to the Euchariſt, it is good to receive it daily, provided there be no prickings of Conſcience, and no danger of receiving our own Condemnation. Not that I would have Men faſt on* Sundays, *or in the Fifty days after* Eaſter, *but I muſt ſtill return to my Principle,* **That every Countrey ought to follow its own Cuſtom, and look upon the Ordinances of their Anceſtors as Apoſtolical Laws.** This Letter was written about the Year 406.

Lucinius to whom this Letter is directed being dead. S. *Jerom* comforts his Widow *Theodora*, in the following Letter, in which he citeth there the Books of S. *Irenæus* with Commendation.

S. *Jerom*'s Eight and twentieth Letter is a Funeral Oration, in Commendation of a *Roman* Lady called *Fabiola*. This Lady had a former very lewd Husband, and having procured a Separation, ſhe was married to another; but having acknowledged her fault, ſhe did publick Penance, and was admitted to the Communion. She built at *Rome* an Hoſpital for ſick Perſons whom ſhe had aſſiſted with wonderful Zeal, and ſurprizing Charity. S. *Jerom* commendeth chiefly thoſe generous Actions, and ſpeaks of the Journey which ſhe had undertaken to *Bethlehem*, where ſhe remained ſome time with him. This Letter was written in 400, two years after the Funeral Diſcourſe for *Paulina*, and Four years after that for *Nepotian*, as S. *Jerom* ſays in the beginning.

The Nine and twentieth is a Note to *Theophilus*, wherein he excuſeth himſelf, that he had not yet tranſlated into Latin that Biſhop's Book concerning *Eaſter*, becauſe of the troubles of the Church that had diſquieted him, and *Paula*'s Death which had overwhelmed him with Grief; So that this Letter was written in the Year 404.

In the Thirtieth, S. *Jerom* comforteth a *Spaniard*, one *Abigaüs*, for the loſs of his ſight, he commends his Piety, and deſires him to exhort *Theodora*, *Lucinius* his Widow, to continue her Journey to *Jeruſalem*, this ſhows that this Letter was written after *Lucinius* his Death, about the Year 408, or 409.

The Thirty firſt is likewiſe a Letter of comfort to another Blind man, one *Caſtrutius*, who was S. *Jerom*'s Countrey-man. He thanks him for beginning his Journey to come to ſee him, but deſires him, to undertake the Journey next year. The Year of this

S. *Jerom.*

this Letter is not known. It is probable that it was written very near the same time with the foregoing.

In the Two and thirtieth, having administred comfort to *Julianus* one of his Friends, for the loss of two Daughters, of his Wife and Estate, and for the Discontents occasioned by his Son-in-Law, he adviseth him to give himself to God, and embrace a monastical Life: This Letter is written from the Solitudes of *Bethlehem* about the Year 408.

In the Thirty third, he exhorteth *Exuperantius* to forsake the Wars, and the World, and to withdraw himself with his Brother *Quintillian* to *Bethlehem.*

The Thirty fourth is to his Aunt *Castorina*, with whom he had had some difference, he intreats her by this Letter to be reconciled to him, this Letter was in all probability written during S. *Jerom's* first retreat, and since he tells her, that he had written to her the year before upon the same Subject, this must be of the Year 373, or 374.

The Five and thirtieth was written at the same time. He prays *Julian* the Deacon to send him News of his own Countrey, and gives him thanks for sending word, that his Sister continued in the resolution not to Marry.

The Thirty sixth to *Theodosius* and the other Monks, was written by S. *Jerom*, after his quitting the Desart of *Syria* in 374. where those Monks dwelt. He desires them to pray, that God would call him back into the Desart.

The Thirty seventh to the Virgins dwelling upon Mount *Hermon*, is written from the Desart of *Syria*, about the Year 373. He complains that they had not answered the Letters that he had written to them.

The Eight and thirtieth is certainly not S. *Jerom's*, and there is nothing in it worth Observation.

In the Thirty ninth he invites *Rufinus* Presbyter of *Aquileia*, who was then in *Egypt*, to come to him in his Solitude of *Syria*, where he was alone with *Evagrius* only, after the going away of *Heliodorus*, and the Death of *Innocent* and *Hylas*. This Letter is of 373, or 374.

The Fortieth, Forty first, Forty second, and Forty third, are very near of the same time, they are written to his old Friends at *Aquileia*. The First to *Niceas* Deacon of that Town, the Second to *Chromatius*, *Eusebius*, and *Jovinus*: The Third to *Chrysogonus* a Monk of *Aquileia*: and the last to another Monk called *Anthony*. These are of no great Consequence.

The Forty fourth to *Rusticus* is more useful. He exhorts that Man to do Penance, urging several places of Scripture touching Repentance. He invites him to visit the Holy places. This Letter is not of the same Stile with the rest of this Father's Letters.

The Forty fifth Letter is a biting Satyr against Virgins and Women, who dwelt with Clergy Men that were not of their Kindred.

The Six and fortieth is a Declamation against *Sabinianus* a Deacon, whose Life had been disorderly both in his own Countrey and at *Bethlehem*. These Three last are written from the Solitude of *Bethlehem*. The year is uncertain.

The Seven and fortieth is an Historical Narrative of a Woman of *Vercelle*, who having been falsly accused of Adultery, and condemned to die, tho' she constantly denied the Fact, was tortured seven times, but could not be put to Death. The Stile of this Letter is florid and childish, tho' S. *Jerom* writ it when he was well in years.

The Life of S. *Paul* the first Hermite, is one of S. *Jerom's* first Works. This man at Fifteen years of Age withdrew himself into the Desarts of *Thebais*, when *Valerian* and *Decius* persecuted the Church, fearing his want of strength to resist the Temptation. He spent there the rest of his Life, which lasted 113 years. S. *Jerom* gives an account of the manner of his being visited by S. *Anthony*, and describes several Circumstances of that History that are very hard to be believed.

The Life of S. *Hilarion* is full of Miracles of that Holy Anchorete S. *Anthony's* Disciple. S. *Jerom* places it in his Catalogue, amongst those Books which he wrote after his Return from *Rome* to *Bethlehem*. Likewise he makes mention there of the History of a Monk in the Desart of *Chalcis* called *Malchus*, who having quitted the Monastery to return into his Countrey, was taken and carried away Captive by the *Saracens*.

This Volume endeth with his Book of the Famous men, or Ecclesiastical Writers, written in Latin by S. *Jerom*, and translated into Greek, as it is supposed, by *Sophronius (n)*. He did it at the request of *Flavius Dexter*, *Præfectus Prætorio*, in imitation of *Suetonius*, and other profane Authors, who writ the Lives of Philosophers, and other Famous men. He confesses that *Eusebius* his Books did him much Service: He intreats the Authors of his own time, whom he doth not mention, not to take it ill; he declares that he did not intend to conceal their Works, but that they had never come to his hands; but however, if their Writings make them Famous, his silence will not long prejudice them. Lastly, he observes that this Treatise confounds *Celsus*, *Porphyry*, *Julian*, and the other sworn Enemies of the Church, who reproached it as having no Philoso-

(n) *By* Sophronius.] *Erasmus* published this Version under *Sophronius's* Name upon the credit of a Manuscript. None doubted at first, but that it was his. Mr. *Vossius* the Father owned it, but M. *Isaac Vossius* his Son, contradicted that Opinion in his Notes upon S. *Ignatius's* Epistles: where he boldly affirms, that this Version is not *Sophronius's*: that it is very bad, that he that made it did not understand Greek; that it is visible that it was written by an Impostor. *Huetius* in his Book, *De optimo genere interpretandi*, refutes *Vossius*, and doth not doubt but that Translation was made by *Sophronius*.

phers,

S. *Jerom.* phers, no Orators, or learned Men; by proving to them that it was eſtabliſhed, uphield and adorned by very great Men. This Book comprehends the Catalogue of Eccleſiaſtical Authors, and Writers, from Jeſus Chriſt to S. *Jerom*'s time. It concludes with a Catalogue of the Works which this Father had compoſed to the Fourth year of the Emperor *Theodoſius*, which is the Year 392, of Jeſus Chriſt.

The Second Tomb, which is in the ſame Volume contains the Letters, or rather the Diſcourſes of Diſpute and Controverſie.

The Firſt is his Treatiſe againſt *Helvidius, of the perpetual Virginity of the Bleſſed Virgin Mary.* That man had written a Book wherein he pretended to ſhew by Teſtimonies of the New Teſtament, and the Opinions of ſome ancient Fathers, that after the Birth of Chriſt the Virgin *Mary* had Children, by *Joſeph* her Husband. The firſt paſſage of Scripture which *Helvidius* cites for his Opinion is that of S. *Matthew, ch.* 1. *The Virgin being eſpouſed was found with Child, before* Joſeph *and ſhe came together: Helvidius* concluded from this place, that therefore they came together afterwards. S. *Jerom* anſwers him, That this Conſequence doth not follow, becauſe that a thing is often ſaid to have been done before another, which other is never to be done: and that when it is ſaid ſuch a one died before Penance, it doth not follow, that he, of whom this is ſpoken, does Penance in the other World; ſo likewiſe from what S. *Matthew* ſaith, That ſhe was found with Child before *Joſeph* knew her, it doth not follow, that he knew her after ſhe was with Child. The Second paſſage quoted by *Helvidius* is another of the ſame Evangeliſt, Joſeph *knew not his Wife till ſhe had brought forth her Son*; *Helvidius* concludes from this paſſage as from the former, therefore he knew her after ſhe was delivered. He maintained that the word *until* always ſignifyed in Scripture a fixed time, after which the thing would come to paſs. S. *Jerom* ſhews him, that tho' this is often true, yet there are ſeveral paſſages where it ſignifies an unlimited time, as it is ſaid of God, *I am, till you are grown old*, or *until that*, which can never deſcribe the Term, or the end of God's exiſtence, ſeeing he is for ever. And when Jeſus Chriſt ſaith in the Goſpel, *I am with you to the end of the World*; it were ridiculous to conclude, Wherefore he will be no more after the World's end.

Helvidius's Third Objection is grounded on the Title of *Firſt Born* given to Jeſus Chriſt, *Luk. ch.* 2. S. *Jerom* affirms, that it doth not ſuppoſe that he had younger Brethren, for in the Language of the Scripture, every Child of the firſt lying in of a Woman is called Firſt-born, theſe words being Synonymous, *Adaperiens vulvam* and *Primogenitum*, as appears, *Numb.* 18. *Exod.* 13. *Levit.* 12. *Luk.* 2.

The laſt Objection is taken from what is ſaid in Scripture that Jeſus Chriſt had Brethren; now among his Brethren, ſaid *Helvidius*, are reckoned S. *James*, and *Joſes* Son of *Mary*: as it is ſaid, *Matt.* 27. *Mark* 15. *Luk.* 24. That *Mary* the Mother of *James* and *Joſes* was preſent at the Paſſion, and at the Burial of Jeſus Chriſt, but this *Mary*, ſaid he, is the Mother of the Lord; for it is not likely, that ſhe ſhould forſake him upon that occaſion. S. *Jerom* anſwers, that it is very certain by S. *John*'s Teſtimony, that *Mary* the Mother of God was near the Croſs of Jeſus Chriſt at his Paſſion, ſince he recommends her to that Evangeliſt; but that *Mary* the Mother of *James*, and *Joſes* is different from the Mother of the Lord, ſeeing that of the two Apoſtles called *James*, one was Son of *Zebedee*, and the other of *Alpheus*. But it cannot be ſaid that the Lord's Mother was married to either of theſe two Perſons. He maintains then, that *Mary* the Mother of *James* and *Joſes* was the Wife of *Alpheus*, and Siſter to the Mother of our Lord, and is alſo called *Mary Cleophe*. The Conjecture not being very certain, S. *Jerom* gives this general Anſwer, That the word *Brother* is equivocal, and is taken Four ways, a Brother by Nature, by Nation, by Relation, and by Affection; but ſticks to the Brother-hood by Blood, ſhewing by ſeveral places of Scripture, that Couſins, and near Kindred are called Brethren.

Having thus with much Wit and Learning, refuted the falſe Conſequences that *Helvidius* drew from thoſe paſſages of the New Teſtament: S. *Jerom* oppoſes to *Tertullian*, and *Victorinus* whom *Helvidius* had quoted, the Authority of S. *Ignatius*, S. *Polycarp*, S. *Irenæus*, S. *Juſtin*, and other ancient Apoſtolical Authors, who had written againſt the Hereticks *Ebion*, *Theodorus* of *Byzantium*, and *Valentinus*, whom S. *Jerom* pretends to have been of *Helvidius* his Opinion. But the Error of thoſe Hereticks was far more intolerable, and we do not read that the Fathers quoted by S. *Jerom*, did preciſely refute *Helvidius*'s Error. However S. *Jerom* rejects *Tertullian*'s Authority, by ſaying, That he was not of the Church; and as for *Victorinus Patarionenſis*, he ſaith, That his Teſtimony hath no greater difficulty than that of the Scripture, ſince he ſpeaks of Chriſt's Brethren, but does not ſay that they were the Sons of *Mary*. In the latter part of this Diſcourſe, he ſpeaks like an Orator of the inconveniencies of Marriage, and the Advantages of Virginity. This Treatiſe was compoſed at *Rome*, about the Year 383.

In his Treatiſe againſt *Jovinian*, he further defends the Excellency of Virginity. This *Jovinian* had aſſerted in a ſmall Diſcourſe publiſhed at *Rome*, That Widows and married Women were not to be leſs regarded than Virgins, if they have the ſame Vertues; This was the firſt Error of this man. The Second was, That a Chriſtian baptized could not fall from Righteouſneſs. The Third, That Abſtinence from certain Meats was unprofitable: The laſt, That the glorified Saints are all equally Happy. S. *Jerom* refutes the firſt of theſe Errors in the firſt Book. He explains at firſt S. *Paul*'s Notions concerning Marriage and Virginity; afterwards he takes notice of the Examples of the Old and New Teſtament, which *Jovinian* had brought to prove, that the

greateſt

greateſt Saints and moſt excellent men of all Ages had been Married. S. *Jerom* ſhews that he has multiplied thoſe Examples too much: He affirms that the Apoſtles left their Wives, after their Call to the Apoſtleſhip, and that S. *John* being called before he was Married, always lived in Celibacy: He anſwers thoſe places of Scripture alledged by *Jovinian*, and diſcourſes of the Celibacy of Biſhops, Prieſts, and Deacons. He condemns ſecond Marriages with much ſeverity, and produces ſeveral Examples of Heathen Women that either kept their Virginity, or continued in Widowhood. S. *Jerom.*

In the ſecond Book he refutes *Jovinian*'s other errours. He ſhews againſt the ſecond, that the holieſt of Men may fall from Baptiſmal Grace. Againſt the third, that tho' God is the Creator of all things fit for Man's uſe, yet it is good to faſt, and uſe abſtinence, and that it is very dangerous to indulge one's Senſes, and ſatisfie greedineſs. Laſtly, that as there are various degrees of Vice, and Vertue here in this life, ſo there are likewiſe in the other ſeveral degrees of felicity and pain. Theſe Books were not compleated by S. *Jerom* when he writ his book *of famous men* tho' he mentions theſe two books there: and ſo they are of the year 392.

Theſe Books being publiſhed at *Rome*, ſeveral perſons found fault with the hard terms which S. *Jerom* made uſe of in ſpeaking of Marriage. *Pammachius* having ſent word of it to S. *Jerom* hinting withall at the principal Paſſages excepted againſt. This Father expounds them in the apology directed to him, declaring that it was never his intention to condemn Matrimony.

He found himſelf obliged a ſecond time to defend himſelf from the ſame accuſation againſt a Monk; and this he does in the Letter intituled the fifty firſt to *Domnion.*

The fifty ſecond Letter to *Pammachius* was joyned to the apology directed to him. He thanks him for ſecuring the Copies of his Books againſt *Jovinian*; but he tells him that it was impoſſible to ſuppreſs them: that he had not the good fortune to be able always to correct his own Works, as ſome had; becauſe he had no ſooner compoſed them, but they were made publick even againſt his Will. He inſults over thoſe that found fault, challenging them to write againſt him. He adviſeth him to read the Commentaries of *Dionyſius*, *Rheticius*, *Euſebius*, *Apollinarius*, and *Didymus*, who expounded that paſſage of the Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*, and ſpoke in the behalf of Virginity more powerfully than himſelf. He ſends him Word, that he had Tranſlated out of the Hebrew, the Books of the Prophets, of *Job*, and that he had written Commentaries upon the twelve Minor Prophets, and upon the Book of Kings. He obſerves that if his Tranſlation of *Job* be compared with the Greek, and the old Latin Verſion, there will be found ſuch a difference as is betwixt truth and falſhood.

The fifty third Letter is directed to *Riparius* a Presbyter in *Spain*, who deſired to know his opinion of a Book of *Vigilantius* a Presbyter of *Barcelona*; who condemned the Veneration of Relicks, and the Worſhip of Saints. S. *Jerom* exclaims againſt that errour, and prayeth *Riparius* to ſend him his Book that he might refute it at large, and this he does with great earneſtneſs in the Treatiſe that followeth this Letter, written two years after, as he himſelf affirms. He taxeth *Vigilantius*, with reviving *Jovinian*'s errours, and wonders that any Biſhops ſhould be of his mind. If, ſaith he, *the name of Biſhops may be given to ſuch as will Ordain no Deacons, except they are Married: what will the Churches of the Eaſt, thoſe of* Egypt, *and even of the See of* Rome, *which do not admit into the Clergy any but ſuch as are unmarried, or who, being married profeſs to live as if they were not?*

Having made this occaſional remark concerning the celibacy of Clarks, he particularly undertakes *Vigilantius*'s errour about Relicks and the Invocation of Saints. This Man maintained that the Bones of the dead were not to be honoured, and that the Saints could not hear our Prayers. S. *Jerom* puts himſelf into a great heat to prove the contrary, and falls upon *Vigilantius* with a great deal of reproachful Language. In that Treatiſe he likewiſe defends the Feſtivals of Saints, the Solemnities practiſed upon their Eves, Pilgrimages to *Jeruſalem*, the Monaſtick State, and the uſe of lighted Torches only in the Night; for he owns, that in his time they lighted none in the Day. *We*, ſaith he, *do not light Torches in the day time*, as you accuſe us, but only in the Night, that their Light may afford joy and comfort in the Obſcurity of the Night. This Treatiſe was written long after the Book *of famous Men*, about the year 406.

The fifty fourth Letter to *Marcella*, is againſt the errours of the Diſciples of *Montanus*. He not only lays them open, but accuſeth them, 1. Of owning but one perſon in God. 2. Of condemning ſecond Marriages, as adulterous. 3. Of holding the obligation to keep three Lents. 4. That they did not acknowledge Biſhops to be the Apoſtle's Succeſſors, and the firſt of the Hierarchical Order, but that there were two degrees of Perſons above them. 5. That they were very rigid in impoſing of Penances, and never granted Abſolution. 6. That they believed the prophecies of *Montanus*, *Priſca*, and *Maximilla*. Laſtly he ſays that they were accuſed of celebrating Criminal Myſteries with the Blood of a Martyred Child; but declares that he had rather believe that this was not true. This Letter is written about the year 400.

In the fifty fifth Letter to *Riparius*, he ſays that *Ruffinus*, whom he calls his *Catiline*, had been expelled out of *Paleſtine.*

In the fifty ſixth he commends *Apronius* for oppoſing the errors of the *Origeniſtes*, and invites him to come to *Jeruſalem.* Both theſe Letters are written under the Pontificate of *Anaſtaſius*, about the year 400.

S. Jerom.

The two following Letters are written to Pope *Damaſus*, out of the Deſarts of *Syria*. S. *Jerom* asks his advice, what he ſhould do about the diſputes then in the Eaſt. *I am*, ſaith he, *tyed to your Holineſs's Communion, that is to* S. Peter's *Chair; I know that the Church is founded upon that Rock. Whoſoever eateth the Lamb out of that Houſe, is a prophane Man. Whoſoever is not found in that Houſe ſhall Periſh by the Flood. But foraſmuch as being retired into the Deſart of* Syria, *I cannot receive the Sacrament at your hands, I follow your Collegues the Biſhops of* Egypt: *I do not know* Vitalis; *I do not communicate with* Meletius; Paulinus *is a ſtranger to me. He that gathereth not with us, ſcattereth.* He gives an account afterwards of the occaſion of thoſe Diviſions. *After the deciſion of the Council of* Nice, *after the Decree of the Council of* Alexandria, *enacted with the conſent of both the Eaſtern and Weſtern Biſhops, they yet ask of me that am a Roman a new Confeſſion of Faith, to acknowledge three Hypoſtaſes. It is an* Arian *Biſhop, and the* Montaniſts *who require that of me..... We ask what ſignifies this Word* Hypoſtaſis, *they ſay, that it ſignifies a ſubſiſting perſon; we anſwer that if it be ſo, we are of that opinion; They are not ſatisfied with our profeſſing that Sence, but they require further that we own theſe Terms. There muſt be ſome Poyſon hid under theſe words. We ſay openly, if any one owns not three ſubſiſting Perſons, let him be Anathema; but becauſe we do not uſe the Terms which they require we are accuſed of being Hereticks..... Order me if you pleaſe what I ſhould do, I will not be afraid to ſay, that there are three Hypoſtaſes, if you command me ſo to do.* Yet he is afterwards of opinion, that this way of ſpeaking is not to be approved of, becauſe the Term *Hypoſtaſis* is for the moſt part equivalent to that of Subſtance.

The fifty eighth Letter to *Damaſus* is much upon the ſame Subject, and he asks his advice with whom he ought to communicate, *Meletius*, *Paulinus*, or *Vitalis*. Theſe Letters are of 374.

The following Treatiſe is a Dialogue betwixt an Orthodox Chriſtian and a Diſciple of *Lucifer Calaritanus*. This Man defends the Conduct and Opinions of thoſe of his Sect, maintaining, that thoſe are not to be owned as Biſhops that Communicated with the *Arian* Biſhops, and that ſuch as were Baptized by Hereticks ought to be Baptized again. The Orthodox Chriſtian affirms the contrary. S. *Jerom* introduces the Orthodox Chriſtian relating the Hiſtory of the Council of *Ariminum*, and the diſſentions that troubled the Church, and ſhewing that it was a reaſonable thing to Pardon thoſe Biſhops that had been ſurprized. There is in that Treatiſe a curious paſſage about Tradition, which he proves by the cuſtom of impoſing of Hands, and the Invocation of the Holy Ghoſt, after the adminiſtration of Baptiſm. He adds, *That many other things are obſerved in the Church upon the account of Tradition without being authorized by a written Law; as*, ſaith he, *the dipping of the Head three times in Water at Baptiſm, the giving Milk, and Honey to the Baptized: not bowing the Knee upon Sundays, nor all the time betwixt Eaſter and Whitſontide.* The *Luciferian* advances this Propoſition; and the Orthodox Chriſtian agrees to it, confeſſing that the Biſhop alone lays his Hands upon the Baptized, to cauſe the Holy Ghoſt to come down upon them: that he only conferrs the Sacrament of Confirmation. But he ſays that this Cuſtom was introduced rather for the honour of the Prieſthood, than through any neceſſity; That however the Holy Ghoſt deſcends upon them that are Baptized tho' they receive not the impoſition of hands from the Biſhop. This Treatiſe was written at *Rome* about the year 384.

The 59th. Letter to *Avitus*, contains any numeration of thoſe errours which S. *Jerom* had found in the Books of *Origen*'s Principles, Tranſlated by *Rufinus*; which *Pammachius* had ſent him ten years ſince: which ſhows that it was written about the year 407.

The 60th. is a Tranſlation of S. *Epiphanius*'s Letter to *J.* of *Jeruſalem*, concerning the Ordination of *Paulinianus*, whom S. *Epiphanius* had ordained Deacon and Prieſt, in a Monaſtery of S. *Jerom*'s, which *John* of *Jeruſalem* pretended to be under his juriſdiction. This Letter is very cunningly written. He complains of the anger which *John* of *Jeruſalem* had ſhewed for that ordination, repreſenting to him that ſuch behaviour was contrary to the Spirit of the Church; and that inſtead of being angry that he had ordained a Prieſt in a Monaſtery of ſtrange Monks that were not of his Dioceſs, he ought to ſhow much ſatisfaction, becauſe there ought to be no Diſſention among Prieſts, when no other thing is aimed at but the good of the Church. " That though all Biſhops have every one " their Church committed to their Charge, and whereof they ought to take Care, and that no " Man is to Incroach upon another's Juriſdiction, yet Chriſtian Charity which hath no Bounds is " to be preferred in all things; and that the Action is not to be conſidered in its ſelf, but reſpect " ought to be had to the Circumſtances of Time, Place, Perſons, and Occaſions. He urges afterwards ſuch things as might excuſe his Ordination by ſaying, that there being but two Prieſts in their Monaſtery, *Jerom* and *Vincentius*, who would not perform any Function of their Miniſtery, he thought it his Duty to give them a Prieſt; and having met with *Paulinianus*, who ſo declined the Prieſthood, that *John* could not ſeize upon him to put him into Orders, he cauſed him to be taken by Force and Ordain'd a Deacon: and that afterwards he Ordained him Prieſt, againſt his Will, when he waited at the Altar, and that however the Ordination was performed in a Monaſtery and not in a Pariſh of his Dioceſs. He adds that the Biſhops of *Cyprus*, were much more ſimple, and careleſs in the Sence of *John* of *Jeruſalem*; for they were ſo far from finding Fault, that their Fellow-Biſhops Ordained out of their Dioceſſes, thoſe Perſons that declined the Prieſthood; That on the contrary they Exhorted them to do it. He ſpeaketh next againſt *Origen*'s Errors, and deſireth *John* of *Jeruſalem* to Condemn them. He reduceth them to Eight principal Heads, which are theſe. 1. That the Son of God does not ſee his Father. and that the

Holy

Holy Ghoſt doth not ſee the Son. 2. That Men's Souls were ſent from Heaven to the Earth for their Sins, and ſhut up in Bodies as in ſo many Priſons. 3. That the Devils ſhall repent one day of their Faults, and ſhall reign with the Saints in Heaven. 4. That *Adam* and *Eve* had no Fleſh before they committed ſin: and that the Skins wherewith they are ſaid to have been covered, ſignifie their Bodies. 5. That man ſhall not riſe again with Fleſh and Bones. 6. That the earthly Paradiſe is to be underſtood Allegorically. 7. That the Waters, which the Scripture ſpeaks of above the Firmament, are the Angels, and that thoſe which are ſaid to have been under the Earth are the Devils. 8. That by ſin Man loſt the Image of God. The latter part of this Letter is concerning a Veil whereon was painted the Image of a Man, which S. *Epiphanius* had found in a Countrey Church near *Jeruſalem*, and had cauſed it to be torn in Pieces, becauſe he condemned that Practiſe as contrary to the Cuſtom of thoſe times. We have ſhewed in another place, that this Letter was truly written by S. *Epiphanius* in 392, and tranſlated by S. *Jerom* in 393. S. *Jerom.* [See S. *Epiphan.* Vol. II.]

John of *Jeruſalem* ſeeing himſelf thus accuſed by S. *Epiphanius*, made an Apology, which he ſent to *Theophilus* Biſhop of *Alexandria*, and cauſed it to be publiſhed every where, and chiefly in the *Weſt*. *Pammachius* having ſeen it at *Rome*, wrote to S. *Jerom*, to let him know that Men were divided about that matter, and deſired him to write to him about it. S. *Jerom* did not deſerr to put Pen to Paper, and directed to him in 393. the Sixty firſt Letter, wherein he obſerves, that S. *Epiphanius* having by his Letter, laid Eight Articles of *Origen*'s Errors to *John* of *Jeruſalem*'s Charge, he had juſtified himſelf but from Three, without ſo much as mentioning the other Five. Thoſe three Articles are about the knowledge of the Son of God, the Pre-exiſtency of Souls, and the quality of Bodies after the Reſurrection. As to the firſt head *John* of *Jeruſalem* had cleared himſelf, by declaring that he was no *Arian*; but S. *Jerom* pretends that he had not juſtified *Origen*. He had explained his Opinion very obſcurely upon the Second and the Third. S. *Jerom* relates *Origen*'s Opinion upon thoſe three Articles, and refutes them with much Earneſtneſs. Then he enlarges upon the Quarrel betwixt S. *Epiphanius* and *John* of *Jeruſalem*: He complains, that the latter had addreſſed himſelf to *Theophilus* Biſhop of *Alexandria*; and that he had ſaid in the beginning of his Apology, that he was charged with the care of all the Churches. "You, *ſaith he*, directing his "Diſcourſe to *John* of *Jeruſalem*, who make your boaſt of following the Rules of the Church, and "obſerve the Canons of the Council of *Nice*, and go about to appropriate to your ſelf the Clergy "that depend upon other Biſhops, tell me I pray, Is *Paleſtine* under the Juriſdiction of the Biſhops "of *Alexandria*? If I miſtake not, it was decided in the Council of *Nice*, that *Cæſarea* was "the Metropolis of *Paleſtine*, and *Antioch* of all the *Eaſt*. You ought therefore either to ſend "to the Biſhop of *Cæſarea* with whom you knew, we Communicated; or if a Judge was to "be ſought for further off, you might have ſent your Letters to *Antioch*. But I gueſs what it "was that kept you from ſending to *Cæſarea*, or *Antioch*; I perceive what you were afraid of, "and were willing to avoid: You choſe rather to apply your ſelf to a pre-ingaged Perſon, than "to yield your Metropolitan that deference which you owe him. After that he accuſeth *Iſidore*, whom *Theophilus* had ſent to the place to inform himſelf of the ſtate of things, of being corrupted by *John* of *Jeruſalem*, of following his Paſſion, and declaring abſolutely for him; of being concerned in Compoſing the Apology, and then undertaking to carry it himſelf. "So that, "*ſaith he*, He that dictated the Letter was he that carried it. At laſt S. *Jerom* ſays, That the Original of that Quarrel was not *Paulinianus*'s Ordination, but the accuſing of *Origen*'s Errors. And this he ſets forth ſpeaking againſt *John* of *Jeruſalem* with all poſſible Vehemency. By this Letter it appears, that both S. *Jerom*, and the other Monks of *Paleſtine* had great Differences with him.

But leſt *Theophilus* perſwaded by *John* of *Jeruſalem*'s Letter, ſhould come to eſpouſe his Intereſt, S. *Jerom* directs the Sixty ſecond Letter to him, in defence of his own Cauſe. This Biſhop had ſent him a Letter by *Iſidore*, whereby he exhorted him to Peace. S. *Jerom* declares in his Anſwer, That he was deſirous of nothing more; but that ſuch as could alone procure it, were contented only to make a ſhow of being for it. That the Peace which he would have, was a true Peace, the Peace of Jeſus Chriſt, a Peace without Enmity, a Peace without War. That there could be no Peace, when one would uſurp Dominion and Empire, when he Excommunicated true Catholicks, when Men were forced to communicate with an Heretick, and to receive the Body of Jeſus Chriſt at his hands, and when violence was uſed. Theſe things he Charges upon *John* of *Jeruſalem*, and complains of the injurious Treatment wherewith he uſes him in his Letter. And as for that which *John* of *Jeruſalem* upbraided him withal, that he had formerly tranſlated *Origen*'s Books, which this Author ſo much condemns; Now he anſwers, That he was not the only Man that did it: that before him S. *Hilary* the Confeſſor had done it: but that imitating him he had expunged what was dangerous in thoſe Writings, and tranſlated what was good and uſeful; and however he had always commended *Origen* for his Ability in expounding the Scriptures, yet he had always condemned him for his Errors. *That he owned there was a vaſt difference betwixt the Apoſtles Writings, and thoſe of other Eccleſiaſtical Writers, ſince the former wrote nothing but what was true, whereas the latter were ſometimes deceived.* Afterwards he juſtifieth the Ordination of his Brother *Paulinianus*, ſaying, That S. *Epiphanius* did not ordain him in the Dioceſs of *John* of *Jeruſalem*, ſince the Monaſtery where that Ordination was performed, belonged to the Dioceſs of *Eleutheropolis*, and not to that of *Jeruſalem*: That he had done very ill

in

in aſſerting that S. *Epiphanius* had ordained a Child, ſince *Paulinianus* was then Thirty years old: That *John* himſelf was not older when he was ordained Biſhop.

S. *Jerom*

S. *Jerom* having thus pleaded for himſelf, doth in his turn likewiſe accuſe *John* of *Jeruſalem*. He ſays, That this Biſhop was the Author of all this trouble, and a Fomenter of the Diviſion: that pretending to be for Peace, he proſecuted a cruel War: That he requeſted, and obtained his Baniſhment. Here he crys out in this manner: *The Church of Chriſt*, ſaith he, *was eſtabliſhed by ſufferings, and ſhedding of Blood. Perſecutions have increaſed it, and by Martyrdom it came to be Crowned. If our Enemies were not of this Diſpoſition; if they had rather perſecute than be perſecuted; In this Countrey there are* Jews *and* Hereticks *of all ſorts, and particularly infamous* Manichees, *who hindred them from falling upon theſe; Their Spleen is againſt us, we are the only Perſons whom they intend to drive away.... One Monk*, I ſpeak it with griet, *One Monk who boaſteth of being the Biſhop of an Apoſtolick See, threatneth another Monk, deſires he ſhould be baniſhed, and accordingly 'tis done; but God be praiſed*, adds he, *Monks are not frighted with Perſecutions, they wait for the Blow without Trouble, and without offering to defend themſelves. For every Monk being out of his own Country is alſo out of the World. What need is there of the Prince's Authority, or of written Orders? Let them give us the leaſt Summons, and we will depart immediately, knowing what we are, and being perſwaded that the Earth is the Lord's, and that Jeſus Chriſt is not ſhut up in any place. He tells us of going to* Rome *to communicate with that Church, from which we ſeem to be ſeparated; but this we need not do, we are as much in Communion with the Church of* Rome *in* Palæſtine *as if we were at* Rome, *we communicate with its Prieſts which are in the Town of* Bethlehem. At laſt S. *Jerom* profeſſes that he is ready to be reconciled to *John* of *Jeruſalem*, provided he would put on a charitable Spirit, and prove the ſame towards him as he had been before. *We know*, ſaith he, *what we owe to the Biſhops of Jeſus Chriſt; but let them be contented with Honour and Reſpect, and know that they are Fathers and not Maſters; and particularly with relation to thoſe who deſpiſing Ambition, preferr reſt and quietneſs before all other things.*

After S. *Jerom*'s 63d. Letter follows *Ruffinus*'s Preface to his Tranſlation of *Origen*'s *Principles*. He ſaith in that Preface, That ſeveral perſons deſirous of learning the Holy Scriptures wiſhed that *Origen* might be made to ſpeak Latin: That his Collegue and Brother, S. *Jerom*, having tranſlated two Homilies of this Author upon the Book of *Canticles*, had ſo much exalted him in his Preface, that Men were very deſirous to ſee his Works: That he had given this advantageous Teſtimony of him, *That he exceeded all others in his Commentaries, but had ſurmounted himſelf in his Homilies upon the Book of Canticles: That this ſame S.* Jerom *had promiſed to tranſlate the other Works of this Author, but he thought it afterwards more glorious to write himſelf and to be an Author rather than an interpreter. We therefore proſecute and compleat a thing which he has both approved and began, but we cannot render* Origen's *Words with the ſame Eloquence.* And he adds, That this very thing had kept him from undertaking that Tranſlation; but at laſt he yielded to *Macarius*'s earneſt Intreaties; however that in this Verſion he had followed the Rule of thoſe who had tranſlated that Author before him; and that he had imitated S. *Jerom*, by cutting off thoſe things which ſeemed diſagreeable to the Doctrine of the Church; and ſo much the rather, becauſe in *Origen*'s Works there were Notions quite contrary: That the Reaſon of that ſeeming Contradiction might be found in the Apology that *Pamphilus* had written for *Origen*, and which himſelf had tranſlated; and that he pretended to ſhew, by undeniable Proofs, that *Origen*'s Works had been corrupted in ſeveral places by Hereticks or Men of ill deſigns; and that for this very Reaſon he had either omitted or altered in the Tranſlation of that Treatiſe, thoſe Articles wherein he ſeemed to ſpeak otherwiſe than he did in his other Books. This Preface was written in 397. when *Ruſinus* publiſhed his Verſion of the Books of *Origen*'s Principles at *Rome*.

It was no ſooner publiſhed, but *Oceanus* and *Pammachius* ſent it to S. *Jerom*, obſerving that they had found ſtill ſome Errors there, notwithſtanding that great part was expunged: intreating him, that to ſecure them in the Truth, he would make a Faithful Tranſlation of that Work. The Note which they writ to him about that Buſineſs, is the ſixty fourth Letter.

S. *Jerom* thinking himſelf indirectly affronted by *Ruſinus*'s Preface, intimating that he had formerly commended *Origen*, which might inſinuate that he then approved his Errors, and approved them ſtill, fell inſtantly to writing, to let the World know in what Sence he had commended *Origen*: He owns that he did it in two places of his Works, namely, in the Prologue of his Tranſlation of the Homilies upon the *Canticles*, dedicated to *Damaſus*, and in the Preface to his Treatiſe *of Hebrew Names*. But he affirms, that in both theſe places, he had not ſpoken either of his Doctrine or of his Opinions. *I have commended him*, ſaith he, *as an able Interpreter, and not as a man whoſe Dogm's ought to be followed; I have admired his Parts without approving his Doctrine, I have valued his Philoſophy, and not his Preaching.* He adds, *That if any man would know what his Opinion has always been concerning* Origen's *Books, let him but read his Commentaries upon* Eccleſiaſtes, *and his three Volumes upon the Epiſtle to the* Epheſians, *whereby it will appear that he hath conſtantly contradicted* Origen's *Opinions. Huetius* is not perfectly ſatisfied with this Excuſe of S. *Jerom*: He ſays that it doth not appear by the Commentaries which he citeth, that he hath contradicted *Origen*'s Notions, tho' he hath filled them with that Author's Dogm's without quoting him. *If he believed them falſe*, ſays he, *ought he not to have cenſured them? Why did he not think it an Honour to Copy them, as he affirms in the Preface to the ſecond Book of his*

Commentary

Commentary upon the Prophet Micah? *Why hath he asserted in his Preface to the Book of* Hebrew Names, *That none but an ignorant man could deny that* Origen *was one of the Masters of the Church, after the Apostles.* " These Reasons made *Huetius* say, That *Rufinus* was in the right " in accusing S. *Jerom* of being an *Origenist*, and upbraiding him in his first Invective, that the " Name of a Master of the Church cannot be given to an Heretick; that S. *Jerom*'s Excuse is " pitiful; that *Rufinus* thoroughly proves that he commended *Origen*'s Doctrine; and that at " last this Father is obliged to confess that his Opinions were altered as to *Origen*: That *Sulpi-* " *tius Severus* had a great deal of Reason to find fault, that S. *Jerom* having at first followed " *Origen*, did of a sudden condemn all his Works: That S. *Augustin* did justly accuse him of " Inconstancy and Lightness; and that Pope *Pelagius* the II. is not to be blamed for putting " him amongst *Origen*'s Disciples. *That, in a word, tho' this Holy Doctor acted the part of a good Catholick in abjuring* Origen's *Errors after he had owned them; yet it were to be wished he had been more constant and moderate, and that he had not so much indulged the Motions of his inflamed Choler, so as to be carried away unto contrary Notions, according to the different Circumstances of Time, and outrageous railing against the greatest Men of his Age. For this must be acknowledged, that* Rufinus *reproved him often with Reason, and that he often blamed* Rufinus *without Ground.* This is the Judgment which the Learned *Huetius*, now nominated to the Bishoprick of *Soissons*, doth with much Reason and Justice make of the Parts and Conduct of S. *Jerom.* I willingly subscribe to it, and do not doubt but that as many as have ever read this Father, will be of the same Mind*.

S. *Jerom.*

[* By this it will appear that things are not always to be approved or disapproved upon S. *Jerom*'s Word. In his management of his Quarrel he is deserted by the Papists, because they condemn the Errors of *Origen* as well as he, and therefore they cannot with any Decency excuse his Carriage towards *Rufinus*; but in his Controversies with *Jovinian* and *Vigilantius*, *concerning Virginity, and Invocation of Saints*, he is applauded by them; only the wiser men amongst them are a little out of Countenance at his Heat: It is a Misfortune that *Jovinian*'s and *Vigilantius*'s Books are lost; and there is Reason to believe from those other Disputes wherein S. *Jerom* was ingaged, that if we knew what they said for themselves, instead of thinking them Hereticks, we should esteem them illustrious Defenders of the Christian Religion against that Superstition which an immoderate Zeal for a Monastical Life, did at that time introduce into the Church. *Jovinian* indeed is accused of maintaining, That a Christian who is baptized cannot fall away from Grace, which is a very great Error; but it had no relation to his other Opinions, and since Obstinacy is necessary to make a man a Heretick, it would be rashness to call *Jovinian* a Heretick of whom we know nothing, but what we have from his Enemies.]

And now to return to our Subject: S. *Jerom* going on to justifie himself of those things which they reproached him withal, namely, of commending *Origen*, sets forth some Examples of great Men that might be commended for their Learning, who did hold very remarkable Errors. " S. *Cyprian*, saith he, took *Tertullian* for his Tutor, as appears by his Writings, and yet did " not approve the Dreams of *Montanus* and *Maximilla* as he did. *Apollinarius* hath written " very convincing Books against *Porphyrius*; and *Eusebius* writ a most useful History of the " Church. The former erred concerning the Mystery of the Incarnation, and the latter defends " the Opinions of *Arius*. He owns that he was *Apollinaris*'s Disciple, *Didymus*'s Scholar, yea; that he hath had a *Jew* for his Master; that he collected carefully all *Origen*'s Works, and read them exactly, but affirms, that he never followed his Errors. Lastly, to make short, he saith, that if he may be believed, he never was an *Origenist*, and that tho he had been, yet now he ceaseth to be so. Upon this Principle he exhorts others to imitate him, and to condemn his Errors; after that, he gives *Origen* high Commendations, rejecting his Opinions. He refutes what *Rufinus* had asserted, that the Errors which were found in *Origen*'s Works had been added; and laughs at the Liberty which he had taken to expunge what he thought fit. Last of all, he affirms, that the first Book of the Apology for *Origen*, which bore the Name of *Pamphilus*, was not that Martyrs, but *Didymus*'s, or at least some other Author's. This Letter is written near 150 years after *Origen*'s Death, that is, in the year 399.

The Sixty sixth Letter to *Rufinus*, wherein he complains of his Preface, is written at the same time. He speaks to him as to a person with whom he would not quite fall out; he telleth him, that he knew not with what Spirit he writ that Preface, but that all the World saw how it was to be understood; that he might have been even with him, by commending him after the like malicious Manner, but that he chose rather to justify himself of the Crime laid to his Charge than offend his Friend; that he intreated him to cite him no more after the same manner; that he undertook to write to him about it as to his Friend, rather than to ingage with him publickly. To let him know that he would do nothing that might check that sincere Reconciliation which he had made with him, he exhorts him on his part to do the same, least, saith he, that biting one another we do not mutually consume one another.

Rufinus, who was not of a Temper to lie still without replying, immediately put pen to Paper to write against S. *Jerom*. *Paulinianus*, who was then in the West, having found a Way to get the Extracts of *Rufinus* his Book before it was quite published, sent them to his Brother, who besides was informed by *Pammachius* and *Marcellinus*, of the principal Heads contained in *Rufinus*'s Answer, and so he composed immediately his first Apology divided into two Books.

In the First he answers *Rufinus*'s Calumnies. The First was, that he had translated into Latin the Books of *Origen*'s *Principles* without altering.

S. Jerom. S. *Jerom* anſwers that he did it, to ſhow the falſity of *Rufinus* his Tranſlation, and to ſhew *Origen*'s Errors, and ſo his Tranſlation could hurt no body, ſince it appeared that it was made only to condemn the Errors of that Book.

To juſtifie *Origen*'s Doctrine about the Trinity, *Rufinus* had quoted the Firſt Book of *Pamphilus*'s Apology. S. *Jerom* affirms, that it was not compoſed by that Martyr.

Rufinus laid before him the Praiſes which he had given to *Origen*. He anſwers as he did before, that he had commended his Learning but not his Doctrine, as he had commended *Euſebius* and *Apollinaris* without approving their Errors.

Rufinus charged him with publiſhing Errors, and Contradictions in his Commentaries. He ſays that he did it without approving of them; that he has collected in his Commentaries, the Notions and Words of others, obſerving that ſome underſtood thoſe paſſages in one Sence, and others in another, that ſo the prudent Reader may chuſe what is truth, and reject what is falſe; and that in this Caſe none can Tax him with Errors, and Contradictions, who barely relates the Notions, and different Expoſitions of others. This he proves by the Example of the ableſt Commentators of profane Authors.

Rufinus had found fault, that he had variouſly tranſlated the Twelth Verſe of the ſecond *Pſalm*, where the vulgar Tranſlation ſaith, *Embrace the Diſcipline*, by rendring it according to the Hebrew, ſometimes *worſhip the Son*, ſometimes *worſhip ye only*. S. *Jerom* tells him, That he had kept to the Sence rather than to the Letter, tranſlating the Hebrew word *Naſhecu*, which ſignifieth, *Kiſs* or *Embrace*, by this term *Worſhip ye*; That as to the other word *Bar*, which hath ſeveral Significations, (for it ſignifies *the Son*, or *a handful of pickt Ears of Corn*,) he had followed the former Signification in his Commentary, and that in his Verſion, to prevent the *Jews* accuſing *Chriſtians* of falſifying the Holy Scripture, he adher'd to the latter Signification, which both *Aquila* and *Symmachus* followed.

Rufinus found fault likewiſe with ſeveral paſſages in S. *Jerom*'s Commentary upon the Epiſtle to the *Epheſians*, in which he had abridged the Commentaries of *Origen*. S. *Jerom* defends himſelf, by ſaying that he produced *Origen*'s Opinions without approving of them, ſince he obſerves at the ſame time, that thoſe Explications were not his own.

Laſtly *Rufinus* upbraided S. *Jerom*, that he was naturally given to Calumniating, and ſpeaking evil of every Body: That he reproved other Mens works out of Envy: Yea, he laid Perjury to his Charge; becauſe having proteſted before the Judgment Seat of Chriſt (as he ſays in his Book *of the Inſtruction of Virgin's*,) that he would read no more the Books of profane Authors, yet it did appear, that he had not left off reading of them. S. *Jerom* juſtifieth himſelf from the former Accuſations; but as to the laſt he thinks it an Honour to follow the Study of learned Books, and declares, that whatſoever he hath ſaid in the Treatiſe *concerning the Inſtruction of Virgins*, was only the Deſcription of a Dream.

Towards the latter end of this Letter, he aſſerts that what he had ſaid in the Eighty third Epiſtle to *Oceanus*, That Baptiſm remits all Sins, that it blots out even the very ſpot of *Bigamy*: So that a Man might be ordained after a ſecond Marriage, if the former was before Baptiſm. This Deciſion is contrary to that of Pope *Innocent* I.

S. *Jerom* having thus pleaded for himſelf againſt *Rufinus*'s accuſations, anſwers the Apology which he had made to ſatisfie Pope *Anaſtaſius* who had Condemned him, and to juſtifie himſelf of thoſe things that they Reproached him withall. He made Profeſſion of the Faith of the Church, and of the Myſtery of the Holy Trinity at firſt. S. *Jerom* anſwers that this is not the Queſtion, for now all Mankind was perſwaded of that Principle concerning the Incarnation. S. *Jerom* asks him what he thought of the Soul of *Chriſt*, whether it was Created before or at the Moment of his Conception. He chargeth him that he did not ſpeak plain enough about the Reſurrection of the Body, and further he pretends that *Rufinus* did not ſufficiently explain himſelf upon the Eternity of the Devil's puniſhment. Concerning the Origination of the Soul he had ſaid that there were three different Opinions; Some held that one Soul begat another, as *Tertullian* and *Lactantius*. Others that God Created them after the Forming of the Body, and ſo they came in by Infuſion; and laſtly ſome imagined that they were made when God Created the World of nothing; that this was *Origen*'s Opinion, and that of ſome other Greeks: For his part, he was at no certainty about it, but left it to God, and to thoſe to whom it ſhould pleaſe God to Reveal it: But that he believed what the Church openly profeſſed, that God was the Creator of Souls, and Bodies. S. *Jerom* torments himſelf much about the laſt Point, and tho' he doth not ſay that any of theſe three Opinions are decided, yet he enveigheth much againſt *Rufinus*, becauſe he would not Condemn *Origen*'s Opinion. He endeavours afterwards to Refute the Reaſons which he alledged to juſtifie himſelf for Tranſlating the Books of *Origen*'s Principles: He finds fault that he ſhould ſtrike out ſome of the Errors and leave the reſt. He anſwers thoſe Conjectures which he brought to ſhow that *Origen*'s Books were Corrupted; and ſince he had aſſerted the ſame thing of the paſſages in the Works of the ancients, as in S. *Clemens*, *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria*, and which did not ſeem to be agreeable to the Doctrine of the Church, of the Myſtery of the Holy Trinity: He denies that that can be reaſonably ſaid, obſerving that if ſuch Conjectures may take place, the greateſt Hereticks ſhould thereby be eaſily excuſed, as *Marcian*, *Manichæus*, *Arius*, *Eunomius*. But as *Rufinus* might have preſſed upon S. *Jerom* by asking him, Why then were there any Errors in their Works, and whether he would call them Hereticks upon that Account? S. *Jerom*

prevents

prevents that Objection by ſaying, *That perhaps they were in an Error, or the expreſſions they made uſe of had another Sence, or their Works might be Corrupted by Tranſcribers; or laſtly, that Writing before the* Arian *Hereſie appeared, they did not take the neceſſary Precautions againſt it.* S. Jerom.
When S. *Jerom* made theſe remarks, he did not conſider, that *Ruſinus* might uſe them to defend *Origen*, as he did to excuſe the Ancients: and perhaps this way of juſtifying him had been more Solid than that which he made uſe of, by ſaying that thoſe Errors had been added. This S. *Jerom* oppoſes with all his Might, and endeavours to ſhow, that all the Examples of falſification of the Fathers Works alledged by *Ruſinus*, have no Relation to thoſe that are ſuppoſed to be in *Origen*'s Books. In the reſt of the Letter he juſtifies himſelf from that Calumny, that he blamed the Verſion of the *Septuagint*. He declares, that he was ſo far from Condemning it, that he had Corrected it himſelf, and ſpake much in its Commendation. But he aſſerts that this Tranſlation was not Compoſed by the LXX in diſtinct Cells, and he defends thoſe that have recourſe to the Hebrew Text.

Ruſinus was much ſurprized to ſee an Anſwer to a Book that was not yet publiſhed, and he Writ immediately to S. *Jerom* about it, and ſent him withall an intire Copy of his firſt Anſwer. This Father who was not wont to leave any thing unanſwered that was againſt him, wrote immediately the third Book of his Apology, which contains nothing but Perſonal Quarrels, or Repetitions of what had been ſaid before: which commonly proves the end of all diſputes that continue long betwixt learned Men.

Pelagius having made his Errors publick. S. *Jerom*, who ſuffered no New Opinion in the Church to paſs unpuniſhed, fell upon him Vigorouſly in his Letter to *Cteſiphon*.

The firſt Maxim of *Pelagius*, which he oppoſes, is that of *Apathy*, that is, Freedom from Paſſions, which this Heretick thought Men could attain unto; and that having once got thus far, they might be without Sin.

The Second is concerning the Grace of *Jeſus Chriſt*, whereof *Pelagius* denyed the Neceſſity, affirming that Mens Salvation depended upon the Power of their free Will. S. *Jerom*, as well as S. *Auguſtin* oppoſes this Error, by ſhewing the neceſſity of Prayer, and of good Works. *If* ſaith he, *the Grace of* Jeſus Chriſt *dependeth upon our Will, if we need only a free Will, and none other help is required, to what purpoſe ſhould Prayer be made to God? Wherefore do we endeavour to move his Clemency, and call upon him for Succour, to obtain daily that which is in our own Power? ..... We muſt therefore remove faſting alſo and Continence: For why ſhould I Labour to get that by my Induſtry, which always depends on my ſelf?* He adds that this Conſequence follows ſo Naturally upon this Heretick's Principles, that one of his own Party could not forbear reaſoning after this manner in a Commentary, ſaying; *That if there is need of Foreign help to do good, then Liberty is deſtroy'd.* " S. *Jerom* ſaith againſt this Error, That we have nothing but what is the Gift of God: " That indeed it is Man's part to run and to will, but he hath need of God's aſſiſtance, to do it: " That it is not enough, that God ſhould once give us his Grace, he muſt give it Conſtantly: " If we would obtain we muſt ask for it, and having obtained it, there is need of asking again: " And yet this Grace does not deſtroy free-will, neither does it follow upon theſe Principles, that " it is impoſſible to keep God's Commandments.

The Third Maxim of *Pelagius* refuted by S. *Jerom* in this Letter, is a Conſequence of the former. He held, that Man could be perfect, and freed from Sin, without God's help. S. *Jerom* proves the contrary by ſeveral places of Scripture, which ſhew that Man cannot be delivered, but by the Grace of *Jeſus Chriſt*. This Letter is of the Year 411.

He handleth the ſame Queſtions in the Dialogue againſt the *Pelagians*, where he introduces a *Pelagian*, under the Name of *Critobulus*, diſcovering and eſtabliſhing his Errors; and a Catholick under the Name of *Atticus* confuting them particularly, by Teſtimonies of Holy Scripture. This Dialogue is divided into two Books, and was written ſome time after the Letter to *Cteſiphon* about the Year 415.

The Sixty ſeventh Letter is a Tranſlation of a Letter from *Theophilus* to S. *Epiphanius*, whereby he deſires that Biſhop of *Cyprus* to aſſemble a *Synod* in that Iſland, to Condemn *Origen*, as he had done in *Egypt*. This Letter is of the Year 399.

The Sixty eighth is a Letter of S. *Jerom*'s to *Theophilus*, who had ſent him Word, that he ſhould be exact in the obſervation of the Canons. S. *Jerom* thanks him for his admonition, and exhorts him to uſe his Authority againſt the *Origeniſts*, ſince Patience and Meekneſs could not reclaim them from their Error. This Letter is of the Year 398.

The Sixty ninth is from *Theophilus* to S. *Jerom*, giving him notice how he had driven away the Monks of *Nitria* who were accuſed of *Origeniſm*. S. *Jerom* returns him Thanks for that Noble Action by the Seventieth Letter. And he commends him again in the Seventy firſt Letter for what he had done againſt *Origen*. And in the laſt Place *Theophilus* acquaints him by the Seventy ſecond that he had cleanſed the Monaſteries of *Nitria* of *Origeniſm*.

The Seventy third is from S. *Epiphanius* to S. *Jerom*, giving him notice of the Judgment given by *Theophilus* againſt *Origen*: and he ſends him the Letter written by that Biſhop, and prays him to Publiſh what he had written in Latin upon that Matter.

The Seventy fourth is a Note to *Marcella*.

The Seventy fifth is againſt *Vigilantius*, who had accuſed him of *Origeniſm*, he uſes the ſame Arguments for his defence, that he had done in his other Letters, and treats *Vigilantius* very ill. This Letter was written, about the Year 397.

The

S. Jerom. The Seventy ſixth is of the ſame time. He repeats there what he had written in ſeveral places, that *Origen* deſerves to be commended for his Learning, but that his Principles are not to be followed.

The Seventy ſeventh to *Mark* the Presbyter was written by S. *Jerom* from the Deſart of *Syria*, about the time when the *Eaſtern* Biſhops tormented him, to oblige him to own Three *Hypoſtaſes*, about the Year 373.

The Seventy eighth to *Pammachius* and *Marcella*, is about *Origen*'s Condemnation. He gives them an Account of what *Theophilus* had decreed. He ſends them a Copy of his Letter, and the Acts of his Judgment, and deſireth them to have it confirmed at *Rome*, by Pope *Anaſtaſius*. This Letter is of 399.

The Seventy ninth is the laſt Letter of S. *Jerom*'s, to S. *Auguſtin*. S. *Jerom* ſent it by *Innocent* the Prieſt, who in the Year 419, was ſent from *Africa* into *Egypt* to look after the Copies of the Council of *Nice*. It is not directed to S. *Auguſtin* alone, but to him and *Alypius*. He congratulates their overthrowing of Hereſie, and tells them, That he had not had time yet to Anſwer what *Anianus*, *Pelagius*'s Diſciple had written againſt him, but he would doe it very ſoon if God gave him Life: He ſpeaketh of *Euſtochium*'s Death, who was alive when *Palladius* wrote his *Hiſtoria Lauſiaca*, in 419, which ſhews that this Letter was written in the Year 420.

The Eightieth Letter wherein he commends S. *Auguſtin* for the Reſolution and Courage, wherewith he had oppoſed *Pelagius*'s Hereſie, was written ſome years before. He exhorts him to go on, praiſing him in this manner, *You are commended in* Rome; *The Catholicks look upon you as the reſtorer of the ancient Faith, and what is yet a more honourable thing for you is, That the Hereticks hate you.*

The Eighty firſt is a Note written about the time of his falling out with *John* of *Jeruſalem*, after the Condemnation of the *Origeniſts*, about the Year 404.

In the Eighty ſecond Letter, S. *Jerom* Anſwers the Queſtion about the Origination of Souls, propoſed to him by *Marcellinus* Governour of *Africa*. He does not decide the Queſtion, but ſaith, That he had delivered his Opinion in his Books againſt *Ruſinus*, and adviſes him to conſult S. *Auguſtin*, who would clear that Point to him: He adds, That he could not yet compleat the Commentary upon *Ezekiel*, becauſe of the *Barbarian's* Incurſions. This Letter is of the Year 410.

The Eighty third to *Oceanus* concerneth a Point of Diſcipline, whether a Perſon twice married, but once before Baptiſm, is to be looked upon as a *Bigamiſt*, and ſo to be kept from ſacred Orders: S. *Jerom* maintains the Negative with abundance of Wit.

In the Eighty fourth to *Magnus*, S. *Jerom* proveth by the Examples of S. *Paul*, and of the moſt famous Chriſtian Authors, that a Chriſtian Author, may, as he did, make uſe of prophane Examples, and prophane Authors. This Letter was compoſed about the Year 400. In this Letter there is a Catalogue of almoſt all the Chriſtian Authors to S. *Jerom*.

The Eighty fifth is an Invective againſt one who would have Deacons preferred before Prieſts. S. *Jerom* exalts the Prieſtly Dignity which ſeems too high, when he compares them with Biſhops, " I am informed, *ſaith he*, that one was ſo impudent as to preferr Deacons before Prieſts: be- " fore Prieſts, *I ſay*, who may be compared with Biſhops; For when S. *Paul* plainly teaches that " Prieſts are Biſhops, who can endure that thoſe who ſerve Tables and Widows, ſhould by " Pride exalt themſelves above thoſe, who by their Prayers conſecrate the Body and Blood of " Jeſus Chriſt? Then he produces paſſages out of the Apoſtolical Epiſtles, where they give to meer Prieſts the Name of Biſhops, and adds, " That it was to prevent Schiſm, that in Pro- " ceſs of time, one was choſen to be preferred before others, leaſt every one preſuming to aſcribe " to himſelf the Pre-eminence, the Church of Jeſus Chriſt ſhould be perpetually divided. *For*, ſaith he, *in the See of* Alexandria, *from* S. Mark *the Evangeliſt to the time of* Heraclas *and* Dionyſius, *the Prieſts choſe one of them, whom they placed in a Seat higher than the reſt, and called him Biſhop, much after the ſame manner, as an Army chuſes an Emperor, or as Deacons chuſe one of themſelves to make him Archdeacon: And indeed, what doth a Biſhop doe, that is not done by a Prieſt, if you except Ordination? We are not to believe, that the Church is otherwiſe at* Rome, *than in other Cities of the world.* Gauls, Britains, Africans, Perſians, Indians, *and all other Nations worſhip the ſame God, and have the ſame rule of Faith. If Authority be required, the World is bigger than a City. Let a Biſhop be the Biſhop of what Town you pleaſe, he is neither more or leſs a Biſhop; whether of* Rome, *or* Eugubium, *whether of* Conſtantinople *or of* Rhegium, Alexandria *or* Tunis, *it is ſtill the ſame Dignity, and the ſame Function. Power and Riches do not make a Biſhop greater, Poverty and want of Credit do not render his Station more vile. All Biſhops are Succeſſors of the Apoſtles. But, you will ſay, how cometh it to paſs, that at* Rome *a Prieſt is not ordained, except a Deacon gives him his Teſtimonial? Why is the Cuſtom of one only Town objected to me? Why is the ſmall number of Deacons ſo exalted, as if that were the Law of the Church? All that is rare is moſt eſteemed. The ſmall number hath made Deacons valued, and the great number hath rendred Prieſts contemptible. However, Deacons ſtand before the Prieſts, even when the Prieſts are ſate down, and this is obſerved even in the Church of* Rome: *Tho' I have ſeen a Deacon ſitting in the ſame rank with Prieſts, in the abſence of the Biſhop, and give the Bleſſing in the Preſence of the Biſhop, ſuch is now the Corruption of Manners! But let ſuch as undertake theſe things know, that they are againſt Order; Let them hear theſe*

words

words of the Apoſtle. It is not juſt that we ſhould leave the word of God, to ſerve Tables; *let them learn wherefore Deacons were eſtabliſhed, let them read the* Acts of the Apoſtles, *and remember their condition. The Name of Prieſt or Presbyter denotes Age, and that of Biſhop, Dignity; wherefore in the Epiſtle to* Timothy, *mention is made of the Ordination of Biſhops and Deacons, but not of that of Prieſts, becauſe Prieſts are compriſed under the Name of Biſhops. Laſtly, to ſhew that a Prieſt is above a Deacon, one needs only obſerve, that a Prieſt is made of a Deacon, but not a Deacon of a Prieſt.* S. Jerom.

This Letter was written after his going from *Rome*, the Year is not known, but it was in all probability about the Year 387. What he ſaith of Biſhops, may have a good Sence, if we conſider his deſign in this place, which was to exalt the Dignity of the Prieſthood, by comparing them with Biſhops, not that he thought them equal in Dignity, ſince he poſitively excepteth the Power of Ordination, (and that of Confirmation in his Dialogue againſt the *Luciferians*:) but ſince Prieſts have a ſhare in the Government of the Church, they may in that Senſe be called Biſhops. Like Expreſſions may be ſeen in S. *Jerom*'s Commentary upon the Epiſtle to *Titus*, and in many Authors that have followed him.

The Eighty ſixth is a Letter from S. *Auguſtin*, to S. *Jerom*, whereby he thanks him for the Anſwer to his, and intreats him in the Name of the whole *African* Church, to tranſlate the Greek Authors that had writ Commentaries upon the Scripture. He ſays, That he was very deſirous that S. *Jerom* would tranſlate the Sacred Books after the ſame way, that he had tranſlated *Job*, by ſetting down the differences of the Verſion of the LXX, which had great Authority in the Church. Now becauſe S. *Auguſtin* did not underſtand Hebrew, he could not apprehend that there ſhould be ſo much difference, betwixt the Hebrew Text, and the Tranſlation of the LXX, and doth not approve of any departing from it. *For*, ſaith he to S. *Jerom*, *either thoſe paſſages are clear, or they are dark. If they are dark, you may be miſtaken, as well as the Seventy; If they are clear, can any Man believe, that thoſe learned Men did not underſtand them?* This Letter which was written about the Year 395, not being carried, S. *Auguſtin* wrote another to S. *Jerom* upon the ſame Subject in 397. But the Perſon to whom he had given it to deliver to S. *Jerom*, gave out ſome Copies of it which were ſpread in *Rome*, ſo that it was publick before S. *Jerom* ſaw it. This ſecond Letter is here the Ninety ſeventh. S. *Auguſtin* asketh of S. *Jerom* the true Title of his Book *of Eccleſiaſtical Writers*; afterwards he reproves what S. *Jorom* had ſaid, That S. *Peter*, and S. *Paul*, pretended to have a difference, tho' they were agreed. He pretends that this Opinion is of very great Conſequence, and may have dangerous Effects, becauſe if we admit of an officious Lye in the Holy Scripture, it ſeems to give Men a handle to doubt of all. He therefore exhorts him to alter that paſſage in his Commentary. At the latter end, he prays him to add to his Book *of Eccleſiaſtical Writers*, the Errors of ſome Hereticks of whom he ſpeaks, or to make a Book purpoſely on that Subject. S. *Auguſtin* having no Anſwer, becauſe neither of thoſe two Letters were delivered to S. *Jerom*, wrote a Third by *Cyprian* the Deacon, wherein he requireth an Anſwer to the two former, adding in this, That he found fault with his writing a new Tranſlation of the Bible, pretending that it would cauſe Diſturbances and Scandals, if it were publickly read in the Church: as it really happened in a Church of *Africk*; where a Biſhop having publickly read the Prophecy of *Jonas*, according to S. *Jerom*'s Tranſlation: the People hearing other Terms than they were wont to hear, accuſed their Biſhop of falſifying the Scripture. This Letter was written ſome years after the foregoing, about the Year 403.

S. *Jerom* having received theſe Three Letters by *Cyprian* the Deacon, thought himſelf affronted by S. *Auguſtin*'s demands, and anſwered him with ſome Loftineſs in the Eighty ninth Letter. He repeats all the Queſtions that had been put to him by S. *Auguſtin*, and endeavours to give him Satisfaction. He telleth him, 1. About the Title of his Book *of Eccleſiaſtical Writers*, that it ought to be Entituled, the Book *of Famous Men*, or *of Eccleſiaſtical Writers*.

2. He defends his Expoſition of S. *Paul*'s Epiſtle to the *Galatians*, about the Action of S. *Peter*, and S. *Paul*, by the Authority of *Origen*, *Didymus* and other ancient Authors, whoſe Commentaries he only tranſlated, as he had ſaid before in the Preface. That if he is in an Error, he had rather err with thoſe Great men, than flatter himſelf with having the Truth only on his ſide. He adds Reaſons to Authority, ſhewing by the Hiſtory of the *Acts*, That S. *Peter* could not but know, that Chriſtians were freed from the Burden of the Law; That on the other ſide S. *Paul* had himſelf practiſed that very thing whereof he here accuſeth S. *Peter*, by obſerving the Ceremonies of the Law; from whence he concludes that both theſe Apoſtles, being of the ſame Opinion, had agreed to raiſe that ſmall Diſpute to inſtruct both *Jews* and *Gentiles* by that pious Artifice. Afterwards he refutes S. *Auguſtin*'s Opinion, and ſtrives to anſwer the Reaſons which he had produced.

Laſt of all he gives him Reaſons for the Notes, that were in his Tranſlation of the Scripture. He anſwereth S. *Auguſtin*'s reaſoning, to prove that he had not done well in Tranſlating the Bible a new, very pleaſantly, by retorting the ſame upon him. " You cannot be ignorant, ſaith he, " that the *Pſalms* have been expounded by ſeveral Commentators, Greek and Latin, who wrote " before you. Pray tell me, how you durſt undertake to give a new Expoſition of them, after thoſe " Great men? You believed that thoſe places which you explained were either clear or obſcure: " If they were clear, it is probable (to uſe your own way of reaſoning) that they did underſtand them, and if they are obſcure, and they did not well underſtand them, it may " be thought that you might be miſtaken as well as they. And laſtly, he makes " himſelf ſport with their Quarrelling with the good Biſhop for reading his Tranſlation of

S. *Jerom.* *Jonas*, ſhewing that the occaſion of it was ridiculous, becauſe the Queſtion was about one ſingle word only, namely the term *Gourd*; which he had rendred *Ivy*. This Letter is of the Year 404.

S. *Jerom* being ſometime without anſwering this Letter, S. *Auguſtin* wrote to him, that he was informed that he had received his Letters, and expected an Anſwer, and whereas there was a Diſcourſe that he had ſent a Book to *Rome* againſt S. *Jerom*, he aſſures him that he had not. This Letter is of the Year 402. It is here the Ninetieth.

S. *Jerom* in anſwer to it ſaith, That he ſaw a Letter wherein he reproved a paſſage of his Commentary upon S. *Paul*, and adviſed him to retract it; but not being ſure that this Letter was from him, he had not anſwered it yet, becauſe he had been diſturbed by the Sickneſs of *Paula*. Afterwards he upbraids him for the Liberty he had taken; and Taxes him with ſeeking after Glory, by attacking Great men, telling him that he ought to examine his own Strength, and not compare himſelf with a Man that was grown old in Studying the Holy Scripture, and much leſs provoke him to a Combat. And at laſt deals with him, as with one whom he did not much value, and whom he judged not worthy of his Anger. This Letter is of the Year 402.

The Ninety ſecond is written by S. *Jerom* with the ſame Spirit. Again he complains that S. *Auguſtin*'s Letter was publiſhed. He writes him word, that his Friends ſaid that he had not Acted innocently in that particular, but ſeemed to go about to eſtabliſh his own Glory, by the ruin of another Man's: That if he would Diſpute, there were young and able Men at *Rome* of his own ſtrength; As for himſelf, he might, like a *Veteran* Soldier commend the Victories of others, but not engage in the Fight; That he would not ſo much as read his Books to find fault; That he had ſeen nothing of his, but his Soliloquies, and ſome Commentaries upon the *Pſalms*, and that if he would examine them, he could ſhow him how he departed from the Expoſition of ancient Authors. This Letter is of the Year 403.

S. *Auguſtin* having received both theſe Letters, anſwered him with much Civility and Moderation, yet without ſubſcribing to his Opinions. He ſpeaks of the Quarrel which he had with *Ruſinus*, and laments that Diviſion, repreſenting to him, that he had not ſhewed that Meekneſs and Charity which he might have done. This Letter is written very Artificially. It is the Ninety third. He directed it to *Preſidius*, to ſee it conveyed to S. *Jerom*, as appears by the Ninety fifth.

S. *Jerom* contented with S. *Auguſtin*'s Complements and Satisfaction, writ to him ſome time after the Ninety ſixth Letter, whereby he excuſes himſelf for having anſwered him, and tells him, that he earneſtly deſired there ſhould be no more Diſputes betwixt them.

S. *Auguſtin* having received this Letter by *Firmus*, returned an Anſwer by the Ninety ſeventh Letter, to what S. *Jerom* had written to ſatisfie his Requeſts, and defended his Opinions with great Clearneſs and Moderation. This Letter is here the Ninety ſeventh, and was written as well as the foregoing in the Year 403.

After this time there was no more ſaid of the Queſtions that were betwixt them, and they never writ to one another but with Civility. This may be taken Notice of in the Letters we have already ſpoken of, and in the Ninety fourth, where S. *Jerom* thanketh S. *Auguſtin*, for Dedicating and ſending to him, by *Oroſius*, the Books concerning *the Origination of Souls*; and he tells him, That he ſpake honourably of him in the Dialogue, which he wrote againſt *Pelagius*. This Letter is of the Year 406.

The Ninety eighth is a Complement from S. *Jerom* to S. *Auguſtin* of the Year 397.

The Ninty nineth Letter to *Aſella* was written by S. *Jerom*, at his going from *Rome*; he defends himſelf very warmly from the falſe Rumours, which his Calumniators had ſpread againſt him; becauſe of the Familiarity which he had had at *Rome* with ſome *Roman* Ladies. This Letter he writ when he was Embarking to return into the *Eaſt*, in 385.

The Hundredth Letter is a Satyr againſt one *Bonoſus*, who had taken, what S. *Jerom* had writ in general againſt all Vices, as particularly deſigned againſt himſelf, it is probably of the ſame time with the foregoing.

[*Eraſmus*'s Edition which Dr. *Cave* follows calls him *Bonaſius*, which ſeems to be the truer Reading by the Letter it ſelf, wherein S *Jerom*, quibbles upon his *Name*, and plays upon his *Noſe*, and tells him, That tho' his *Name be lucky*, yet upon that Account he has no Reaſon to value himſelf.]

The Hundred and firſt to *Pammachius*, *Concerning the beſt Method of tranſlating*, is about the Tranſlation, which he made Two years before of S. *Epiphanius*'s Letter to *John* of *Jeruſalem*. He was accuſed of not having done it faithfully. To juſtifie himſelf, he proves by the Examples of the beſt Tranſlators both Eccleſiaſtical and Prophane, that to tranſlate well, one is not to follow the words, or terms, but the Sence and Conceptions of his Author. He ſaith, that this Treatiſe was compoſed Two years after the Tranſlation of S. *Epiphanus*'s Letter, of the Year 303, which ſhews that it is of 395.

In the Hundred and ſecond to *Marcella*, he argues againſt thoſe who accuſed him, of corrupting the Text of the Goſpel, becauſe he had corrected the faults of the Latin Tranſlation according to the Greek Original; and he reproveth thoſe that found fault with him, for blaming the Virgins frequenting Men's Company. This Letter was written likewiſe ſometime after his Departure from *Rome*, in 385, or 386.

Theſe are S. *Jerom*'s Letters, and Treatiſes contained in the Second Volume.

The

The Third contains the Critical Letters and Works upon the Holy Scripture.

The Firſt directed to *Paulinus*, is not upon that Subject only; for he exhorts him not only to the Reading of the Holy Scripture, but alſo to retire, and to vow Poverty. But the Principal Subject of that Letter is Precepts, and a Method which is to be obſerved both in Reading and underſtanding the Holy Scripture. He ſhews at firſt that no Man ought to enter upon that Study, without a Skilful Guide to ſhew him the Way. He complains that all other Arts, and Sciences, are exerciſed by none but Men of that Profeſſion, but that every one pretends to be Skill'd in the underſtanding of the Scriptures. S. *Jerom.*

To ſhew that Men are deceived, and that the Scripture is not ſo eaſily underſtood, as they imagine, he reckons up the ſeveral Books, and takes notice of the great difficulty of finding the true Sence and Spirit of them, and he draws up in ſhort very curious Obſervations upon every Book of the Scripture, and upon the Character of their Authours.

The Second Letter in Number one hundred and four to *Deſiderius*, is a Preface to his Verſion of the *Pentateuch*. He ſheweth how neceſſary, and withall how difficult it is to undertake it after the Tranſlation of the LXX, and that this is defective.

The hundred and Fifth Letter is a Preface to the Book of *Job*.

The hundred and Sixth is a Preface to the Books of *Kings*, where he ſets down the number of the Canonical Books, of the old Teſtament, according to the *Jewiſh* Catalogue.

The hundred and Seventh is a Preface to the *Chronicles* directed to *Chromatius*.

The hundred and Eighth is another Preface to the *Chronicles*.

The hundred and Ninth is a Preface to *Ezra* and *Nehemiah*.

The hundred and Tenth is the Preface to *Tobit*.

The hundred and Eleventh to *Judith*.

The hundred and Twelth to *Eſther*.

The hundred and Thirteenth to *Job*.

The hundred and Fourteenth is another Preface to *Job*.

The hundred and Fifteenth is a Preface to the Books of *Proverbs*, *Eccleſiaſtes*, and the *Canticles*.

The hundred and Sixteenth is a particular Letter concerning his Tranſlation of *Eccleſiaſtes*.

The hundred and Seventeenth to *Iſaiah*.

The hundred and Eighteenth to *Jeremiah*.

The hundred and Ninteenth to *Ezekiel*.

The hundred and Twentieth to *Daniel*.

The hundred and Twenty firſt to the Twelve Minor Prophets.

The hundred and Twenty ſecond to *Joel*.

The hundred and Twenty third is a Preface directed by S. *Jerom* to *Damaſus* upon the new Tranſlation of the four *Evangeliſts*.

The hundred and Twenty-fourth is a Letter from *Damaſus* to S. *Jerom*, wherein he asketh him five Queſtions about the Holy Scripture. The Firſt, what is the meaning of thoſe Words *Geneſis* Chap. 4. *Whoſoever Slays* Cain, *Vengeance ſhall be taken on him ſeven-fold*. The ſecond, if all that God did was very good, as it is ſaid in *Geneſis* wherefore is mention made of Clean and unclean Creatures? The third why God ſaid to *Abraham*, that the Children of *Iſrael* ſhould go out of *Egypt* in the fourth Generation; and yet it is ſaid in *Exodus* that it was the fifth Generation which came out of *Egypt*. The fourth why *Abraham* received Circumciſion as a Seal of Faith. And the fifth why *Iſaac* Bleſſed that Son whom he deſigned not to Bleſs.

S. *Jerom* makes no anſwer to *Damaſus* about the ſecond and fourth Queſtion, becauſe they were handled at Large by *Tertullian*, *Novatian*, *Origen* and *Didymus*: But he explaineth the reſt. He ſaith to the firſt concerning thoſe Words of *Geneſis*, *Whoſoever ſlays Cain Vengeance ſhall be taken on him Sevenfold*; That they ſignifie, that whoſoever killeth *Cain*, ſhall undergo the ſeven ſorts of Revenge, or Puniſhment wherewith he was threatned. He reſolves the Third, by obſerving that we are not to Read in *Exodus*, that the Children of *Iſrael* went out of *Egypt* at the Fifth Generation, as it is in the Tranſlation of the Seventy, but that they went out Armed, as it is in *Aquila*'s Tranſlation: Laſtly he anſwereth the fifth, ſaying that *Iſaac* did that good thing for the Family, in Bleſſing *Jacob* by a particular Effect of God's Providence without knowing it: He cites afterwards a Paſſage out of *Hyppolitus*, which gives an Allegorical Senſe to that Action, affirming that *Eſau* was a Type of the People of the *Jews*, and *Jacob* that of the Church. He approves this Expoſition, and ſo he eaſily anſwers *Damaſus* his Queſtion.

In the hundred and Twenty fifth Letter to *Evagrius*, he examineth who *Melchiſedeck* was: He rejects that Man's Opinion, who held that *Melchiſedeck* was the Holy Spirit. As alſo *Origen*'s and *Didymus*'s who ſaid that *Melchiſedeck* was an Angel. He produces the Opinions of *Hyppolitus*, S. *Irenæus*, *Euſebius*, and *Euſtathius*, who believed him to have been a *Canaanite*, King of a City called *Salem*, and a Prieſt of the Lord: He likewiſe takes Notice of the *Jewiſh* Opinion that it was *Sem Noah*'s Son, and he ſeems not to diſapprove it. He obſerves that the City of *Salem*, was not *Jeruſalem* as *Joſephus* and moſt of the ancients believed, but another City near *Scythopolis*, called, as he ſays, *Salem* even in his time.

The following Letter to *Fabiola*, is a moral Explication of the Forty Encampings of the *Iſraelites*, from their going out of *Egypt* to the Land of Promiſe. He looks upon that Journey

S. Jerom. as a Repreſentation of the way to Heaven, and to every decamping he applies a moral Inſtruction. The like Reflections are made in the Hundred and twenty eighth Letter upon the Habits, and Sacerdotal Ornaments of the Prieſts under the old Law.

He ſhews in the Hundred and twenty ninth, that what is ſaid of the promiſed Land, is to be underſtood ſpiritually of eternal Glory, and as he makes uſe particularly of the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews* to prove his Aſſertion, ſo he affirms, that tho' the Greek Churches will not own it no more than the *Revelations* of S. *John*, yet the *Latins* receive both, becauſe they are quoted by the Ancients.

In the Hundred and thirtieth to *Marcella*, he tells her what the *Ephod* and *Teraphim* were.

The Hundred and thirty firſt Letter to *Rufinus*, contains an Allegorical Expoſition of the Hiſtory of the two Women that were judged by *Solomon*, who were, as he pretends a Figure of the Church and of the *Synagogue*.

In the Hundred and thirty ſecond, he anſwers an Hiſtorical difficulty about the years of *Solomon* and *Ahaz*. It is ſaid of *Solomon* that he began to Reign at twelve years, that he Reigned fourty years, and that his Son *Roboam* Succeeded him being fourty one years old. It ſeems by that, that *Solomon* had a Son at eleven years: The ſame is ſaid of King *Ahaz*. He is ſaid to have begun his Reign at twenty years of Age, that he Reigned ſixteen years, and that his Son *Hezekiah* Succeeded him at the Age of twenty five, which alſo intimates that *Ahaz* had him at Eleven years of Age. This ſeems Extraordinary and Incredible. S. *Jerom* anſwers that it might poſſibly be, but that the difficulty might be ſalved thus, that the Reigns both of *Solomon* and of *Ahaz*, may have had a double beginning: When they began to Reign with their Fathers, and when they began to Reign by themſelves. This being ſuppoſed, the anſwer is at Hand, when it is ſaid that *Solomon* began to Reign at twelve, and *Ahaz* at twenty years of Age, is to be underſtood of the beginning of their Reign with their Fathers, whereas when it is ſaid in another Place, that they died after having Reigned, one fourty, and the other ſixteen years, that is to be underſtood of the Time when they began to Reign alone. Whence it follows that they might then be of Age to have Children. He confeſſes at the Latter end of this Letter that there are ſeveral Chronological difficulties in the Hiſtory of the old Teſtament: Eſpecially about the years of the Kings of *Iſrael* and of *Juda*, but he would have no Man trouble himſelf much to Explain them.

The Hundred and thirty third Letter to *Marcella* is a Critick upon the Commentary upon the *Canticles*, that was made by *Rheticius* Biſhop of *Autun*. He obſerves ſeveral Faults in that Author, which were mentioned in the ſecond Volume of this *Bibliotheca*.

The Hundred and thirty fourth to *Sophronius* containeth Notes upon the *Pſalms*. He ſaith that ſome divide them into Five Books, but that he Comprehended all in one Volume, following therein the Authority of the *Jews* and the Apoſtles. He affirms that they are written by thoſe whoſe Names are found at the beginning of every *Pſalm*. He ſpeaks afterwards of his Latin Tranſlation of the *Pſalms*, and of *Sophronius*'s deſign to Tranſlate it into Greek.

The Hundred and thirty fifth Letter to *Sunia* and *Fretella*, is a Critick upon thoſe paſſages of the *Pſalms* where the Greek of the *Septuagint*, and the Latin Verſion differ. S. *Jerom* layeth this down for a Rule, That when there is a Difference betwixt the Latin Copies of the New Teſtament, they ought to go to the Original: So likewiſe when there is any Difference between the Greek and the Latin of the Old Teſtament, to find out the Truth, the Hebrew Text ought to be conſulted. By this Rule he explains all thoſe paſſages of the *Pſalms* where the Greek of the Seventy, and the Verſion then in uſe did not agree.

In the Hundred and thirty ſixth to *Marcella*, he expounds the ten ſeveral Names given to God in the Hebrew Tongue.

In the Hundred and thirty ſeventh to the ſame, he gives the Signification of the Terms *Halleluja*, *Amen*, *Maranatha*. *Halleluja*, according to him, ſignifies *praiſe the Lord*. *Amen* is a Word which ſignifies that Credit is given to a thing, deſiring that it may be ſo; and which may be rendred, *So be it*. *Maranatha* is a Syriack Word, which S. *Jerom* tranſlateth, *Our Lord comes*.

In the Hundred and thirty eighth Epiſtle to the ſame, he ſhows the Meaning of the Hebrew *Selah*, which the *Greeks* tranſlate *Diapſalma*, a Word very frequent in the *Pſalms*. He ſaith that ſome have ſaid that the *Diapſalma* was an Alteration of the Verſe; and others, that it ſignified a Pauſe; others, a Change of the Tune: He is not of their mind, but ſaith with *Aquila*, that *Selah* ſignifies *always*.

The Hundred and thirty ninth, to *Cyprian*, is an Expoſition of the Eighty ninth *Pſalm* according to the Hebrew Text.

The Hundred and thirtieth, to *Principia*, is an Expoſition of the Forty fourth *Pſalm*.

The Hundred and forty firſt containeth certain Remarks to underſtand the Hundred and twenty ſixth *Pſalm*.

The Hundred and forty ſecond, and Hundred forty third, to *Damaſus*, clears the Hiſtory of *Uzziah*, ſpeaks of the Seraphim, the *Holy*, *holy*, *holy*, and the reſt of *Iſaiah*'s Viſion deſcribed in the ſixth Chapter of his Prophecy.

The Hundred and forty fifth Letter to Pope *Damaſus*, explains the meaning of the Word *Hoſanna*, rejecting S. *Hilary*'s Opinion, who thought that it ſignified *The Redemption of* David's *Houſe*; as alſo that it ſignified *Glory*: To expound it he appeals to the Hebrew Text, and pretends, that *Hoſanna*, whereof they have made *Hoſanna*, ſignifies *Save us Lord*.

The

The Hundred and forty ſixth to the ſame, is an allegorical Expoſition of the Parable of the prodigal Son, whom he ſuppoſes to be a Figure of the *Gentiles* converted to the Faith. S. *Jerom.*

In the Hundred and forty ſeventh to *Amandus*, he gives a literal Explication of three paſſages of the New Teſtament, of theſe Words of *Jeſus* Chriſt, *Matth.* ch. 6. *Take no thought for the morrow; ſufficient unto the Day is the evil thereof.* Of thoſe of S. *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 2. *He that committeth fornication ſinneth againſt his own body:* and of that other of S. *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 15. where he ſaith, *that all things are ſubject to the Son of God, and that he is ſubject to him who hath put all things under him.* At the latter end he moves the Queſtion, whether a Woman having left her Husband becauſe he was an Adulterer, or given to unnatural Luſts, may be married to another; and if, having done it, ſhe might be admitted to the Communion? He anſwers, That ſhe cannot marry without ſinning, and ought not to be admitted to the Communion but after Penance, and having renounced the ſecond Husband.

In the Hundred and forty eighth, he reſolves five Queſtions, which *Marcella* put to him upon ſeveral paſſages of the New Teſtament. The firſt is, How S. *Paul* could ſay, *that eye hath not ſeen nor ear heard, neither have entred into the heart of Man the things which God hath prepared for them that love him.* Since he ſays in another place, *that God hath revealed them by his Spirit.* S. *Jerom* anſwereth that in the former place S. *Paul* ſpeaks of the things which the Eyes and Ears of Fleſh may apprehend, and what may be comprehended by humane Underſtanding without Revelation. The ſecond Queſtion was about the Expoſition which S. *Jerom* had given of the Parable of the Goats and of the Sheep, which are at the right, and at the left Hand of God; whereby he underſtood the *Jews* and the *Gentiles*, and not good and evil Men. Here S. *Jerom* refers to what he had ſaid in his Books to *Jovinian*. The third Queſtion was concerning thoſe of whom the Apoſtle ſaith, that they ſhall be carried alive into the Air at the Day of Judgment to meet Jeſus Chriſt. S. *Jerom* ſticks not to ſay, that this is to be underſtood literally, and that ſuch as ſhall be found alive then ſhall not die, but their Bodies ſhall become incorruptible and immortal. The fourth is about thoſe Words of Jeſus Chriſt to *Mary Magdalen*, *Touch me not.* This is the Sence of them according to S. *Jerom*, *You deſerve not to fall down at my Feet and worſhip me, ſeeing you doubted of my Reſurrection.* It is more natural to expound them after this other manner, *Do not make haſte to embrace and to hold me, I am not yet aſcended into Heaven, I will abide for ſome time upon Earth, and you may do it at leiſure.* The laſt Queſtion is to know whether Chriſt being upon Earth after his Reſurrection, was likewiſe in Heaven at the ſame time? S. *Jerom* anſwereth, that it is unqueſtionable that the Word of God was every where; but he does not anſwer the Queſtion propoſed preciſely, which was not concerning the Divinity, but the Humanity of Jeſus Chriſt.

In the Hundred and forty ninth Letter he propoſeth to himſelf one of the chiefeſt and moſt conſiderable Difficulties of the New Teſtament; namely what is the Sin againſt the Holy Ghoſt, and in what Sence it is unpardonable. But he doth not go to the bottom of the Queſtion, ſhewing only by the bye, againſt *Novatian*, that it is not the Sin of Idolatry.

The Hundred and fiftieth to *Hebidia*, and the Hundred and fifty firſt, to *Algaſia*, contain Solutions of three and twenty Difficulties about particular Paſſages of the New Teſtament, which theſe Ladies had put to S. *Jerom*. They are very curious Queſtions, and S. *Jerom*'s Anſwers are very juſt and learned.

To theſe Works we ought to join the Treatiſes which are at the latter end of the eighth Volume, which likewiſe are Critical Letters. Namely,

The Book *of the Names of the Cities and Countries mentioned in the Bible*, tranſlated out of *Euſebius*.

An Expoſition *of the Hebrew proper Names in the Old and New Teſtament.*

The Hundred and fifty firſt Epiſtle is an Explication of the Hebrew Alphabet, written whilſt he was at *Rome*.

A Collection of *Traditions*, or rather *Jewiſh Expoſitions upon Geneſis*; a moſt curious and uſeful Work for the right Underſtanding of the Text of the Scripture; where he takes Notice of all the Differences betwixt the Hebrew Text and the Tranſlation of the Septuagint.

The Hundred and fifty ſecond Letter, to *Minerius* and *Alexander*, upon theſe Words of S. *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 15. *We ſhall not all die, but we all ſhall be changed*: wherein he gives a particular Account of the different Expoſitions of this Place by the ancient Commentators. He quoteth *Theodorus* of *Perinthus*, *Diodorus* of *Tarſus*, *Apollinaris*, *Acacius* of *Caſarea*, and *Origen*. This Letter is of the year 406.

In the ſame place is the Hundred and fifty third Letter to *Paulinus*, written about the ſame time; he anſwereth two Queſtions put to him. The firſt, how one could reconcile to Free-Will, what is ſaid in *Geneſis*, *that God hardned* Pharaoh's *heart*; and what S. *Paul* ſaith, *That it is neither of the Will, nor of the Endeavours of Men, but of God who maketh Man to act.* The ſecond why S. *Paul* calleth the Children that are born of baptized Parents, *holy*, ſince they cannot be ſaved, but by receiving and preſerving the Grace of Baptiſm. For the former, S. *Jerom* referreth him to what *Origen* ſaith upon that Subject in the Book of *Principles* newly tranſlated by S. *Jerom*. And to the ſecond, he anſwereth, with *Tertullian*, that the Children of Chriſtians are called *holy*, becauſe they are as it were Candidates for the Faith, and have not been defiled with Idolatry; adding, that the Scripture gives the Name of *holy* to things that are pure; and that in this Sence the Veſſels of the Temple are ſaid to be holy.

Laſtly, There is in the ſame place the Hundred fifty fourth Letter to *Deſiderius* and *Sereniſla*, whom he invites to come to *Bethlehem*. It is written after the Treatiſe *of Famous men*, about the Year 400.

We are to reckon likewiſe amongſt S. *Jerom*'s critical Works upon the Bible, the Corrections and Tranſlations which he made of the Books of the Scripture. At firſt he corrected the Greek Text of the Seventy, and reformed the common Edition, by *Origen*'s *Hexapla*. He made a new Tranſlation (*o*) of them, wherein he mark'd by two Hooks, thoſe paſſages of the *Septuagint* that were not in the Hebrew Text, and added the Verſion of what was in the Hebrew Text, which was not in the Tranſlation of the LXX, noting thoſe Additions with a Star, ſo that in this Tranſlation one might ſee at once, both what was added, and what was wanting in the Verſion of the LXX. This Tranſlation of S. *Jerom*'s of the Books of the Prophets, is joyned to his Commentaries.

This was the firſt Labour of S. *Jerom* upon the Bible, which he undertook when he was but young in his firſt Retirement.

Afterwards having attained to a more perfect knowledge of the Hebrew Tongue, he conceived that it would prove a conſiderable Service to the Church, if he ſet forth an entire Tranſlation of his own from the Hebrew Text. Wherefore he fell upon that Work, and publiſhed a new Latin Verſion of all the Books, which the *Jews* own to be Canonical (*p*), and of the Books of *Judith* and *Tobit*, ſetting before the beginning of each Book the Prefaces already mentioned.

This new Tranſlation of S. *Jerom* was but ill received in the Church at firſt. Men were very much pre-poſſeſſed in favour of the *Septuagint*, and S. *Jerom*'s enterprize was looked upon as a raſh and dangerous Innovation: S. *Auguſtin* himſelf diſliked it, and ſent him word, as we have ſeen, that he would have done better if he had been contented with the Tranſlation of the *Septuagint*, and not have gone about a new one, which would certainly cauſe ſome Scandal and trouble in the Church. *Rufinus* and others of S. *Jerom*'s Enemies, went yet further, and accuſed him of perverting the Scripture, and deſpiſing the Authority of the Apoſtles, by rejecting the LXX's Tranſlation which they had made uſe of, to introduce a new one, borrowed, in ſome ſort from the *Jews*. All theſe reproaches did not hinder S. *Jerom* from publiſhing his new Tranſlation. He ſhews the injuſtice of his Accuſers in moſt of his Prefaces. Sometimes he complains of the ingratitude of Perſons in his Age, who inſtead of acknowledging the good Services he had done to the Church, reckoned it as a Crime in him: Sometimes he declares, That he did not undertake that new Tranſlation to condemn the *Septuagint* which he commends, and approves, and which he corrected and tranſlated in his Youth, and that his deſign barely was, to do an uſeful Work. Sometimes he ſaith, That he was obliged to make a new Tranſlation, becauſe the *Septuagint* had been corrupted. But for the moſt part he affirms openly, That the main reaſon which put him upon making a new Tranſlation, was, the want of Exactneſs in that of the Seventy, and the ſmall Conformity which it had with the Hebrew Text; which, he believes ought to be depended upon, as the true Original. And for this reaſon, almoſt as often as he ſpeaks of it, he gives it the Name of *the Hebrew truth*. He alledgeth alſo political Reaſons for his undertaking. The *Jews* accuſed us in their Diſputes with us, that we did not faithfully quote the Holy Scripture, they continually urged that the Hebrew Text was not conformable to what was cited to them out of the Tranſlation of the LXX. The Chriſtians who were ignorant of the Hebrew, and beſides had no Tranſlation from the Hebrew, were extremely perplexed, and were forced, either to remain Speechleſs, or to have recourſe to the *Rabbins*. He ſheweth how neceſſary it was, that a Chriſtian learned in the Hebrew Tongue, ſhould make a Tranſlation conformable to the Hebrew Text. S. *Jerom* had another Argument to recommend his Tranſlation to the *Latins*, and that was point of Honour.

The *Greeks*, ſays he, boaſt that the *Latins* have the Holy Scripture only thro' their Channel; it is good to beat down their Pride, and to let them know, that the *Latins* have no need of them, but could go to the Fountain-head themſelves. Intereſt and Conveniency, were Conſiderations, that S. *Jerom* alſo made uſe of to bring his Tranſlation into credit. There were a great many different Greek Tranſlations; and ſeveral Editions of the Seventy quite different one from the other; It was impoſſible to compare them together without great pains, and much labour, and to have them without a great deal of Money. And after all, that Variety brought in great Confuſion, and rendred the Scripture almoſt unintelligible, to thoſe that did not underſtand the Hebrew Text. How neceſſary then was it to deliver the World out of that perplexity, by ſetting forth a Tranſlation conformable to the Original, which ſhould make all the reſt almoſt uſeleſs.

(*o*) *He made a New Tranſlation.*] He ſpeaks of this Verſion as wholly his own in the Eighty ninth Letter, to S. *Auguſtin*; yet it is likely, that he made uſe in ſeveral Books of the Scripture, of the ancient vulgar Tranſlation, which he only corrected. It is certain that he made a new Tranſlation of the *Pſalms*, as he ſays himſelf in this Epiſtle to *Sunia* and *Fretela*; He alſo tranſlated anew the Book of *Job*, as appears by the two Prefaces to that Book, and to thoſe of *Salomon*, as it is obſerved in the Second Book of the Apology againſt *Rufinus*.

(*p*) *The Books which the* Jews *own to be Canonical.*] He did not tranſlate the Books that were not in the Canon of the *Hebrews*, except *Tobit*, and *Judith*; and ſo the Tranſlations of the Books of *Wiſdom*, *Eccleſiaſticus*, *Maccabees*, *Baruk*, and *Jeremiah*'s Letter, and the Additions to the Books of *Heſter* and *Daniel*, are not S. *Jerom*'s.

How

How good ſoever theſe Reaſons were in themſelves, yet they were not ſtrong enough to make S. *Jerom*'s Tranſlation welcome to the *Latins* at firſt; they kept for the moſt part to the ancient vulgar Verſion, being unwilling that any thing ſhould be altered it: But by little and little S. *Jerom*'s got ſome credit; tho' the ancient vulgar was ſtill in uſe; ſo that in S. *Gregory*'s time both theſe Tranſlations were followed, and this Father obſerves, that himſelf uſed ſometimes one, and ſometimes the other. Since that time S. *Jerom*'s Tranſlation got the upper hand, and was received and read publickly in the Churches of the *Weſt*, excepting the Tranſlation of the *Pſalms*, and ſome Mixtures of the ancient vulgar Tranſlation (*q*), ſome paſſages whereof have been preſerved in the vulgar Latin. S. *Jerom.*

As for the New Teſtament, S. *Jerom* did not undertake to make a new Tranſlation, but contented himſelf with comparing the old one with the Greek, and to correct the principal paſſages where it diſagreed with the Text, as he ſaid himſelf in the Preface of the Goſpels to *Damaſus*, in a Letter to S. *Auguſtin*, and in his Book *of Eccleſiaſtical Writers*. This work was much better received than the new Verſion of the Old Teſtament from the Hebrew, and hardly any Body was offended at it, becauſe the Greek Tongue being eaſily underſtood, it was not difficult to diſcover the Alterations that might be made in the Greek Text, which could not be done in the Hebrew which was underſtood by the *Jews* only.

S. *Jerom*'s Commentaries upon the Scripture, have great Relation to his other Studies, and thoſe Writings that we have hitherto ſpoken of. Firſt of all he ſets down the ancient vulgar Tranſlation, and with it joyns commonly his New Tranſlation: Secondly, He enquires after the Sence of the Hebrew Text exactly, and compares it with the ſeveral Greek Verſions. He cites the other places of Scripture which have any Relation to that which he expoundeth. In making theſe Obſervations, he clears the literal Sence of the Scripture, and diſcovers the Prophecies, by ſhewing their Accompliſhment. And in the laſt place, he adds myſtical Explications, and ſhort Allegories, which moſt commonly are only Etymologies, and Turns of Wit about words. He confeſſeth, that very often, he barely tranſlated ſome paſſages of *Origen*'s Commentaries, and other Greek Authors without naming them: Wherefore he pretends, that the Errors and Contradictions in his Commentaries are not to be imputed to him; becauſe he only related the Opinions of others without approving them: that if he condemned them not, yet he did not intend to defend them, but would ſpare the others Reputation: And laſtly, That this Moderation ſhould give his Enemies no occaſion to Calumniate as they did, and to accuſe him of upholding ſuch Errors, that he was ſo far from, and which he refuted in other places.

Theſe Remarks may give a General Idea of S. *Jerom*'s Commentaries upon the Bible, eſpecially upon the Books of the Prophets, wherein he followeth this method now deſcribed exactly, and inſiſts particularly upon the Expoſition of the Hiſtorical Sence of the Prophecies. He divided his Commentaries into ſeveral Books, and intermix'd here and there ſome Prefaces, in which he explains in general, the ſubject of his Commentaries, and then anſwers the Calumnies that were raiſed againſt him.

The Fourth Volume contains his Commentaries upon the Four great Prophets, namely eighteen Books of Commentaries upon *Iſaiah*, Six upon *Jeremiah*, Fourteen upon *Ezekiel*, and one upon *Daniel*.

The Fifth Volume contains the Commentaries upon *Eccleſiaſtes* and the Twelve minor Prophets.

In the Sixth Volume are S. *Jerom*'s Commentaries upon the Books of the New Teſtament, after theſe there is a Preface to *Damaſus* upon the Four *Evangeliſts*, a Canon, or a Table of the Harmony of the Four *Evangeliſts*: Four Books of Commentaries or Notes upon S. *Matthew*'s Goſpel; wherein he explains very clearly the Letter of the Goſpel, only adding now and then ſome moral Reflections, but he doth not inlarge upon Allegories. He obſerveth very near the ſame method in his Commentaries upon S. *Paul*'s Epiſtles to the *Galatians*, *Epheſians*, *Titus* and *Philemon*, which are in the ſame Volum, with the Tranſlation of *Didymus*'s Book of the Holy Ghoſt.

(*q*) *Excepting the Tranſlation of the* Pſalms, *and ſome mixtures of the ancient vulgar Tranſlation.*] It is certain that our vulgar is not the ancient Tranſlation that was made from the *Septuagint*. It is certain alſo that it was made from the Hebrew, but none of the Fathers underſtood Hebrew beſides S. *Jerom*, and ſo the Body of that Tranſlation cannot be attributed to any Body elſe: Beſides, the Tranſlations of the Books of the Bible which are in his Commentaries, are almoſt wholly conformable to our vulgar. We find alſo in the other Books a great many of thoſe Alterations which S. *Jerom* profeſſes to have made in his Tranſlation. It is certain that the vulgar Tranſlation of the *Pſalms* is not S. *Jerom*'s. It was not made after the Hebrew, but after the *Septuagint*, tho' it is in ſome places conformable to the Tranſlations of *Theodotion*, *Aquila*, and *Symmachus*, and different from that of S. *Jerom*, which is yet extant among his Works. The Additions to the Books of *Heſter*, and *Daniel*, are not of S. *Jerom*'s Tranſlation, no more than that of the Books that were not in the Jewiſh Canon. In ſhort, in our vulgar Latin are many places, which are remains of the ancient Tranſlation mingled with the new, for there are ſeveral places agreeable to the Tranſlation of the LXX, and differing from the Hebrew Text, as well as from the Obſervations, and Tranſlation of S. *Jerom*, who ſcrupulouſly tyed himſelf to *the Hebrew Truth*.

Theſe

S. *Jerom.* These Commentaries were not written by S. *Jerom* in the ſame order as they are ſet down in this Edition. Thoſe upon the New Teſtament were compoſed firſt, not long after he was returned from his Journey to *Rome* towards the Year 388. About the ſame time he writ his Commentaries upon *Eccleſiaſtes*, and undertook afterwards thoſe upon the minor Prophets, beginning at *Micah*, *Nahum*, *Habakkuk*, *Zephaniah*, *Haggai*. Theſe Works were completed before the Year 392. The Commentaries upon the others held him till towards the Year 400. Afterwards he wrote upon *Daniel*, and having done that, he undertook the Commentary upon *Iſaiah*, which was ended in 409; in 410. he compoſed that upon *Ezekiel*. The laſt of all are the Commentary upon *Jeremiah*, as it is obſerved in the Preface. If we add to theſe Works already mentioned, the Tranſlation of *Origen*'s two Homilies upon the *Canticles*, that are in the Eighth Volume, of the Nine Homelies upon *Iſaiah*, of Fourteen upon *Ezekiel*, and of Fourteen upon *Jeremiah*, which are among *Origen*'s Works, and the Verſion of *Euſebius*'s *Chronicon*, we have all the Genuine Works of S. *Jerom*, the reſt being ſpurious as we ſhall ſhew afterwards.

As for the *Chronicon* it ſhould not be looked upon as a mere Tranſlation of *Euſebius*, S. *Jerom* having added many things to it, as he ſays in his Preface, where he obſerves that what is there from *Ninus* and *Abraham* to the taking of *Troy*, is a faithful Tranſlation of the Greek: that from the taking of *Troy*, to the 20th. Year of *Conſtantine*, he had added and altered many things, which he had collected out of *Suetonius* and other Latin Authors; and laſt of all, That he continued *Euſebius* his *Chronicon* from the 20th. Year of *Conſtantine*, to the Sixth Conſulſhip of *Valens*, and the Second of *Valentinian*, that is to the Year 378. of the vulgar *Æra*.

We have loſt a Commentary of S. *Jerom* upon the Tenth *Pſalm*, and the Six following, divided into ſeven parts, which he mentions in his Catalogue. Notes upon all the *Pſalms*, which he ſpeaks of in the firſt Apology againſt *Rufinus*; and a Treatiſe upon the Book of *Job*, which he mentions in the Commentary upon the Fifth Chapter of *Amos*. S. *Auguſtin* in his Treatiſe of Hereſies to *Quodvultdeus*, ſaith, That he had heard that S. *Jerom* had compoſed a Treatiſe upon the ſame Subject, but that he could not find it. The ſame Saint ſpeaks in the Two hundred and ſixtieth Epiſtle to *Oceanus*, of a Treatiſe of S. *Jerom*'s which *Oroſius* had brought to *Oceanus*, wherein he treated of the Reſurrection. *Caſſiodorus* names ſome other Works of this Father, as a Letter to *Antius*, where he ſaith, That he has explained great Difficulties: An Expoſition upon *Salomon*'s Judgment: Notes upon all the Prophets; and a Commentary upon the *Revelations*. *Trithemius* mentions a moral Commentary upon the Four Goſpels, and another upon the Canonical Epiſtles; but theſe Treatiſes are not extant: neither is it very certain, that they were S. *Jerom*'s.

I have omitted ſome Books that are in this Volume now mentioned, becauſe they are not S. *Jerom*'s, tho' they bear his Name; Here is the Catalogue of them, and a Critick upon them.

The Queſtions upon the Book of *Chronicles*, and the Books of *Kings*, which are rejected by moſt of the Criticks, as being not S. *Jerom*'s. Firſt, Becauſe when S. *Jerom* makes a Catalogue of his Works, he ſpeaks only of his Queſtions upon *Geneſis*, but ſays nothing of his having written the like work upon the *Chronicles*, or the *Kings*. 2. Becauſe the ſubject and the ſtile of theſe latter Queſtions ſeems different from that of the former. In his Queſtions upon *Geneſis*, S. *Jerom* ſets down often the Hebrew words of the Text, and the Greek terms of the Tranſlations, of which he examines the differences: but in theſe there is nothing like it. In the Queſtions upon *Geneſis*, he ſeriouſly ſearcheth into the Sence of the Scripture, and makes ſolid and uſeful Reflections: Theſe on the contrary are full of uſeleſs, trifling, and fabulous Remarks. Wherefore *Lyranus* thinks they are unworthy of S. *Jerom*; and aſcribes them to ſome newly converted *Jew*: For my part I would not affirm ſo poſitively, that they are not S. *Jerom*'s. They were compoſed by a Man that underſtood Hebrew, who kept to the Letter of the Holy Scripture, who was acquainted with Jewiſh Traditions: all which Characters belong to S. *Jerom*: the ſtile of thoſe Books is very like his, and no Man ought to wonder that in a Treatiſe of this Nature he hath followed ſome of the Jewiſh Fancies.

This will not hold of the ſmall Treatiſe which contains the Explication of the Countries, and Towns ſpoken of in the *Acts*: it being evidently written by ſome other Author beſides S. *Jerom*, ſince he quotes this Fathers Treatiſe when ſpeaking of *Smyrna*. It is among *Bede*'s Works, who probably may be the Author of it.

The Commentary upon the Lamentations of *Jeremiah* is a Collection by *Rabanus* of the thoughts of ſeveral Fathers, and particularly of S. *Gregory*. It is among that Author's Works, and it is cited under his Name, by *Bonaventure*, in his Commentary upon the *Lamentations*.

The Commentary or Book of Annotations upon S. *Mark*'s Goſpel, is altogether unworthy of S. *Jerom*, both for the ſtile and for the matter. The Author knew neither Greek nor Hebrew, nor ſpake very good Latin. He is guilty of ridiculous Errors, as when he ſaith, That *Paſcha* ſignifies *Paſſage* in Latin, and that *Phaſe* ſignifies *the offering of a Victim*, and when he Remarks that *Nardus Piſtica*, is as much as to ſay *Myſtical*. He confounds *Mary Magdalen*, with *Mary* of *Bethany*; an Opinion refuted by S. *Jerom* in his Commentary upon the Twenty ſixth Chapter of S. *Matthew*. Speaking of the Croſs, he repeateth ſeveral Verſes out of *Sedulius*, who writ long after S. *Jerom*.

The Commentaries upon the *Pſalms* have not fewer Marks of their being Suppoſititious, for 1. The Author of them had no knowledge of the Hebrew and Greek Tongues. 2. His Method

in

in Expounding the Scripture is quite different from S. *Jerom*'s, for whereas S. *Jerom* keepeth to the Historical and Literal Sence, he uses only Moral and Mystical Expositions. 3. His Remarks are contrary to S. *Jerom*'s; as when he Expoundeth the Hundred and fourth *Psalm*, he saith that *Cynomia* is a *Dog-fly*. But S. *Jerom* rejects that Notion, at the latter end of his Letter to *Sunia* and *Fretella*. Upon the Eighty sixth *Psalm*, he observes that according to the Hebrew, it must be *Nunquid Sion, dicet Homo?* S. *Jerom* renders it, *Ad Sion, dicet Homo*. He denies that the Eighty ninth *Psalm* is written by *Moses*, tho' S. *Jerom* ascribes it to him, in his Commentary upon the thirteenth *Psalm*. He saith that a Passage of *Scripture* cited by S. *Paul* in the third Ch. of the Epistle to the *Romans*, is taken out of *Deuteronomy*, and S. *Jerom* shews that it is out of *Isaiah*. 4. This Authour's Stile is far from the Elegancy of S. *Jerom*'s, nay it is very full of Faults, Repetitions, and Solecisms. 5. This Authour's Commentary is made up of common Places, and moral Exhortations. 6. He quoteth S. *Eucherius* upon the Sixteenth *Psalm*. 7. It is manifest that these Commentaries are not Notes explaining the Letter of the Scripture; but Instructions, and Conferences (as appears by the Expositions of the Eighty ninth, Hundred and eleventh, and Hundred and fifteenth *Psalms*) whose Conclusions are in the form, of an Homily; and by several Expressions, discovering that the Author spake to others. And this has made it be believ'd, that they are the Discourses of some Monk, who expounded the *Psalms* to his Brethren, by collecting the Expositions of some Commentators. Wherefore it is no wonder to find in the Commentary upon the Ninety third *Psalm* a passage which S. *Augustin* citeth in his Epistle to *Fortunatianus*, under S. *Jerom*'s Name, and in the Commentary upon the Fiftieth *Psalm*, another passage quoted under S. *Jerom*'s Name by S. *Gregory*, in his Exposition of the Fourth penitential *Psalm*.

S. *Jerom*.

The Commentary upon *Job*, having been made, as appears by the Conclusion, at the request of *Victorius* an English Bishop, who lived in *Bede*'s time, cannot be S. *Jerom*'s, but very likely *Bede*'s himself. Some attribute it to *Philip* a Priest and Monk, S. *Jerom*'s Disciple, to whom *Gennadius* ascribes Commentaries upon *Job*. But this Commentary of *Philip*'s is that which is attributed to *Bede*, and this is rather *Bede*'s, being very like the Commentary upon the Proverbs of *Solomon*, which is undoubtedly his, as *Trithemius* assures us: These Commentaries do very much differ from S. *Jerom*'s, both as to the Stile, and the Matter: The Author citeth the Scripture according to our Vulgar Translation; he quotes S. *Augustin*, S. *Gregory*, and S. *Jerom*. In the Commentary upon the Twenty fifth Chapter of *Job*, there is a passage cited by *Faustus Rhedonensis* under S. *Jerom*'s Name: It is likely that the Author of that Work had taken it out of this Father.

The Commentaries, or Notes upon all S. *Paul*'s Epistles are not S. *Jerom*'s, but a *Pelagian* Authour's, who openly teacheth his Errors in several places, and particularly upon the Seventh Chapter of the Epistle to the *Romans*. It is certain, that *Pelagius* made a Commentary upon S. *Paul*'s Epistles, which S. *Augustin* quoteth in several places of the Third Book *of Merits, and Remission of sins*. This same Commentary of *Pelagius* is likewise cited by *Marius Mercator*, and there are most of the passages quoted by both these Authors. Yet two or three are not there; which might give occasion of doubting, whether it were perfectly the same, if *Cassiodorus* had not informed, us that he struck some places out of it.

The Epistle to *Demetrias* the Virgin which is the first Book of S. *Jerom*'s Ninth Volume, belongs likewise to *Pelagius*, as S. *Augustin* assures us, in his Book *of the Grace of Jesus Christ*, where he refuteth the Errors therein contained.

The Second Epistle of the same Volume is a Letter of S. *Augustin*'s to *Juliana*, *Demetrias*'s Mother, against the foregoing Letter.

The Third directed to *Gerontius*'s Daughters, is of the same stile with the First; and the Author seems to be of the same Opinions. He commendeth S. *Paulinus* as his Contemporary and his Friend.

The Eighth Letter *of the knowledge of God's Law*, seems to belong to the same Author, and perhaps *Pelagius*, who was S. *Paulinus*'s Friend, and had written a Letter to him.

The Fourth Letter to *Marcella*, the Fifth to *a Banished Virgin*, the Ninth *of the Three Vertues*, the Twelfth *of the Honour due to Parents* are written in the same stile. *Marianus* thinks that the former belong to S. *Paulinus*. The Sixth, and Seventh are of the same Author: In this last there is some Discourse of the Worship of Relicks, and of discovering the Bodies of S. *Gervasius*, and S. *Protasius* by S. *Ambrose*. Some ascribe both these Letters to *Maximus Taurinensis*.

The Tenth Letter *of the Assumption of the Virgin Mary*, is written by some Latin Author who lived when the *East* was infected with the Errors of the *Eutychians*; as he observeth himself, long after the Death of S. *Jerom*, and *Sophronius*, to whom some have attributed this Letter. He that writ it set it out under S. *Jerom*'s Name, that what he saith of the Blessed Virgin *Mary*, might be more valued. And the better to colour his Cheat, he pretends to direct it to *Paula* and *Eustochium*. Altho' he enlargeth much upon the Commendations and Prerogatives of the Virgin *Mary*, yet he saith that it was not certain, whether she was risen again, and her Body carried up into Heaven. This Treatise tho' suppositious, was inserted into the Offices of the Church by *Paulus Diaconus*, and *Alcuinus*, in *Charlemaign*'s time: And since it hath made up part of the Lessons for the Feast of the Assumption, in the old Breviaries of *France* and *Italy*.

The Eleventh is likewise upon the same Subject, and perhaps written by the same Author.

The Book *of the Seven Ecclesiastical Orders*, falsly supposed to be directed to *Rusticus* Bishop

S. Jerom. of *Narbon*, who lived at the ſame time with S. *Leo*, belongs to a Modern Author in compariſon of S. *Jerom*, who lived after *Iſidore* of *Seville*, from whom he hath taken many things. Yet he is older than *Micrologus*, or than Biſhop *Hincmar*, who quote this Work under S. *Jerom*'s Name; which ſhows that this Author wrote about the ſeventh Century.

The fourteenth Letter is *a Commendation of Virginity*; where he deſcribes the Danger of Loſing it, and the Enormity of the Crime committed by a Virgin conſecrated to God, when ſhe violateth her Vows. This likewiſe is a Work of an Author younger than S. *Jerom*, as well as the thirteenth Letter, where ſome Expreſſions which the Scripture makes uſe of after a Manner ſuitable to the Weakneſs of our Underſtanding, are explained. An ordinary Skill may diſcover that none of theſe pieces are S. *Jerom*'s.

The Creed attributed to *Damaſus*, which is the fifteenth piece of this Volume, is a Confeſſion of Faith copied out, partly from that in S. *Gregory Nazianzen*, and in *Vigilius Tapſenſis*, which we attributed to *Gregory* of *Bætica*: but this was brought to the Form it now has, long after *Damaſus*; for there is the Article that the Holy Ghoſt proceedeth from the Father and the Son. which was not in all the ancient Creeds.

The Explication of the Creed dedicated to *Damaſus*, immediately after this Confeſſion of Faith now ſpoken of, is that Confeſſion of Faith which *Pelagius* ſent to Pope *Innocent*, that is condemned by S. *Auguſtin* in his Book *of the Grace of Jeſus Chriſt*, where he produces ſome Extracts out of it, which are word for word in this.

The eighteenth Tract is a third Confeſſion of Faith, ſuppoſed to be directed to S. *Cyril*, and compoſed by ſome Modern Author, as appears by his Method of Expounding the Myſteries.

The following Treatiſe *upon the Creed* goes under *Ruſinus*'s Name, who without diſpute is the true Author of it.

The Treatiſe to *Præſidius* is a Declamation compoſed by ſome mean Imitator of S. *Jerom*, who affects to ſpeak of the Deaths of *Valentinian* and *Gratian*, as happening in his time, for I cannot believe that the trifles and impertinences that occurr in that Work are S. *Jerom*'s: they are far more worthy of an Impoſtor.

The Treatiſe *of the Circumciſion* to *Theraſia*, is a more genuine and an Ancienter Monument.

The Twenty firſt Epiſtle is a Letter of S. *Auguſtin* to *Januarius*, which was formerly the One hundred and nineteenth, and now the Fifty fifth among this Father's Epiſtles.

The Authour of the two following Treatiſes is not known, which are, the one a Declamation againſt a Virgin called *Suſanna*, that was fallen into ſin; and the other a reproof to *Evagrius*, for refuſing to comfort a Churchman that had ſinned.

The Twenty fourth Letter is written by *Paulinus*.

The other Pieces in the firſt part of this Volume are mean, and flat Sermons upon divers Subjects.

The Thirty ſixth concerning the Obſervation of the Eves of Holidays is aſcribed in the Third Volume of F. *Dachery*'s *Spicilegium*, to *Nicetius* Biſhop of *Triers*, who lived about the year 535: there may be poſſibly ſeveral other Sermons of the ſame Author.

The Fortieth and laſt, is a Letter upon the Parable of the Prodigal Son, which belongs to ſome *Pelagian* Author, and perhaps to *Pelagius* himſelf.

The Second part of this Volume containeth certain Diſcourſes very like S. *Jerom*'s, though they bear the Names of their Authors. Theſe are, a Letter of S. *Paulinus* to *Sebaſtian* the Hermit, the Tranſlation of *Pamphilus* his Apology for *Origen*, a Treatiſe of *Ruſinus* concerning the falſification of *Origen*'s Books, the Tranſlation of *Origen*'s Principles by *Ruſinus*, with his Prologue, *Ruſinus* his Apology to Pope *Anaſtaſius*, this Pope's Letter to *John* of *Jeruſalem*: Both the Books of *Ruſinus* againſt S. *Jerom*. Three Letters of S. *Auguſtin* to S. *Jerom*, which formerly were the Twenty eighth, Twenty ninth, and One hundred fifty ſeventh, amongſt S. *Auguſtin*'s, and now the One hundred ſixty ſixth, One hundred ſixty ſeventh, and One hundred ninetieth, and the Homily of the Paſtors which is in the Ninth Volume of the ſame Author. The Epiſtle attributed to *Valerius* addreſſed to *Ruſinus*, which comes after theſe Treatiſes of S. *Auguſtin*, is the Work of ſome Impoſtor.

Gennadius his Book *of Famous Men*, is a continuation of S. *Jerom*'s: but the Catalogue *of ſome Eccleſiaſtical Authors*, which is found alſo in this Volume, is a ſad piece, and ſo are two Letters going before it, and two others immediately following, falſely aſcribed to S. *Jerom* and to *Damaſus*.

The *Rule for Monks* is a Collection of Sentences and Precepts taken out of S. *Jerom*, compoſed by *Lupus* General of the Monks that ſtiled themſelves of the Order of Hermits of S. *Jerom*, and approved by Pope *Martin* V.

The Dialogue, of the Origination of the Soul, betwixt S. *Auguſtin* and S. *Jerom*, is the Fiction of ſome ignorant Perſon, who drew out of both theſe Fathers Works ſome Paſſages of his Dialogue.

It is not eaſy to gueſs who was the Author of the ſmall Treatiſe *of the Body and Blood of Jeſus Chriſt*; but it is eaſy to gueſs, that he that compoſed it was well vers'd in the Doctrine of the Fathers: The ſame may be ſaid of the Author that wrote the Homily upon the Parable of the importunate Neighbour who asked a Loaf of his Friend. *Luk.* chap. 11.

The third part of this Volume contains ſuch Treatiſes as *Marianus* judged unworthy to be ranked among Pieces of any Value. He might have joined to them thoſe which he ſet down in the firſt and ſecond Rank, whereof ſome are even more contemptible than thoſe in the third.

He

He begins with three Epistles which some Impostor composed under S. *Jerom*'s Name. But the Imposture is discovered by the Meanness of the Expressions, and the little Exactness in the Thoughts, which discover the Cheat. The first is a comforting Letter to *Tyrasius* upon the Death of his Daughter. The second an Exhortation to *Oceanus*, how Injuries are to be endured. The third to the same, concerning the Lives of Clergy-men. It is a strange thing that *Baronius* durst affirm this to be really S. *Jerom*'s, it being manifest that the Stile is very different from S. *Jerom*'s; besides that he speaketh of S. *Martin*, whom he calleth Blessed, and of his Life composed by *Sulpitius Severus*. We have already given our Judgment of the Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Authors that is inserted here, and of the precedent and following Letters. S. Jerom.

The *Rule for Nuns* is written by some simple and unlearned Monk.

The Letter of *Chromatius* and *Heliodorus* to S. *Jerom*, and the Answer under this Father's Name, upon the Virgin *Mary*'s Life, are fabulous Fictions wholly unworthy of Credit.

Lastly, S. *Jerom*'s Life, supposed to have been written by his Disciple *Eusebius*, S. *Augustin*'s Letter to S. *Cyril* in S. *Jerom*'s Commendation, and S. *Cyril*'s to S. *Augustin* about his Miracles, are rejected by every body, as miserable Pieces, full of Fables, Falsities and Ignorance. Can there be a grosser one than what the *Pseudo-Cyril* saith, That S. *Jerom*'s Miracles convinced *Silvanus* the Heretick, who taught, That there were two Wills in Christ? as if either S. *Cyril* or S. *Jerom* had lived in the Time of the *Monothelites*, or had approved of those Hereticks Doctrines.

S. *Jerom*, doubtless, was the Learnedest of all the Fathers; he understood Languages very well, and was well skilled in Humanity and Philological Learning. He was well vers'd in Ecclesiastical and Prophane History, and very skilful in Philosophy. Poets, Historians, Orators, and the Greek and Latin Philosophers were equally familiar to him; he throughly understood them, and filled his Writings with their finest Strokes. His Way of Writing is clear and lively. He affects not that lofty Eloquence of the Barr, which is supported by high Terms and a handsom Turn of a Period; but he excelleth in that other kind of Eloquence that is necessary for those that commit their Thoughts to Writing, which consists in the Nobleness of Expressions and Thoughts. His Discourse is enlivened by a wonderful Variety of lively and surprizing Turns, and adorned with an infinite number of different Colours, sometimes he brings in Flowers of Rhetorick; sometimes he dexterously employs Logical Subtilties. He often makes apt Allusions by the finest passages of the Poets, and constantly calleth to his Assistance the Thoughts and Maxims of the Philosophers. In a word, he collects the finest things in all Arts and Sciences, and adapts them so exactly to his Discourse, that they seem to be there in their natural Place. So that his Style may be compared to those in-laid Works, where the Pieces are so artificially pieced together that they seem to have been made one for the other. Yet it must be confessed that he affecteth this Way of Writing too much, and overchargeth his Discourse with Quotations. He gives a diverting and chearful Air to the rougheſt Questions, and explains the most intricate Difficulties with great Clearness. His Commentaries upon the Scripture are written in a Style very different from his other Works. Those Flowers, and that Ornament before named, are banished from them, and the Text is explained with Simplicity and Clearness, as he says himself in several places: For he saith in his Questions to *Damasus*, *He that treateth of the holy Scripture, should not borrow* Aristotle's *subtle Reasonings, nor use* Tully's *Eloquence, or the Flowers of* Quintillian *to refresh his Reader with his Declamations. His Discourse should be plain and vulgar. It is not necessary that it should be composed with Care; it is sufficient that it expounds the Things, and discovers the Sence of the Scripture and clears its Obscurities. Let others be eloquent, and by that get Commendations and Applause; let them thunder out great Words in a plausible Harangue, for my part I am satisfied to speak so as I may be understood, and discoursing of the holy Scripture, I strive to imitate its Simplicity.* So much of his Style. His Genius was hot and vehement; he fell upon his Adversaries with fierceness, made them ridiculous by his Jests, trampled upon them with Terms of Contempt, and made them blush with Reproaches. Though he was very Learned, yet there is infinitely more liveliness and Vehemency in his Exhortations and Polemical Works than Exactness and Solidity. He knew a great deal, but he never argued upon Principles, which made him sometimes contradict himself. He often carries his Subject too far, being transported with his ordinary Heat, he commends, blames, condemns and approves of things according to the Impression which they make upon his Imagination. He is more moderate and just in his Commentaries, but not always exact, because he did not think enough, but contented himself with dictating to his *Amanuenses* (as he owns himself) either what he had read in other Mens Commentaries, or learned from the Jews. He often sets down the Expositions of different Commentators, without altering any thing, and without naming those from whom he took them: Nay, he introduced such Explications as he did not approve himself, though without refuting them; being persuaded that it was enough that he had given notice to his Reader, that in his Commentaries there were several Explications which he copied out of others. Thus he excused himself of some Errors that were imputed to him, because they were found in his Commentaries. This Advertisement may serve also to vindicate him from several Errors and Contradictions which may be found in his Commentaries. In this manner he justifieth himself against *Rufinus*, who upbraided him for teaching in his Commentary upon the Epistle to the *Ephesians*, *Origen*'s Opinions of the Resurrection,

S. *Jerom.* Reſurrection, the Præ-exiſtence of Souls, and of the Deliverance of Devils and Damned Men. He does not deny that theſe Opinions are in his Commentaries; but he aſſerts, that they are ſet down in *Origen*'s Name, and not in his own; and conſequently, that they ought not to be imputed to him. It is an extraordinary thing however, that having produced theſe Opinions of *Origen* without declaring againſt them, he ſhould afterwards look upon them as Criminal in *Origen*, and condemn them as very dangerous Errors. But what may ſeem yet more ſtrange, is, that himſelf hath uttered ſomething like it in his Commentary upon the 66th. Chapter of *Iſaiah*; where he really acknowledges, that the Puniſhments of Devils, Infidels, and impious Men, that know not God, are never to end; but he ſaith, That as for Sinners and impious Men that are Chriſtians, whoſe Works are to be tried and purified by the Fire, the Judge's Sentence will be moderate, and temper'd with Clemency. I know this place is underſtood of Purgatory and Venial Sins; but S. *Jerom*'s Words ſeem to imply ſomething more, ſince the name of Impious Chriſtians cannot be given to thoſe who are guilty of Venial Sins only, and deſerve no more than Purgatory. Several ſuch things may be found in the Commentary upon the 4th. Chapter of *Amos*, in the firſt Book againſt the *Pelagians*, and in the Commentary upon the Prophet *Nahum*, where he ſays, That God granted pardon to thoſe that periſhed in the Flood, as well as to the *Sodomites*, *Egyptians*, and other Sinners, who were puniſhed in this World for their Crimes; according to this Rule of the Prophet, That God will not puniſh twice for the ſame Sin. Several other particular Opinions of *Origen*, are to be met with in this Father's Commentaries, which he ſeems to approve of. He teaches in his Treatiſe of the Prodigal Son, that the Angels may ſin. Upon the Epiſtle to *Titus*, he affirms that they were before the Creation of the World. Upon the Prophet *Micah*, That they ſhall be preſent at the laſt Judgment. Upon the Epiſtle to the *Epheſians*, That Chriſt died for them. Upon *Eccleſiaſtes*, That the Sun and the Stars have Souls; and many other Notions of this kind which he rejected himſelf when he refuted *Origen*.

In S. *Jerom*'s Commentaries there are alſo ſeveral Opinions that ſavour of Jewiſh Superſtitions, or the too great credulity of the firſt Chriſtians: As when he aſſerteth in the Commentaries upon the Prophets, *Daniel* and *Micah*, That the World ſhall laſt but One thouſand years; or, when he ſaith in his Commentary upon the Prophet *Habakkuk*, That God's particular Providence extends only to Men; and that all other Creatures are governed by a general Providence, without God's having a diſtinct knowledge of each Event: Or, when by too much ſcrupuloſity he condemns all Oaths, as he doth in his Commentary upon the 5th. of S. *Matthew*, and upon the 2d. Chapter of *Zachary*: Or, when he forbids Chriſtians to pay Tribute to Heathen Princes, upon S. *Matthew*, Chapt. the 7th. Or, when he pretends that the Name of *Father* is to be given to no Man, in the Commentary upon the Epiſtle to the *Galatians*, l. 2. But if he is too ſcrupulous in theſe places, in others he ſeems to be a little too free; as, when in his Commentary upon *Jonas*, he adviſes and approves the Action of ſuch as kill themſelves to preſerve their Chaſtity. Perhaps ſome perſons will not think him leſs to blame in his Commentary upon the 23d. of S. *Matthew*, where he diſapproves the Action of ſome devout Women, who, in imitation of the *Phariſees*, bound about their Necks, Books of the Goſpel, or Croſſes, or other Marks of Devotion *. Laſtly, He ſometimes giveth Allegorical Sences to things which are to be underſtood literally; as, when in the Commentary upon the Epiſtle to the *Epheſians*, he ſaith, That *Jacob*'s Wreſtling with the Angel, is not to be underſtood literally of a corporeal and viſible Combat, but myſtically of an inviſible and ſpiritual Fight: Yet he is angry that Men ſhould ſay that Hell-fire is not a real fire, and that the Scripture makes uſe of that word by a Metaphor; or, that what is ſaid of the Earthly Paradiſe, is not to be underſtood Literally, but Allegorically. Theſe are *ſome* of the Faults that have been taken notice of in S. *Jerom*'s Commentaries, and which crept in by the too great precipitation with which he wrote them.

[* If ſome Perſons will think S. *Jerom* to blame, others, upon much better grounds, will commend him for diſapproving Practices that are ſo very ſuperſtitious, and that cannot any manner of way tend to the advancement of ſolid Piety and Holineſs.]

His Polemical Treatiſes are written with more care. But as he indulges his ordinary heat too much, ſo he falleth into thoſe extreams for which he hath been often blamed. As for example; when he diſputeth with *Helvidius*, he commendeth Virginity to that exceſs, that it was thought, he deſigned to condemn Matrimony; and his Book having ſcandalized many, himſelf was obliged to apologize for it, and moderate the terms which he had uſed before. When he undertakes to abate the pride of Deacons, who would make themſelves equal with Prieſts; he ſo exalteth the Dignity of the latter, that he ſeems not to think them inferior to Biſhops. He diſcourſeth after ſuch a manner of Virginity, as would almoſt perſwade Men that it is neceſſary to lead that ſort of life to be ſaved. Labour, Faſtings, Auſterities, with other Mortifications, Solitude and Pilgrimages, make up the ſubject of almoſt all his Advices and Exhortations. His delight was to write and hear of the Lives of Monks and Hermits, and he eaſily believed whatſoever was told him upon that ſubject, though never ſo extraordinary.

Moſt of S. *Jerom*'s Writings being either Critical or Moral, there is very little Dogmatical concerning the main Points of Chriſtianity to be met with in them: Beſides, he flouriſhed in a time wherein the Diſputes concerning the Trinity and Incarnation were over: The *Arian* and *Apollinarian* Hereſies having been rejected, and thoſe of *Neſtorius* and *Eutyches* not being yet riſen.

The

the *Pelagian* Hereſie brake out towards the latter end of this Father's Life, which he undertook to refute immediately, with as much vigour, as he could have done in his earlier years. He ſhewed the Neceſſity of Chriſt's help, and the Impoſſibility of living in this World without Sin; and free from Paſſions, againſt that Heretick: However, he doth not weaken the ſtrength of Free-will, which conſiſted, in his Opinion, in a free choice, either to follow or to reject God's Call. He went no further into the Nature of Grace, or other Difficulties about Original Sin and Predeſtination. He ſeems to think that God hath predeſtinated or reproved Men, becauſe of his Eternal fore-knowledge of the Good or Evil they ſhould doe. This he teacheth in his Apology againſt *Ruſinus*, by oppoſing *Origen*'s Principle, which grounded Predeſtination or Reprobation upon paſt Merits. He ſaith upon the 121ſt. *Pſalm*, that the Prayer of Jeſus Chriſt did not always obtain what he deſired. S. *Jerom.*

I ſhall conclude theſe Remarks with ſome Paſſages of S. *Jerom*, that expreſs his Thoughts upon the Sacraments of the Euchariſt and Penance. *You ask* (ſaith he in his Letter to *Hedibia*, Queſt. 2.) *how thoſe words of our Saviour in S.* Matthew *are to be underſtood: I ſay unto you, that henceforth I will drink no more of the fruit of the Vine, untill I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom. Some grounding their Opinion upon theſe words, have invented a fabulous Reign of a Thouſand years; wherein, they pretend, that Jeſus Chriſt ſhall reign corporeally, and drink of a ſort of new Wine, whereof he has not drunk from the time of his Paſſion, to the end of the World. But not to trouble our ſelves about ſuch Fables: Let us acknowledge, that the Bread which our Saviour brake, and gave to his Diſciples, is the Body of the ſame Saviour. If then the Bread that came down from Heaven is the Lord's Body, and if the Wine which he gave to his Diſciples is his Blood, let us reject thoſe Jewiſh Fables, and go up with the Lord into that great and high Room* [*which is the Church*;] *let us receive at his hand the Cup, which is the New Covenant.* Moſes *gave us not the true Bread, but our Lord Jeſus Chriſt did; he invites us to the Feaſt, and is himſelf our Meat; he eats with us, and we eat him. We drink his Blood, we daily tread in the Sacrifices, the Grapes that are red with his Blood.* He tells us again upon the ſame Subject, in his Commentary upon the firſt Chapter of the Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*, *That Jeſus Chriſt the Son of God hath given his Blood to redeem us, but that this Blood of Jeſus Chriſt may be taken, either for his Spiritual and Divine Fleſh; whereof he ſaith himſelf, My Fleſh is Meat indeed, and my Blood is drink indeed: Or for his Fleſh that was crucified, and his Blood that was ſpilt in his Paſſion with the Soldier's Lance.* The Author of the Book *of the Body and Blood of Chriſt*, that goes under *Bertram*'s Name, quotes this laſt paſſage, which doth not prove, as ſome pretend, that the Fleſh of Jeſus Chriſt is not really in the Euchariſt, but only that it is not there after a viſible, paſſible, and corruptible manner, as it was upon the Croſs. The Compariſon, added by S. *Jerom*, of the Fleſh of the Saints, explains his meaning. *There may be found* (ſaith he) *a variety of Fleſh and Blood in the Saints; ſo that the Fleſh which ſhall one day ſee the Salvation of God, ſhall be different from the Fleſh that ſhall be incapable of poſſeſſing his Kingdom.* Thus, as the Fleſh of Saints, in the next Life, is the ſame Fleſh, though impaſſible and incorruptible; ſo the ſame Fleſh of Chriſt, which was corruptible, and capable of ſuffering upon the Croſs, is impaſſible and incorruptible in the Euchariſt. There is another paſſage, the Expoſition whereof is much controverted in the Commentary upon the Twenty-ſixth Chapter of S. *Matthew*, where he ſaith, *That the Lord having celebrated the Old Paſſover, which was a Figure of the New, paſſed to the true Sacrament of the Paſſover, that as formerly* Melchiſedeck, *High-prieſt of the Almighty God, offering Bread and Wine, drew out before-hand the Figure of this Myſtery; ſo Jeſus Chriſt, to fulfill the ſame, ſhould repreſent the Truth of his Body and Blood.* Theſe laſt words are variouſly rendred: The Proteſtants will have the word *repræſentare* to ſignifie only *to repreſent*. The Church of *Rome*, on the contrary, maintains, that *repræſentare* implies as much as *to make preſent*. This latter Sence is confirmed by the following Words: *The fatted Calf which is offered, to obtain the Salvation of Repentance, is the Saviour himſelf, whoſe Fleſh we daily eat, and whoſe Blood we daily drink. The Reader, who is one of the Faithfull, underſtands as well as I doe, what this nouriſhment is, which filling us with its abundance, makes us put forth outwardly Praiſes and holy Thanksgivings. This ſacred Feaſt is daily celebrated; The Father receiveth his Son every day, Jeſus Chriſt is continually offered upon the Altars.* In the Epiſtle to Pope *Damaſus*, he ſaith, That there is as much difference betwixt the Loaves they offered to God in the Old Law, and the Body of Jeſus Chriſt, in the Euchariſt, as betwixt the Shadow and the Body, betwixt the Image and the Truth, and betwixt the Types and the Things they repreſent. Laſtly, In the Epiſtle to *Heliodorus*, ſpeaking of Prieſts, he ſaith, That they make the Body of Jeſus Chriſt with their ſacred Mouth: *Qui Chriſti corpus Sacro ore conficiunt.* In his Commentary upon *Zephaniah*, he ſeems to doubt whether wicked Prieſts conſecrate it: But 'tis probable, that he ſpeaks thus rather to terrifie them, than to eſtabliſh a Propoſition, whoſe Conſequences would prove very dangerous.

[Theſe words, *which is the Church* are not in S. *Jerom.*]

I add an excellent Paſſage of this Father concerning the Sacrament of Penance, taken out of his Commentary upon theſe Words of the 16th. Chapter of S. *Matthew*: *Whatſoever ye ſhall bind on Earth, ſhall be bound in Heaven; and whatſoever ye ſhall looſe on Earth, ſhall be looſed in Heaven. Some* (ſaith he) *Prieſts and Biſhops of the New Law, underſtanding not the ſence of theſe words, doe imitate the pride of the Phariſees, by aſcribing to themſelves a power to condemn the Innocent, and to abſolve the Guilty. But God doth not ſo much conſider the Sentence of the Prieſt, as the Life of the Penitent: And as the Levites did not cleanſe the Lepers, but only ſeparated thoſe that*

S. Jerom. *were cleanſed from thoſe that were not, by the knowledge which they had of the Leproſie: Even ſo the Biſhop, or the Prieſt, doth not bind thoſe that are innocent, and looſe the guilty; but having heard the difference of Sins, he knows whom to bind, and whom to looſe, in the diſcharge of his Miniſtery.*

In this place, we may take notice, 1. Of the Cuſtom of declaring Sins to the Prieſt. 2. The Power which Prieſts had to Abſolve. 3. The uſe Prieſts were to make of the Keys, and the care they were to take not to Abſolve, but ſuch as were truly penitent*.

[*After what has been already ſaid of S. *Jerom*, one can hardly eſteem him a Perſon, upon whoſe Authority Points of Doctrine or Matters of Diſcipline can ſafely be eſtabliſhed. He may however give the Sence of the Church in his own time, in Matters wherein he perſonally was not concerned, in which we have Reaſon to think that he gives a faithfull Account of things: And therefore ſince we have no Cauſe to disbelieve what he ſays of the Euchariſt, and of (what the Church of *Rome* calls the Sacrament of) Penance; but, on the contrary, may reaſonably ſuppoſe, that he ſpake the Sence of the Church. The Paſſages themſelves are to be examined. Of thoſe concerning the Euchariſt, we are to conſider, 1. That he keeps himſelf to the Language of the New Teſtament in his Anſwer to *Hedibia*'s Queſtion, and only confutes the *Millennaries*, but ſays nothing of the *Modus* of the Preſence of the Body and Blood of Chriſt in the Sacrament. 2. That his Interpretation of thoſe Words in S. *John*, *My Fleſh is Meat indeed, and my Blood is Drink indeed*, of the Spiritual and Divine Fleſh of Jeſus Chriſt, ſhews that he underſtood them Allegorically; for he diſtinguiſhes that from the Fleſh of Jeſus Chriſt, which ſuffered upon the Croſs: Now there is equal Reaſon to believe, that what our Saviour ſays in the 6th. Chapter of S. *John*, concerning Eating his Fleſh, and Drinking his Blood, is literally to be underſtood, as what he ſays in the Inſtitution of the Sacrament of the Euchariſt: And if one is Allegorically to be interpreted, then they are both. 3. That the Myſteries of Religion were as nicely examined in that Age, as in any ſince Jeſus Chriſt declared it to the World; and when every thing elſe that was Myſterious was controverted, this ſingle Article of the Real Preſence, as defined by the Council of *Trent*, which is *contrary* to that Reaſon, that the other Diſputes concerning the Trinity and the Divine Decrees are properly *above*, was never debated. This is ſo ſtrange (if we ſuppoſe the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome* to have been then receiv'd) that it is incredible; eſpecially when we conſider, 4. That the generality of the Fathers, at that time, interpreted every thing in Scripture Allegorically, to which they could not aſſign a convenient Literal ſence. This the People were uſed to: This was S. *Jerom*'s practice very often; and he had learnt it of *Origen*, whom he ſeems ſincerely to have follow'd, till he quarrelled with *Ruſinus*: So that we have great Reaſon to think, that Men ſo accuſtomed to Allegories, as the Teachers and the People were in this Age, would not be at a Loſs to interpret our Bleſſed Saviour's meaning in any of his Words, which Literally interpreted, would contradict and do Violence to that Reaſon by which they were capacitated to underſtand any part of his Law.

The Paſſage produced in favour of *Auricular Confeſſion* proves nothing leſs; S. *Jerom* ſays, That after the Prieſt *had heard the difference of Sins, he knew whom to bind and whom to looſe*; that is very true; but that is no Reaſon for Men to reveal all their Sins to the Prieſt; becauſe the Church, in that Age, put Men under Penance only for publick Sins; thoſe that had committed private ones of ſuch a Nature, as would, if diſcovered, have made them unfit to come to the Sacrament, were exhorted to put themſelves under a voluntary Penance; and if they did ſo, they were obliged to declare why they did it, that ſo the time of their Penance might be regulated; but this ſeems to have been left to themſelves, which makes it quite another thing from the practice of the Church of *Rome*.]

S. *Jerom*'s Works were publiſhed by *Eraſmus*, and printed in ſix Volumes at *Baſil*, from the Year 1516, to the Year 1526. In 1530, they were again printed at *Lions* by *Gryphius*, and at *Baſil*, by *Froben*, in 1553. The Firſt Edition of *Marianus* was at *Rome*, by *Manutius*, in the Years 1565, 1571, and 1572. The Second at *Paris*, by *Nivelle*, in 1579. The Third at *Antwerp*, in 1579. The Fourth at *Paris*, with *Gravius* his Notes, in 1609. The Fifth is of 1624, at *Paris*. The Laſt was printed in 1643. Theſe are the Collections of all this Father's Works. There are ſeveral of them printed by themſelves, as the Letters in *Octavo*, printed at *Rome* by *Manutius* in 1566, at *Antwerp* in 1568, with *Gravius*'s Notes, and at *Mentz* in 1470, at *Venice* in 1476, at *Paris* in 1583, at *Dilingen* in 1565, at *Louvain* in 1573. The Book of *Famous Men*, at *Louvain* and *Helmſtad* in 1611, at *Colen* in 1580, at *Lions* in 1617, at *Antwerp* in 1639. The Epiſtles to *Theophilus* at *Paris* in 1546, and 1589. The Book of *Virginity* at *Rome* in 1562. The Treatiſe of *Hebrew Names* at *Wirtemberg* in 1626. I ſay nothing of the Editions of the *Chronicon*, becauſe they were mentioned in the Account of *Euſebius* his Works.

[Dr. *Cave* mentions an Edition of S. *Jerom*'s Works at *Frankfort* in 1684, in 12 Volumes in *folio*, with all the *Scholia*, Cenſures, Index's, and Collections of all ſorts that had been printed, till that time, upon S. *Jerom*; which are all comprized in the three laſt Volumes.]

The *Benedictines* of the Congregation of S. *Maura* will ſoon undertake a new Edition of S. *Jerom*. There is reaſon to hope that it will not be inferior either in Beauty or Exactneſs to thoſe of S. *Auguſtin* and S. *Ambroſe*, which are almoſt compleated by the Labours of thoſe Illuſtrious Monks, who make ſo good uſe both of their Time and Watchings, to enrich the Church with ſuch glorious Works.

RUFI-

RUFINUS.

Rufinus.

RUFINUS, Sir-named by ſome *Toranus*, or *Tyranius* (*a*), a Prieſt of *Aquileia* (*b*), was famous in S. *Jerom*'s time; and after he had been one of his beſt Friends (*c*), he proved afterwards one of his greateſt Enemies. He embraced a Monaſtick life (*d*), and was baptized in a Monaſtery about the Year 370. He went out of *Rome* with *Melania* in 372, to go into *Egypt* (*e*), to viſit the Monks in the Deſert of *Nitria*; they came out of *Egypt* into *Paleſtina*, and dwelt 25 Years in *Jeruſalem*, where the Houſe of that famous Widow was the Reſort and Harbour of all the Pilgrims that came to viſit the holy Places. She received them with joy, kept them at her own Charges, and gave great Gifts to the Church of *Jeruſalem*. All this time *Rufinus* ſpent his Life in the Study and Exerciſes of Piety. Becauſe he underſtood the Greek and Latin Tongues very well, he undertook to Read and Tranſlate the Works of Greek Authors, and eſpecially of *Origen*: He conceived ſo high an Eſteem for that Author, that he undertook his Defence againſt all Accuſers. This made him fall out with S. *Jerom*, who took the contrary ſide: However, they were reconciled before *Rufinus* (*f*) left *Paleſtina* to return to *Rome*. But this Peace did not laſt long. *Rufinus* and *Melania* having tarried 25 Years in the Eaſt, reſolved to go back to *Rome*: They took Shipping in the Year 397; and having paſſed by *Nola*, where they were very well received by S. *Paulinus*, Biſhop of that place, they came to *Rome*. Sometime after *Rufinus* publiſhed the Tranſlation of the Firſt Book of the Apology for *Origen*, which went under *Pamphilus*'s Name, with a Letter to ſhow that *Origen*'s Works had been falſified, and a Tranſlation of the Books of *Principles*, with a Preface that offended S. *Jerom*. This Saint wrote immediately his Apology againſt *Rufinus*, againſt which *Rufinus* compoſed Two Books of Invectives. This Controverſie made a great noiſe in *Rome*, where both theſe famous Antagoniſts were in great credit, and had many Advocates. *Rufinus* kept himſelf quiet as long as Pope *Syricius* lived, and received a Letter of Communion from this Pope; with which he retired into *Aquileia*. But after his Death, *Anaſtaſius*, that ſucceeded him, cited *Rufinus* to appear before him; but he not appearing, only excuſing himſelf by an Apology, was condemned without Mercy; ſo that he could not preſerve his Dignity of Presbyter in *Aquileia*, where he abode till the *Viſigoths* ſpoiled *Italy* in 409, when he was forced to retire into *Sicily*, where he died in the Year 410 (*g*).

Rufinus wrote Two ſorts of Books, Tranſlations of Greek Authors, and Books of his own making.

(*a*) *Sir-named* Toranus *or* Tyranius.] This Sir-name was given him by a certain Author that ſpeaketh of Eccleſiaſtical Writers, whoſe Book is immediately after the Treatiſe of *Ildephonſus* of *Toledo* in *Miræus*'s *Bibliotheca*. He is commonly called *Toranus*; but the Original of that Name is not known.

(*b*) *Prieſt of* Aquileia.] *Gennadius*, *Palladius*, and all the reſt of the Ancients ſay that he was of *Aquileia*, a City of *Italy*; yea, himſelf ſeems to declare it plainly in his Apology; yet *Marius Mercator* calleth him a *Syrian*. *Garnerius* is of opinion, That that *Rufinus*, ſpoken of by *Marius Mercator*, and whom he ſuppoſes to have been Author of the *Pelagian* Hereſie in *Rome*, is not the ſame with him of whom we write now; but his Arguments are very weak, and in all probability he is the ſame *Rufinus*. Father *Gerberon* thinks, on the contrary, that *Marius Mercator* ſpeaks indeed of our *Rufinus*; but he affirms, that *Rufinus* was not born in *Aquileia*, but only a Prieſt and an Inhabitant of that Town. He quotes two paſſages of S. *Jerom* to prove it, but they are not convincing. It is more natural to ſay that *Marius Mercator* called *Rufinus*, a *Syrian*, becauſe he dwelt long in *Syria*, and came from thence, when he ſowed the *Pelagian* Doctrine in *Rome*.

(*c*) *One of his beſt friends*] S. *Jerom* commends him in the 5th. Epiſtle to *Florentius*, and recommends him as a Man whom he particularly eſteem'd. His 4th. Epiſtle to *Rufinus* ſhews the ſame.

(*d*) *He embraced a Monaſtick life*] He ſaith in his firſt Invective, that Thirty years before he was baptized in a Monaſtery by *Chromatius*, *Jovinian* and *Euſebius*. This Writing is of 399, or 400.

(*e*) *To go into* Egypt, &c.] *Palladius* relateth theſe Circumſtances of the Lives of *Rufinus* and *Melania*, in his *Hiſtoria Lauſiaca*. Chap. 32, and 33. he ſaith, That they abode 27 Years in the Eaſt, but S. *Paulinus* reckons but 25: And this Epocha agreeth beſt with the other circumſtances of their Journey.

(*f*) *Yet they were reconciled.*] S. *Epiphanius* in his Letter charges *Rufinus* with *Origen*'s Errors, and reckons him among the Followers of *John* of *Jeruſalem*, and among S. *Jerom*'s Enemies. S. *Jerom* ſays the ſame in the 66th. Letter to *Rufinus*, as ſoon as he had publiſhed his Tranſlation of the Books of *Principles*, *Scias nos reconciliatas inimicitias purè colere.*

(*g*) *Where he died*, &c.] S. *Jerom* in his Commentaries upon *Ezekiel* and *Jeremiah*, ſpeaks of *Rufinus* as one already dead: It is certain that *Rufinus* retired into *Sicily* after *Rome* was taken, as he ſays himſelf in his Letter to *Urſacius*, ſet forth by *Valeſius*.

The

Ruſinus. The Greek Tranſlations are the greateſt and moſt conſiderable part of his Labours; for, as *Gennadius* ſays, he gave the *Latins* a great many of the Greek Books. The Catalogue of them is this:

The Twenty Books of *Jewiſh* Antiquities, by *Flavius Joſephus.*

The Seven Books of the *Jewiſh* War.

Two Books againſt *Appion* of the ſame Author.

Euſebius his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, reduced into Nine Books, and Tranſlated with great Liberty (*h*). The Books of Recognitions (*i*), attributed to S. *Clement*, with a Preface.

The Sentences (*k*) of *Sixtus* the *Pythagorean*, which he had falſely aſcribed to Pope *Sixtus* the Second of that Name.

The Book of *Origen*'s Principles; 17 Homilies of the ſame Author upon *Geneſis*; 12 Homilies upon *Exodus*; 16 Homilies upon *Leviticus*; 28 Homilies upon *Numbers*, 26 Homilies upon *Joſhua*; 9 Homilies upon the Book of *Judges*; the firſt Homily upon the Book of *Kings*; 9 Homilies upon the *Pſalms*, and Commentaries upon the Epiſtle to the *Romans*; and a Letter of *Origen*'s, where he complains of his Book's having been corrupted.

The firſt Book of *Pamphilus*'s Apology for *Origen.*

The Orations of S. *Gregory Nazianzen*: The Aſcetical Rules of S. *Baſil*, and ſome other Treatiſes of both theſe Fathers of the Church.

The Sentences of *Evagrius Ponticus*; and ſome other Treatiſes of this Author. He Tranſlated beſides, if we believe *Gennadius*, a Treatiſe of *Pamphilus*'s againſt the Mathematicians *: And S. *Jerom* obſerves, that he had publiſhed an *Arian*'s Book under the Name of *Theophilus* the Martyr; but neither of theſe Books are extant.

[* By *Mathematicians*, they meant *Judicial Aſtrologers*; as alſo did moſt of the ancient *Romans*, who were for the moſt part very ignorant of that part of Learning, till towards the Fall of their Empire, when *Apuleius*, *Boëthius* and *Caſſiodorus* Tranſlated ſome of the Elementary Books of the *Grecians*, into Latin.]

Ruſinus gave himſelf a great deal of liberty in his Tranſlations, and kept more to the Sence which he judged ought to be given to Authors, than to their Words. In a word, his Tranſlations are Paraphraſes, rather than literal and faithfull Verſions. He hath uſed much freedom, particularly in *Euſebius*'s Hiſtory, and in *Origen*'s Treatiſes, where he hath changed, added and ſtruck out many things, as he acknowledgeth himſelf. But if theſe Tranſlations be not ſincere, they are eloquent enough, and they have that clearneſs which makes them pleaſing to the Reader.

The Works of Ruſinus's *own Compoſition, are theſe.*

Two Books of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, which he hath added to the Tranſlation of *Euſebius* his Books; wherein he continues the Hiſtory of the Church, to the Death of *Theodoſius* the Emperor. Theſe Books are dedicated to *Chromatius* of *Aquileia*, and were written at the ſame time that *Alaric*, King of the *Goths*, waſted *Italy*. They were Tranſlated into Greek by *Gelaſius* of *Ceſarea*. They are pretty well written, but there are many Hiſtorical faults (*l*).

A Diſcourſe to prove, that *Origen*'s Books have been falſified; publiſhed at *Rome* in 397, with the Tranſlation of *Origen*'s Book of Principles, and of *Pamphilus*'s Apology.

Two Books againſt S. *Jerom*'s Apology, entituled *Invectives.*

In the former, to juſtifie his Doctrine againſt the Accuſations of S. *Jerom*, he produces that Creed, and that Doctrine which he had learned at *Aquileia* above Thirty years before, from *Chromatius*, *Jovinian* and *Euſebius*; he obſerveth, that in his Church they did not only profeſs in their Creed to believe the Reſurrection of the Fleſh, *carnis reſurrectionem*; but that they added, *of this Fleſh*, *hujus carnis reſurrectionem.* "To the end, ſaith he, that making the Sign of the Croſs upon our Brother, as is uſually done at the end of the Creed, we may make a publick profeſſion, that we believe the Reſurrection of the ſame Fleſh which we now touch. He uſes

(*h*) Euſebius *his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory reduced into Nine Books, and Tranſlated with great Liberty.*] He hath paſſed over almoſt all *Euſebius* his Ninth Book, and hath made but One of the Eighth and Ninth. In the Seventh he hath added a Relation of S. *Gregory Thaumaturgus* his Miracles, which is not in *Euſebius*; and in the Ninth, an Harangue of *Lucian* the Martyr. There is ſome alteration in the Order of the Chapters in the Sixth and Seventh Books. There are ſeveral faults in his Tranſlation; he makes *Zacharias*, ſpoken of in S. *Luke*, to have been a Martyr at *Lions*; he confounds S. *Biblias* with S. *Blandina*, &c.

(*i*) *The Books of Recognitions.*] *Bellarmin* believes that this Tranſlation is falſely attributed to *Ruſinus*; but *Gennadius* owns it to be his.

(*k*) *The Sentences of* Sixtus *the* Pythagorean.] S. *Jerom* upbraids him with that fraud in ſeveral places. *Ep. ad Cteſiph. in c.* 18. *Ezek. & in c.* 12. *Jeremiæ.*

(*l*) *There are many Hiſtorical faults.*] Theſe are ſome of them. He ſuppoſes that *Athanaſius* hid himſelf for ſix years after he was condemned by the Council of *Tyre*. He perverts the Order of Time in the Hiſtory of S. *Athanaſius*. He ſheweth but little favour to S. *Gregory Nazianzen*, and S. *Baſil*. He ſaith that S. *Hilary* was Excommunicated, which is falſe: And he confounds the Time, when he ſays, That S. *Hilary* was Baniſhed after the Council of *Milan*. There are ſeveral other faults of the ſame nature; notwithſtanding which, it is a very uſefull Work, becauſe he is the firſt that has unfolded and put in order the Hiſtory of that time.

this

this Confeſſion for his Juſtification againſt S. *Jerom*, from the Accuſation of being in an error in the point of the Reſurrection of the Fleſh, and of not believing that Man ſhould riſe again with his whole Fleſh. He affirms, that he is wrongfully accuſed of that Error; for his Opinion is, that the whole Body ſhall riſe again with its Members; but that it ſhall be glorious and immortal, and ſhall be no more ſubject to Corruption, and other infirmities of mortal and corruptible Fleſh. *Rufinus.*

After this he anſwers what was objected againſt him, that he entertained Heretical Opinions concerning the Trinity. He ſhews, that his Doctrine in that point cannot be ſuſpected of Error: That if through inadvertency he hath let paſs in the Tranſlation of *Origen*'s Principles, any paſſage wherein he ſeems to ſay that the Son ſees not the Father, and that the Holy Ghoſt ſees not the Son, he ſhould not for all that be accuſed of Error, ſince in ſo many places he profeſſes the contrary: That if they had charitably warned him of it, he would have either blotted out or altered it, as he had done the others, which he found to be contrary to the Doctrine of the Church, concerning the Trinity. He complains alſo, that *Paulinianus* had poiſoned the Tranſlation of that place, making him ſay, That it was neither impious or abſurd to ſay that the Son ſees not the Father; whereas he had only ſaid, That he would afterwards give a reaſon of the Sence, in which it might be ſaid, That the Perſon of the Father was inviſible.

After that he repelleth all S. *Jerom*'s reproachfull Allegations, declaring that S. *Jerom* himſelf had formerly commended *Origen*, Tranſlated his Works, and that in his Commentaries there were the ſame Errors concerning the Nature of the Fleſh, when riſen again; the Præ-exiſtence of Souls, and the end of the Torments of the Devils, and the Damned; for which Reaſon he found fault that *Origen*'s Books were Tranſlated. This he ſheweth by long Extracts out of different Commentaries of this Father.

The Second Book of *Rufinus*'s Invective is concerning the perſonal Reproaches which he utters againſt S. *Jerom*. Firſt he charges him with tearing the Reputation of Chriſtians of all States and Conditions, in his Book of Virginity, and with blaming their Manners at ſuch a rate, that *Pagans* and *Apoſtates* enquired diligently after that Book, to make uſe of it againſt the Church. Secondly, he accuſes him of Perjury, becauſe after a ſolemn Oath to read the Books of profane Authors no more, he ceaſed not to read and make uſe of them in his Works: Particularly he takes notice of a paſſage in his Treatiſe of *Virginity*, wherein he pretends that S. *Jerom* ſpake of God after an irreverent manner. He laughs at S. *Jerom*, for boaſting that he was *Didymus*'s Diſciple, for having had one Month's Converſation with him. He jeſts upon him for taking as his Teachers, *Porphyry* the Philoſopher, and *Barrabas* the *Jew*. He quoteth ſeveral places of his Writings, to prove, that he not only commended the Erudition and Learning of *Origen*, but that he approved his Doctrine alſo. He accuſeth him of ſtriking out of his *Chronicon*, what he had ſaid before in favour of *Melania*. He reproveth him for the low eſteem he had of the Septuagint. He finds fault with his contemptuous rejecting the Story of their 70 Cells. He blames him for not owning the Hiſtory of *Suſanna* for Canonical. Laſtly, he makes it Criminal in S. *Jerom* to Tranſlate the Bible a-new. This Invective is written with much addreſs and vehemence. He compoſed it in the Year 399.

Sometime after he writ his Apology to Pope *Anaſtaſius*; wherein having expounded his belief of the Trinity, the Reſurrection, the laſt Judgment, and the Torment of Eternal fire for the Devils, in a very Catholick manner; he declares that he was uncertain of the Origination of Souls, having obſerved that Eccleſiaſtical Authors were not agreed upon that Subject; That ſome, with *Tertullian* and *Lactantius*, believed that they were formed with the Bodies; That others, as *Origen*, were of opinion, that they were created with the World, and that God infuſed them into Bodies; and Laſtly, That others affirmed that God both created and placed them in the Bodies at the ſame time; and ſo, not knowing which of theſe Opinions was the trueſt, he remitted the deciſion to God, not being able to be poſitive concerning any more than what the Church teaches, That God is the Creator of Souls and Bodies.

Having thus given an account of his Doctrine, he juſtifies himſelf of the Objections made againſt him for Tranſlating *Origen*'s Books. He ſaith, that it is very plain, that it was Envy only that made them condemn that Undertaking; That if there is any thing diſpleaſing in the Author, the Tranſlator is not to be charged therewith, who has barely delivered the Sence of the Author. That he had prevented the inconveniency that might have happened, by ſtriking out the Errors which he conceived to have been added in *Origen*'s Books; That he had given notice of it in his Preface; ſo that they were much to blame to accuſe and calumniate him upon that Subject: "For, *ſaith he*, when will Simplicity and Innocency be ſecured againſt Envy and "Slaundering, if they be not upon this occaſion? I neither juſtifie nor approve *Origen*, but I "Tranſlated him, and ſo did many others before me; I am the laſt, and that at the requeſt of "my friends. If ſuch a Tranſlation is not acceptable, be it ſo, I will Tranſlate no more. He concludes, by aſſuring the Pope, That he neither has, nor ever had any other Sentiments than theſe he hath now declared, and which are thoſe of the Church's of *Rome*, *Alexandria* and *Aquileia*; telling him withall, That ſuch as through Envy or Jealouſie againſt their Brethren, do occaſion Scandals and Diviſions, ſhall give an account at the Judgment-ſeat of God.

Ruſinus. The Expoſition *of the Creed* directed to *Laurentius*, which is found amongſt the Works of S. *Cyprian*, and of S. *Jerom*, is likewiſe *Ruſinus*'s Work. *Gennadius* who was one of the moſt zealous Defenders of this Author, ſaith he hath done extremely well in this piece, and that all other Expoſitions of the Creed are not to be compared with it; and indeed it would be hard to find a more compleat Treatiſe upon the Creed than this.

He obſerves in the beginning, the difficulty of that Undertaking, becauſe it was very dangerous to ſpeak of Myſteries; That ſome famous Authors had already written, but very ſuccinctly upon that Subject: That *Photinus* had choſen that way to eſtabliſh his Hereſie: but his deſign was to expound the Creed with ſimplicity, by keeping to the very terms of the Scripture, ſo to ſupply what had been omitted by thoſe that writ before him. Then he declares, that the Apoſtles had Conference together to compoſe the Creed, before they divided, that ſo they might teach all whom they ſhould convert by the ſame common Creed; That it is called *Symbolum*, either becauſe it is the reſult of a Conference betwixt ſeveral Perſons, or becauſe it is the Mark of diſtinction, whereby Chriſtians are known. Afterwards he examines all the Articles, and obſerves the ſeveral ways of repeating them in different Churches. He clears their Sence in a very plain manner, and confirms it by the moſt oppoſite paſſages in the Holy Scripture. In explaining the Article of the Catholick Church, he gives a Catalogue of the Canonical Books, of the Old and New Teſtament, and admits into the Canon of the Old Teſtament, none but the Books owned by the *Hebrews*: But he ſays, That there are other Books read in Churches, which are not made uſe of to confirm Articles of Faith, and he calls them Eccleſiaſtical Books. Theſe Books in the Old Teſtament are; *Wiſdom*, *Eccleſiaſticus*, *Tobit*, *Judith*, the *Maccabees*, and in the New Teſtament, the Book of *Hermas*, and S. *Peter*'s Judgment. He obſerves further upon the ſame Article, that there is but one Church: and in few words he condemns moſt of the Sects that have ſeparated from it; He enlarges much upon the laſt Article concerning the Reſurrection of the Body, obſerving again in this place, that the Church of *Aquileia* had added, *of this Body*, and that they made the ſign of the Croſs in the Concluſion of the Creed.

The Expoſition of *Jacob*'s Bleſſing is the firſt Book that is Printed under *Ruſinus*'s Name, in the Collection of his Works. This Treatiſe was written at *Paulinus*'s requeſt; which made *Iſidore* to attribute it to *Paulinus*, tho' it be compoſed by *Ruſinus*, as *Gennadius* aſſures us: It is divided into two Books. In the firſt he explains *Judah*'s Bleſſing, and in the ſecond, that of the reſt of *Jacob*'s Children. He particularly keeps to the Hiſtorical Sence, without neglecting either the Myſtical or the Moral: He ſhews, That this Patriarch's Prophecies are fulfilled, either in the Church, or in the Jewiſh Tribes.

He follows the ſame method in his Commentaries upon the Prophets *Hoſea*, *Joel* and *Amos*. Theſe Commentaries are clear and neat: He expounds his Text after an elegant but natural way without intangling himſelf with Allegories, hard Queſtions, or long Digreſſions. He tells us in the Preface, That he had made ſome Commentaries upon *Solomon*'s Books, and that he deſigned to do the like upon all the leſſer Prophets. He deſires the Reader to take Notice, That he made uſe of the laſt Tranſlation which is conformable to the Hebrew Text, but that he had but little help from other Men's Works in his Commentaries. " For, *ſaith he*, the *Latins* ſeem to have been " agreed to write nothing upon the Minor Prophets. Some *Greek* and *Syrian* Authors indeed " have endeavoured to expound their Prophecies; and I confeſs I have read upon thoſe Books " ſome Commentaries of S. *John* Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*; but, his Cuſtom was, he compoſed " them rather for Exhortations to his Auditors, than for Expoſitions of the Scripture Text. *Ori-* " *gen* after his peculiar way, entertained his Readers with delightful Allegories, but takes no pains " to give the Hiſtorical Sence; which is the only thing that is ſolid. S. *Jerom*, a Man of vaſt Parts, " and throughly learned, hath written Commentaries upon thoſe Prophets, but he ſo much inſiſt- " ed upon the Jewiſh Traditions, that he took no pains to find out the Sence of the Prophecies " by their Events. So that his Commentaries are wholly made up, either of *Origen*'s Allegories, " or of Jewiſh Traditions. This is *Ruſinus* his Judgment of others; and it muſt be confeſſed, that he hath avoided what he reproves in the Commentaries of others, and that his is more uſeful for the underſtanding of the Hiſtorical Sence of the Prophecies. It is ſtrange that *Gennadius* ſhould make no mention of theſe Commentaries; but the Stile and the Circumſtances ſufficiently diſcover them to be compoſed by *Ruſinus*: Tho' ſome have doubted it.

We have only now to ſpeak of the Commentaries upon the Seventy five firſt *Pſalms*, which were Printed by themſelves at *Lyons*, in the Year 1570. but they cannot belong to *Ruſinus*, becauſe there are whole Periods taken out of S. *Auguſtin*'s Commentaries upon the *Pſalms* (*m*), and out of S. *Gregory*'s Morals. *Gennadius* ſpeaks of ſeveral Letters of Piety written by *Ruſinus*, among which he gives the firſt place to thoſe that are written to *Proba*, but they are not now extant.

(*m*) *There are whole Periods taken out of S.* Auguſtin's *Commentaries upon the* Pſalms.] This is particularly remarkable upon the *1ſt. Pſal. ver.* 1. *Pſal.*3*d.ver.*1. *Pſal.*4*th. ver.*1. Upon the Ninth *Pſalm* there is a whole Period which beginneth, *Prima perſecutio*, taken almoſt word for word out of S. *Auguſtin*'s Commentary upon the Third *Pſalm*. The Author ſays, That he lived in a time, when no Hereſies appeared, which ſhews that this is the Work of a new Compiler.

It muſt be acknowedged, That *Rufinus*, tho' very ill uſed by S. *Jerom*, was one of the ableſt Men of his time: Perhaps he had not ſo much Learning as S. *Jerom*, but his Temper was better and leſs violent. He doth not write ſo good Latin, but his Stile is more even. It cannot be denied, but that the Latin Church is obliged to him for the knowledge of the moſt conſiderable among the Greek Authors; and particularly of Church-Hiſtory. Tho' he was accuſed of divers Errors, yet he was convicted of none, and he juſtified himſelf ſufficiently of the reproachful Objections made againſt him. He defended *Origen*, but that was by rejecting the Errors Father'd upon him. The olny Thing he may be thought to have been guilty of, not upon the Score of his own Writings, but by the Teſtimony of the Authors that have ſpoken of him, is that he was *Pelagius*'s Tutor. But perhaps the Diſciples Errors may have been imputed to the Maſter, tho' he never taught them. However it cannot be ſaid, That he divided from the Church upon that occaſion, or that theſe Errors were obſtinately maintained by him. And ſo, in my Opinion, it is very unjuſt for modern Writers, to blemiſh the Memory of him, and uſe him, as if he had been one of the greateſt Hereticks in the World. We ſhould not mind all the Accuſations wherewith S. *Jerom* loaded him in the heat of their Quarrel: but rather imitate the Modeſty of Pope *Gelaſius*, who gives him the Character of an Holy Man; *Rufinus vir religioſus*. Tho' he confeſſes, That S. *Jerom* was in the right when he reproved him, for what he ſaid concerning Man's Free-Will. *Rufinus.*

The Works of this Author have been collected into one Volume in Folio, and Printed at *Paris* by *Sonnius* in 1580. They forgot to inſert the two Invectives, and the Apology to Pope *Anaſtaſius*, with the letter concerning the falſifying of *Origen*'s Books, which are in the laſt Volume of S. *Jerom*'s Works. His Tranſlations are in the ancient Latin Editions of thoſe Greek Authors, which were made publick before new Tranſlations were made.

SOPHRONIUS.

"*SOPHRONIUS* a Man of great Erudition, ſays his Friend S. *Jerom*, in his Book *of Famous* "*Men*, writ when he was little more than a Child, the Praiſe of *Bethlehem*, and not long " ago compoſed an excellent Treatiſe of the ruin of *Serapis*: He tranſlated alſo into Greek, " my Treatiſe of Virginity to *Euſtochium*, and the Life of *Hilarion* the Hermit: He likewiſe tur- " ned into Greek the Latin Tranſlation of the *Pſalms*, and Prophets, which I made from the He- " brew Text. The Greek Tranſlation of the Book *of Famous Men*, is alſo attributed to him. There is another *Sophronius* Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, who lived under the Emperor *Heraclius* about the year 636, to whom is aſcribed a ſmall Treatiſe of the Labours and Travels of S. *Peter*, and of S. *Paul*: It is a miſerable buſineſs not worth mentioning. *Sophronius.*

SEVERUS SULPICIUS.

SEVERUS SULPICIUS, (*a*) Prieſt of *Agen* (*b*), famous for the Nobility of his Extraction, the Fineneſs of his Parts, and the Holineſs of his Life, was eminent in the times of S. *Jerom*, and *Rufinus*, he was S. *Martin*'s Diſciple, whoſe Life he writ; He was an intimate Friend of *Paulinus* Biſhop of *Nola*, to whom he writ ſeveral Letters. This Man ſpeaking of *Severus*'s Converſion in one of his Letters, ſaith, That it was altogether extraordinary and miraculous; " Becauſe he had at once ſhaken off the Yoke of ſin, and broken the Bands of Fleſh and " Blood, in the flower of his Age; and at a time when he was famous at the Bar, when neither " Riches, nor a Licence to enjoy Pleaſures after Marriage, nor his Youth could turn him out of " the Way of Vertue, to ingage in the broad and eaſie Path of worldly Men: That he deſpiſed " Wealth and Glory to follow Jeſus Chriſt, and preferred the preaching of Fiſher-men, before *Severus Sulpicius.*

(*a*) Severus Sulpicius.] *Gennadius* ſaith, That *Sulpicius* was his Sirname; and S. *Gregory* of *Tours*, *lib. de vit.* S. *Mart. c.* 1. & *l.* 10. *Hiſt. Franc. c.* 31. calleth him as we do *Severus Sulpicius*: but in his Letters he calls himſelf *Sulpicius Severus*. But ſometimes the Sirname is put before the Proper name. Moſt of the Ancients call him only *Sulpicius*. [*Sulpicius* was the Name of his Family; the Emperor *Galba* was of the *Sulpician* Family: *Severus* was his *cognomen*, as *Cicero* to *Tully*, and *Criſpus* to *Salluſt*; ſo that in Strictneſs his Name is *Sulpicius Severus*, not *Severus Sulpicius*; his *Prænomen*, which went always firſt, is not known: In *Gennadius*'s time, the *Roman* way of naming Perſons was almoſt wholly out of uſe, excepting ſome few of the Deſcendants of the Old *Roman* Families; and therefore one is not ſtrictly to take thoſe words *Cognomento Sulpicius*, as if *Severus* were the Name of the Family and not *Sulpicius*.

(*b*) *Prieſt of* Agen.] He ſaith in the firſt Dialogue *c.* 20. that he was of *Aquitain*, and in his Hiſtory *l.* 2. He calleth *Phœbadius* Biſhop of *Agen* his Biſhop. They were miſtaken who confounded him with one *Sulpicius* Biſhop of *Bourges*, who lived above 190 years afterwards under King *Gontran*: all the Ancients allow to this *Sulpicius* no other Quality, beſides that of Prieſt.]

" all

Severus Sulpicius.

" all the pieces of *Ciceronian* Eloquence, and all the Books of fine Learning: However, he ſhew-
" ed his Eloquence in the Writings which he compoſed after his Converſion.

The chief of theſe Works is his Sacred Hiſtory divided into two Books, which contains an Abridgment of what remarkable things happened in the Hiſtory of the *Jews*, and of the Church, from the Creation of the World, to the Conſulſhip of *Stilico*, and *Aurelianus*, that is, to the Year of Jeſus Chriſt 400, written with great Skill. He wrote alſo S. *Martin*'s Life, three Letters concerning the Death, and Vertues of that Saint, and three Dialogues betwixt *Gallus* and *Poſthumianus*, whereof the firſt is concerning the Miracles of the *Eaſtern* Monks, and the two others about S. *Martin*'s Vertues. *Gennadius* ſaith, That he writ ſome pious Letters beſides to his Siſter, two Letters to S. *Paulinus*, that were common in his time, not to ſpeak of ſeveral others, which were not publiſhed becauſe they were intermixt with Domeſtick Affairs. F. *Dachery* in the Fifth Volume of his *Spicilegium*, hath publiſhed us five Letters of *Severus Sulpicius* to his Siſter, and *Baluzius* hath likewiſe publiſhed two in the Firſt Volume of his *Miſcellanea*. The others are not yet publiſhed.

Gennadius affirms, That *Sulpicius Severus* towards the latter end of his Life, was ſurprized by the *Pelagians*, but that afterwards having acknowledged the Error, which he was fallen into, by too great a deſire of ſpeaking, he kept Silence all the reſt of his days, that he might repair his Fault. *Guibertus* Abbot of *Gemblours*, ſeems to queſtion the matter of Fact. But *Gennadius* his Teſtimony is not to be queſtioned in ſuch a matter: *Sulpicius Severus* lived till towards the Year 420.

This Author is eloquent, his Writings are pure and poliſhed, he writ with great Brevity, and great Clearneſs, wherein he excelled *Salluſt* whom he imitated. His is the beſt written Hiſtorical Abridgment that we have, and yet he is not very exact, but commits Faults againſt the truth of Hiſtory, eſpecially of the Eccleſiaſtical. He is very credulous of Miracles, and approves the Dreams of the Ancients about the Reign of a Thouſand years, about Anti-Chriſt, whom he thought to be *Nero*, about the time of the World's end, and about the Sons of Men that had to do with the Women. He paſſes over the Church Hiſtory from Jeſus Chriſt, to the Fourth *Century*, very lightly; he ſaith very little of the *Arians*, but he inlargeth much upon the *Priſcillianiſts*, and from him we learn more of them than from all the Authors beſides.

The Life of S. *Martin* is written with the ſame Purity as his Hiſtory; but in a more diffuſe and agreeable manner. The Dialogues are compoſed with ſo much Art and Exactneſs, that one can never be weary of reading them, and particularly the firſt, where *Poſthumianus* relates ſeveral particulars of the *Eaſtern* Monks. He ſpeaks there of the Troubles that were in *Egypt*, and *Paleſtine*, about *Origen*'s Books, and makes a moſt wiſe and moderate Judgment of them, and tho' he does not wholly excuſe *Origen*; Yet he does not approve of that Severity, which the Biſhop of *Alexandria* exerciſed againſt thoſe that defended him. He bewails the misfortune of the Church to be diſturbed with things of ſo ſmall Importance. He commends S. *Jerom* without entirely applauding his Conduct. He quotes a Jeſt of a good Prieſt of the Coaſt of *Africa*, who refuſed to take Money offered him by *Poſthumianus*, ſaying, *That Gold did rather deſtroy the Church than edifie it.*

The Works of *Sulpicius Severus*, which *Lazius* had publiſhed full of Faults, were reviſed and corrected by *Giſelinus*, who Printed them with his own Notes, and with *Galeſinius*'s at *Antwerp*, in the Year 1574. *Sigonius* made a new Edition of them with new Notes, Printed at *Bononia* in 1581, and at *Francfort* in 1593. The Hiſtory was printed with *Druſius*'s at *Franker* in 1607. There is an Edition by *Elzevir* at *Amſterdam* in 1635. And we have him entire with the Notes of ſeveral learned Men, Printed at *Amſterdam*, by *Hornius* his care in 1647, and 1654. Theſe are the principal Editions of *Sulpicius Severus*, to ſay nothing of the Collections, into which his Works have been inſerted.

In ſpeaking of *Sulpicius Severus* who writ S. *Martin*'s Life, it is worth obſerving that a Creed is aſcribed to this Saint, but it is very uncertain, whether he be the Author of it, tho' it is very ancient.

S. PAULI-

Saint PAULINUS.

SAint *PAULINUS*, called alſo *Pontius*, and *Meropius*, deſcended from an illuſtrious Family of *Roman* Senators, was born at *Bourdeaux* about the Year 453. He was directed in his Studies by the famous *Auſonius*; he ſtudied with ſo much Aſſiduity the beſt of the Latin Authors, that he got a ſtile very like theirs. He advanced afterwards to the moſt conſiderable Offices of the Empire. *Auſonius* ſays that *Paulinus* was Conſul along with him, but his Name being not found in the *Faſti conſulares*, it is probable that he obtained that Dignity only in the Room of ſome other Perſon, who died in the Office, and perhaps in the Year 378, after the Death of *Valens*. He married *Therafia* a rich Woman, by whom he got a great Eſtate, The Happineſs that a Perſon ſo powerful and rich as he was, might have enjoyed, was much diſturbed by abundance of Buſineſſes, which made him recollect himſelf, and reſolve to be converted. and to retire into *Spain* with his Wife *Therafia*, who had contributed much to make him take this Reſolution. He was baptized by *Delphinus* Biſhop of *Bourdeaux* ſome time before his retreat, in the Year 389. He dwelt Four years in *Spain*, where he embraced voluntary Poverty, ſelling his Goods by degrees to give them to the Poor. The Inhabitants of *Barcelona*, where he dwelt conceived ſuch Eſteem for him, that they cauſed him to be ordained Prieſt upon *Chriſtmas-day*, tho' he thought not of it. S. *Paulinus* perceiving that he could not overcome the People's Reſolution, after a long reſiſtance, yielded to be ordained, upon condition that he ſhould not be obliged to remain in *Barcelona*, becauſe his Deſign was to withdraw to *Nola*. This Ordination was performed in 393, and the next Year, he left *Spain* to go into *Italy*. In his way he ſaw S. *Ambroſe* at *Florence*, who ſhewed him ſome Marks of Reſpect: at *Rome* he was kindly received both by Perſons of Quality, and by the People: but Pope *Siricius*, and the Clergy were jealous of him, which made him leave that Town quickly, and repair to *Nola*, where he dwelt in a Countrey houſe half a League from the Town; having lived there Sixteen years with his Wife *Therafia*, in the Study and Exercites of a Monaſtical Life, he was choſen and ordained Biſhop of *Nola* in 409. The beginning of his Promotion was diſturbed by the Incurſions of the *Goths*, who took the City of *Nola*; this Aſſault being over, he enjoy'd his Biſhoprick peaceably to his dying day, in the Year 431. We read in S. *Gregory*'s Dialogues, that he yielded himſelf to be a Captive in *Africa* voluntarily, to deliver a Widow's Son that was taken by the *Vandals*: but this Action which did not agree, either with the Circumſtances, or the time of S. *Paulinus*'s Life, is looked upon by the Learned as a Fable, as ſeveral others are, which may be found in S. *Gregory*'s Dialogues. *Paulinus.*

There was a new Edition lately made of this Father's Poems and Letters, wherein they are ſet very exactly in a Chronological Order.

The firſt Letter is written by *Paulinus* to *Sulpicius Severus*, ſometime after he was ordained a Prieſt; there he exhorteth *Sulpicius Severus* to continue in that ſort of Life, which he had embraced, without being diſturbed at the Diſcourſes of the Men of the World that blamed him. He invites him to come to him at *Barcelona*, and acquaints him after what manner he was ordained Prieſt. " Upon *Chriſtmas-day*, ſaith he, the People obliged me to receive the Order of " Prieſthood, againſt my Will: not that I have any Averſion to that Dignity; on the contrary, " I could wiſh to have began at the Porter's order to come into the Clergy: but as my Deſign " looked another way, ſo I was ſurprized and eſtabliſhed at that new Order of the Divine Pro- " vidence. I ſubmitted my ſelf to Chriſt's Yoke, and am now engaged in a Miniſtery beyond " my Merit and my Strength..... I can hardly yet comprehend the heavy weight of that Dig- " nity: I tremble when I conſider the Importance of that Office, being conſcious to my ſelf of my " own weakneſs: but he that giveth Wiſdom to the Simple, and cauſeth ſucking Babes to ſing " his Praiſes, is able to accompliſh his work in me, to give me his Grace, and make me wor- " thy, whom he has called when I was unworthy. He addeth, That he took Orders upon this condition, that he ſhould not be tyed to the Church of *Barcelona*, ſo that he conſecrated himſelf to the Holy Miniſtery, without being bound to the Service of any particular Church. He invites him at laſt not to put off his Journey, but to come to him before *Eaſter*.

The Second Letter to *Amandus* a Prieſt, afterwards Biſhop of *Bourdeaux* is written likewiſe concerning that Ordination, at the ſame time with the firſt. He intreats him to give him Advice and neceſſary Inſtructions, for the worthy diſcharging of his Miniſtery.

The Third to *Alypius* Biſhop in *Africa*, was written immediately after his Arrival at *Nola*, in the *Autumn* of the Year 394. He commends there S. *Auguſtin*'s Books which *Alypius* had ſent him; he ſends him *Euſebius* his *Chronicon*, and tells him, That he was very deſirous to know the particulars of his Life: and at the latter end of the Letter, he ſays, That he ſent him a Loaf as a Token of their Union, and a Figure of the Trinity, adding, That he ſhall make an Eulogy, of that Bread when he receives it, that is, That in receiving it he ſhall bleſs it, as he ſays in the following Letter to S. *Auguſtin*. It was the Cuſtom of that time, eſpecially with S. *Paulinus* thus to ſend Bread as a mark of Union: See the 1ſt. 4th. 45th. and 46th. Letters. S. *Auguſtin* in the 34th. Letter ſpeaks likewiſe of a Loaf, which he ſent to *Paulinus*, and makes uſe of the ſame

Paulinus. expreſſion; *The Bread*, ſaith he, *which we ſend unto you, ſhall be made a ſubject of Bleſſing, by the Charity wherewith you ſhall receive it.* UBERIOR BENEDICTIO FIET DILECTIONE ACCIPIENTIS VESTRÆ BENIGNITATIS.

The Fourth is written to S. *Auguſtin*; he commends his Five Books againſt the *Manichees* which *Alypius* had ſent him: It is full of Expreſſions, to ſhew how greatly he eſteemed S. *Auguſtin*, of whom he craves advice for his Behaviour: both theſe Letters were written in *Autumn*, in the Year 394, as appears by the Sixth. S. *Auguſtin* anſwers this laſt by the 27th. Letter of the laſt Edition, which is there in the *Italick* Letter.

S. *Paulinus*'s Fifth Letter is directed to *Sulpicius Severus*, wherein he returns him Thanks for the Teſtimonies of Love that he had received from him: He exalts his Converſion; and comparing it with his own, ſhews that it was more ſurprizing and wonderfull. There he alſo ſpeaks of his Diſtemper, and of the Envy which the *Roman* Clergy bore to all men, of any Reputation either for their Holineſs or their Piety: and alledgeth this as a Reaſon of his withdrawing far from *Rome*; He oppoſes Pope *Siricius* his proud Behaviour towards him, *Papæ urbici ſuperba duritia*, to that Charity wherewith both the Biſhops and Clergy of *Campania*, had entertained him by their frequent Viſits, and to that of the *African* Biſhops, who had ſent on purpoſe to know how he did.

The Sixth Letter is written to S. *Auguſtin* in the Year 395, wherein he expreſſeth how impatient he was to receive ſome Letters from him.

The following Letter is an Anſwer of S. *Auguſtin*'s which is the Thirty firſt of his Letters, written in 396. He ſends *Paulinus* word of his Promotion to be a Biſhop.

Paulinus having received this Letter, acquaints *Romanianus* by the Seventh, with his great joy for that News.

In the Eighth he exhorteth *Licentius Romanianus* his Son, in Proſe and in Verſe, to leave the World and give himſelf to God. Theſe Letters are of the Year 396.

In the Eleventh of the following Year, as is ſuppoſed, he urges *Severus Sulpicius* to come to ſee him.

The Twelfth to *Amandus* is one of the moſt excellent of all S. *Paulinus* his Letters. There he very elegantly explains the Degrees of Man's Fall, and of the Redemption by Jeſus Chriſt, obſerving that God had preſerved Holineſs in the poſterity of *Seth*; that in the time of the Flood, The Spirit of Holineſs reſted in one only righteous Man, who was then the Redeemer of Mankind, and a Type of the Redemption through Chriſt: That after the Flood men returning to Corruption, God choſe *Abraham* to be the Father of the Faithful, of whom ſhould come the everlaſting King, and that at laſt all mankind being ſo corrupted with Vice, that hardly any Remedy could be hoped for; the ſame Lord who formed Man, came to reſtore him by the ſame power by which he had created him: That he made himſelf Man to be a Mediator betwixt God and Men: That he was humble, and had choſen the vile things in this World to confound the Proud, the Learned and the mighty things of the Age: And at laſt he died and roſe again, to deſtroy Death in us, and reſtore Immortality. Theſe are the main Points explained very exactly by S. *Paulinus* in that Letter. At the latter end he takes notice that there is both Humility, and a laudable Pride. *That Pride*, ſaith he, *is to be approved, which makes us deſpiſe the World, and neglect whatſoever ſeemeth great, handſome and pleaſing to the Eyes of Men, apply our ſelves only to heavenly things, and ſtoop to nothing but God's Commandments*, &c. *on the other ſide, That that Humility is to be condemned, which hath not Faith for its Foundation, but only ſuch a Littleneſs of mind as ſerves for lying, and is an Enemy to truth, which makes us looſe our Liberty, and become the Slaves of Vice; which mingles Wine with Water*, That is, to ſay, *which weakens the pure truth, by a baſe Complaceny.* MENDACII FAMULA VERITATIS INIMICA MISCENS AQUA VINUM, ID EST, VERITATIS MERUM AQUOSO ADULATIONIS ENERVANS.

The Thirteenth is a Letter of Conſolation to *Pammachius* upon the Death of *Paulina* his Wife in 397, wherein having exhorted him to ſtop his Tears, and moderate his Sorrow, he commends his great Charity to the poor of the City of *Rome*.

In the Fourteenth and Fifteenth to *Delphinus*, and *Amandus*, S. *Paulinus* teſtifies his joy for *Delphinus*'s Recovery, who had been dangerouſly Sick, giving him thanks for the Service he had done to *Baſilius* the Prieſt. In the firſt upon occaſion of *Delphinus* his Sickneſs, he ſaith, That the Afflictions of the Righteous are profitable. 1. For the Exerciſe of their Vertue, 2. To keep them from Pride. 3. To imprint in them the fear of God's Juſtice, which will grievouſly puniſh the Impious, ſince it deals ſo ſeverely with the Righteous.

The Sixteenth Letter to *Jovius*, is an excellent Diſcourſe of Providence. It is placed in 399.

In the Seventeenth to *Severus Sulpicius*, he complains that he came not to ſee him, neither met him at *Rome*, whither he was gone to celebrate the Feaſt of the Apoſtles S. *Peter*, and S. *Paul*; He exhorts him to come into that Countrey, to Honour S. *Fœlix* the Martyr. This Letter was written by S. *Paulinus* at the latter end of the Year 399, after a Recovery from Sickneſs.

The Eighteenth is written to *Victricius* Biſhop of *Roüen*, he ſent it by *Paſchaſius* his Deacon whom he found at *Rome*, and had brought to *Nola*. Having excuſed himſelf for detaining him ſo long, he makes a *Panegyrick* upon *Victricius*, deſcribing the Torments which he had ſuffered for the Faith of Jeſus Chriſt. This Letter is of the ſame Date with the foregoing.

The Three following to *Delphinus* Biſhop of *Bourdeaux*, were ſent in the Year 400, by *Cardamas* an *Exorciſt*, who came to viſit him from that Biſhop. In

In the Firſt, he ſhows his gratitude for the Love which that Biſhop had for him: He owns himſelf to be one of that Biſhop's planting, praying him that he would cultivate the ſame Plant by his Prayers, and water it with his Counſels. In the Second, he gives him Notice of the Tokens of love and reſpect that had been ſhewed him by *Anaſtaſius* Biſhop of *Rome*, and *Veneris* Biſhop of *Milan*. At laſt having commended *Cardamas*, he expounds the beginning of S. *John*'s Goſpel. *Paulinus.*

In the Twenty ſecond to *Severus*, He deſcribeth the Luxury, and Effeminateneſs of the Men of the World, and exalteth the Frugality of the Monks, in very elegant and proper words.

Here is a very pleaſant Letter from *Severus* to *Paulinus*, wherein he recommends a Cook to him, affirming that he was very fit for him, knowing exactly well how to dreſs a Diſh of Beans, and Lettices, and one that would deſtroy as many Pot-Herbs as any Man he ever ſaw.

S. *Paulinus* made this Cook called *Victor* welcome, being ſo highly commended, and *Paulinus* was ſo well pleaſed with him, that he makes his *Panegyrick* in the Twenty third Letter commending him, becauſe he cut his Hair perfectly well. He ſpeaks of the uſe of Hair, and from thence takes opportunity to give an Allegorical expoſition of the Hiſtories of *Sampſon* and *Mary Magdalen*.

Sulpicius Severus had written S. *Paulinus* a Letter wherein he commended that Saint, for diſtributing his Eſtate to the Poor. S. *Paulinus* anſwers him, That it is but a ſmall thing to renounce this World's wealth, except one alſo denies himſelf; and that a Man may quit the Goods of this World heartily, without parting with them altogether. He treateth afterwards of the Conditions of Evangelical poverty, and the dangers and temptations that attend a Spiritual life. Both theſe Letters are ſuppoſed to have been written about the latter end of the Year 400.

The Twenty fifth Letter is addreſſed to a Perſon of Quality, whom he exhorts to quit the World, and adviſes him not to deferr his Converſion.

In the Twenty ſixth Letter he praiſes a Monk named *Sebaſtian*, and a Deacon named *Benedictus*, upon their having worthily diſcharged their Duties. Theſe two Letters are in the Ninth Tome of S. *Jerom*'s Works, among thoſe falſely attributed to him. They ſeem to have been written in the Year 401.

The Twenty ſeventh Letter to *Severus Sulpicius* contains nothing conſiderable.

The Twenty eighth directed to the ſame, is ſomething more uſefull; there are ſeveral paſſages of Scripture applied to Jeſus Chriſt with much wit and dexterity. He writes, that he ſent to him by *Victor*, (whom he commends again in this place,) his Panegyrick of *Theodoſius* the Emperor, and his Verſes in commendation of S. *Felix* the Martyr: Both theſe Letters are believed to be of the Year 401.

By the Twenty ninth, he thanks *Severus* for a Suit of Camel's Hair which he had ſent him; judging, that he thereby intended to let him underſtand the need he had of Penance, and that in exchange he ſent him a Suit of Lamb's Wool which *Melania* had given him; whereupon he takes occaſion to commend that famous Widow, who lately paſſed through *Nola*. If this Letter was written in the ſame Year that *Melania* returned from *Jeruſalem*, as he that writ the Notes upon it ſuppoſes, then it is of the Year 397, and not of 402, as he affirms: But there is no proof that it is of the ſame Year.

Sulpicius Severus had deſired to have S. *Paulinus*'s Picture. The Saint refuſes to give it, and calls his Requeſt a piece of Folly: And this puts him upon diſcourſing in the Thirtieth Letter of the inward and the outward Man; it is thought to be of 402. There he draws a wonderfull Picture of Man's Heart; this is one excellent paſſage of it, much admired of S. *Auguſtin* in his 186th. Epiſtle. *How ſhould I dare give you my Picture, that am altogether like the Earthly Man, and by my Actions repreſent the Carnal Man? Shame preſſeth me on every ſide. I am aſhamed to have my Picture drawn as I am, and I dare not have it made otherwiſe. I hate what I am, and I am not what I would be. But what will it avail me, wretched Man, to hate Vice, and love Vertue, ſince I am what I hate, and my lazineſs hinders me from endeavouring to doe what I love? I find my ſelf at variance with my ſelf, and am torn by an inteſtine War. The Fleſh fights againſt the Spirit, and the Spirit againſt the Fleſh. The Law of the Body oppoſes the Law of the Spirit. Woe is me, becauſe I have not taken away the taſte of the poiſoned Tree, by that of the ſaving Croſs. The poiſon communicated to all Men from our firſt Parent by his Sin, abideth yet in me.*

About the ſame time *Severus* asked S. *Paulinus* to ſend him ſome Aſhes of the Martyrs, to conſecrate a Church: S. *Paulinus* having none, ſent him a Bit of the true Croſs, which *Melania* had brought from *Jeruſalem*, with a Deſign to ſend it to *Baſſula*, *Severus* his Mother-in-Law. This precious Relick was locked up in a Golden Box. Upon Occaſion of this Preſent, he writes the Hiſtory of the Invention of the Holy Croſs. He ſays that *Adrianus* the Emperor cauſed a Temple to *Jupiter* to be built in the place where Chriſt ſuffered, and one to *Adonis* in *Bethlehem* to blot out the Memory, both of Chriſt's Birth and Paſſion: That theſe Temples ſtood till the time of *Conſtantine*: That the Empreſs *Helena* deſtroyed the Temples and Idols of falſe Deities, and erected Churches in thoſe places; and that in one of them the Prints of Chriſt's Feet when he aſcended up to Heaven were viſible upon the Sand. That after this the Empreſs, deſirous to find out where the Croſs of Chriſt lay, ſent for Chriſtians and Jews, to learn of them the Place where it might have been hid, and that when ſhe was ſhewed the Place, ſhe cauſed the Ground to be opened, and contrary to all mens Expectation, having dug deep,

Paulinus. deep, they found three Croſſes planted in the Ground, as formerly; that the Joy of finding what they ſought after, was much abated by the Difficulty of Diſcovering which of the three was the Croſs of Chriſt, but that in this uncertainty it came into the Empreſs's Mind to bring thither a dead Corps; being perſwaded that Jeſus Chriſt would manifeſt by the Reſurrection of that Man which of theſe three Croſſes was his. The thing being immediately done, the Body which had been laid upon the two others (of the Thieves) to no purpoſe, returned to Life, as ſoon as the Croſs of Chriſt touched him. He adds, That this Croſs does not diminiſh, though Chips are conſtantly cut off from it.

In the Thirty ſecond Letter to *Severus*, there are Verſes concerning a Picture which *Severus Sulpicius* had placed in a Church of his own Building, which repreſented S. *Martin* and S. *Paulinus*. The latter out of Humility ſaith, that S. *Martin* repreſented innocent Perſons; but he repreſented Sinners. He likewiſe makes a Deſcription in Verſe, of the Church which he was building at *Nola*; and writ Inſcriptions for both Churches. Here is a Deſcription of the Churches that were built at that time. Both theſe Letters are of the year 403. or thereabouts.

The following Letter to *Alethius*, hath nothing worth taking Notice of: but they have joined with it a Treatiſe directed to the ſame *Alethius*, which is one of the moſt Excellent Pieces in Antiquity, concerning Almſdeeds. It is intituled, *of Eccleſiaſtical Treaſure*; becauſe he ſhews there, that the greateſt Treaſure that a Man can get, and the beſt Gain that he can make, is to give Alms: It is Lending to God, who payeth great Uſe for it, and who gave Wealth to the Rich upon no other Account than that they might communicate to the Poor; as he hath made the Poor and Deſtitute, that the Rich might not want Opportunity of exerciſing Mercy and Charity. This ſmall Treatiſe is full of ſuch Notions about the Excellency and Neceſſity of Alms. It is believed that this Treatiſe was ſent to *Alethius*, by *Victor*, with the foregoing Letter in 403.

In the Thirty fifth, and Thirty ſixth Letters to *Delphinus* and *Amandus*, he recommends to their Prayers the Soul of his Brother, whom he had formerly baptized, deſiring them not to forget it. *Delphinus* being dead in 404. as appears by S. *Paulinus*'s Twenty ſeventh Poem. The Date of this Letter cannot be ſet backwarder.

Victricius Biſhop of *Rouen*, having been at *Rome*, and *Paulinus* not being able to ſee him, this Saint writ him the Thirty ſeventh Letter to tell him that his Sins muſt needs have been the Cauſe of his being deprived of that Happineſs; and there commends the Faith and Watchfulneſs of that Biſhop: This Letter was written after *Victricius*'s Journey into *Italy*, in the Year 404.

In the Thirty eighth to *Aper*, S. *Paulinus* exalts that Man's Converſion, exhorting him to rejoice rather than be ſad, becauſe the World hates and deſpiſes that ſort of Life which he had embraced; charging him to ſerve God with the ſame Zeal that he had ſerved the World. This Letter is ſuppoſed to be of the Year 404.

Aper and his Wife *Amanda* having declared to S. *Paulinus*, that they were obliged to take care of their Eſtate, becauſe of the Lands belonging to their Children; he anſwereth them, that they ought to be perſwaded that the Divine Providence had left them that Care for the Exerciſe of their Vertue. He ſaith further, that a man may advance towards Perfection by the Exerciſe of Country-Buſineſs, and learn to improve his Soul by the manner of tilling Ground. Here one may find an excellent Compariſon of Agriculture, with the ſpiritual Life, and an ingenious Allegory upon thoſe four kinds of Beaſts that eat up the Fruits of the Earth, ſpoken of by the Prophet *Joel*, which he applies to paſſions of the Soul.

In the fortieth Letter S. *Paulinus* anſwereth very modeſtly to the Letter ſent him by *Sanctus* and *Amandus*; he treateth there of the great need he had to bewail his Sins, and applies to this Subject what is in the Hundred and firſt *Pſalm*, concerning the Pelican, the Owl, and the Sparrow.

The Forty firſt, to *Sanctus*, is a Treatiſe of Chriſtian Watchfulneſs, upon the Parable of the Ten Virgins.

In the Forty ſecond, to *Florentius* Biſhop of *Cahors*, he thanketh this Biſhop for the Honour he had done him in writing to him, aſſuring him of his Friendſhip; he commendeth him and deſireth his Prayers. That Letter is full of Noble Expreſſions, to extol the Dignity and Merits of Jeſus Chriſt. *Jeſus Chriſt*, ſaith he, *is that Rock containing that Spring of living Water, which we happily find not far from us, when we are very thirſty in this World: This is it that refreſhes us, and keeps us from being conſumed by the Heat of Luſt. This is the Rock upon which ſtandeth that Houſe that ſhall never fall. This is the Rock which having been opened at the Side caſt out Water and Blood, to make us taſte of two wholſome Fountains, the Water of Grace, and the Blood of the Sacrament, which proves at the ſame time both the Spring and the Price of our Salvation.* Theſe laſt Letters are of the year 405.

The Forty third is written to *Deſiderius*, who deſired an Expoſition of the Benedictions of the Patriarchs; he anſwers him, that he is better able to expound them himſelf, than he, of whom he deſireth the Expoſition. He only gives by the bye, an Explication of the Parable of the Withered Fig-Tree. He ſent this Letter in 406. by *Victor*, lately recovered of a long and dangerous ſickneſs. He gave him likewiſe two Notes which he had written long before, with a Letter to *Severus*, not now extant. *Deſiderius* his Requeſt gave him Occaſion to require

it of *Rufinus*, who gave him that Satisfaction. The Letters he writ upon that Subject are among *Rufinus*'s Works, and among these the Forty sixth and Forty seventh, were written in 408. *Paulinus.*

In the Forty fourth he admires the Spirit of Onction and Piety which he finds in *Aper*'s Letters. Then he commends the Vertues of his Wife, and wishes that her Children may be well brought up.

In the Forty fifth, to S. *Augustin*, S. *Paulinus* returns him Thanks for the Book that *Quintus* had given him at *Rome*, as from him. Afterwards he commends *Melania*, then in Affliction for the Loss of her only Son: Upon Occasion of whose Death, he discourseth of the Felicity which the Saints shall enjoy after the Resurrection. He observes that all their Employment shall be then to praise God everlastingly, and to give him continual Thanks. This Letter was put into the hands of *Quintus* an *African* Deacon, who came into *Italy* in the Year 408. S. *Paulinus*'s Letter is of the 20th of *May* following, as he observes in the Body of the Letter.

The Forty eighth Letter is a Fragment of an Epistle, quoted by S. *Gregory* of *Tours*, in which S. *Paulinus* opposes to the Disorders and Impieties of the Age, the Sanctity and Religion of some Bishops, as of *Exuperius* of *Tolouse*, of *Simplicius* of *Vienna*, of *Amandus* of *Bourdeaux*, of *Diogenianus* of *Albi*, of *Dynamius* of *Angoulesme*, of *Verecundus* of *Clermont*, of *Alethius* of *Cahors*, and of *Pegasius* of *Perigueux*. *Since those times there have been some Ages wherein the Manners of the Laity might have been opposed to the Disorders of Churchmen.*

The Forty ninth Letter to *Macarius* contains the History of a Pilot *Catechumen*, who happening to be alone in a Ship loaded with Corn, which a Storm had blown off of the Port of *Sardinia*, was saved Miraculously by S. *Fœlix* the Martyr's Protection: and having been several days at Sea, at last came safe to Land upon the Coasts of *Abruzzo*. This Letter may be called S. *Paulinus*'s Master-piece. It were difficult to make a more agreeable Description, and a more natural Draught, than this which he makes, of all the Circumstances of that Story. He concludes from thence, that undoubtedly the Saints succour us in time of need. He was a Bishop when he writ it; and so it could not be before the Year 410.

In the fiftieth to S. *Augustin*, S. *Paulinus* proposes to him several Difficulties upon several places of the Scripture, to which S. *Augustin* answereth by the hundred and forty ninth, written in 414. since S. *Paulinus*'s Letter was written some time before. The Date of the fifty first to *Eucherius* is not known; for he was yet in the Monastery of *Lerins*, out of which he did not withdraw till 426. It is a Letter of Christian Compliments, such as are all those of S. *Paulinus*.

There remains only the Passion of S. *Genesius*, Martyr of *Arles*, which bears S. *Paulinus* his Name, and is sufficiently like his Style, though some have doubted whether he was the Author of it.

After these Letters are thirty two pieces of Poetry; fifteen of them are concerning S. *Fœlix* the Martyr, and the others upon different Subjects, upon which I need not inlarge.

We have not his Epitome, in Verse, of a Book of the History of the Kings, commended by *Ausonius*; nor his Panegyrick upon *Theodosius* the Emperor, spoken of in S. *Jerom*, ep. 13. in *Cassiodorus* l. 2. *Instit. divin.* in *Gennadius* and *Trithemius*, and mentioned by S. *Paulinus* in his twenty eighth Letter. We have lost likewise some of his Letters to his Friends, which are mentioned in those that we have, and all those which he writ to his Sister concerning the Contempt of the World, reckoned by *Gennadius* among this Father's Works. The same Author speaks likewise of a Treatise *of Repentance*, and *of the Praise of Martyrs*, which he affirms to be the chiefest of his Works, and an Office of the Sacrament. As to the Collection of Hymns mentioned likewise by him, that perhaps did not differ from the Hymns we have in honour of S. *Fœlix*. S. *Augustin* witnesseth in the thirty first Letter, that S. *Paulinus* was writing something against *Pagans*. S. *Gregory* of *Tours* citeth a Letter, not now extant, which mentions the Relicks of S. *Gervasius* and S. *Protasius*. Lastly, S. *Paulinus* tells us in his forty sixth Epistle, that he had translated some of the Works of S. *Clemens Romanus*. It is likely, that while he was Bishop he made some Sermons, but whether they were not collected, or whether they have been lost, certain it is that we have none of them.

The Letter to *Marcella* is written in S. *Paulinus*'s Style, but it doth not well agree with the History of that famous Widow; for the Author of that Letter writes to her as to a person newly converted: whereas it is certain that she was converted long before S. *Paulinus*. It may be that the Lady to whom it is directed was another of the same Name.

The Letter to *Celancia*, attributed likewise to S. *Paulinus*, is of a Style not very different from his, yet not altogether the same, and he turns the Scripture after another manner. It is certainly of an ancient Author, who lived before Paganism was utterly destroyed, and after the Reign of *Jovian*.

The Poem, whereby the Author exhorts his Wife to consecrate her self to God, is more elegant and better written than those of S. *Paulinus*. It does not agree to him, because at the time when it was written, the West was all in a Confusion, that is, in the year 407. It was not necessary that he should exhort his Wife to be converted, and to lead a Christian Life, seeing she had lived so a long time. Four Manuscripts ascribe that Poem to *Prosper*.

Paulinus. The Poem, immediately following, is a Paraphraſe upon what S. *Bernard* hath written in honour of the Name of *Jeſus*, and ſo is far younger than S. *Paulinus*, though it ſeems to many to be ancient. It is not neceſſary to obſerve, that the Life of S. *Ambroſe* is written by another *Paulinus*.

The ſix Books of S. *Martin*'s Life, aſcribed to S. *Paulinus*, cannot be his, becauſe in the ſecond he is cited as a third Perſon, and he that wrote them mentions *Perpetuus*, ſixth Biſhop of *Tours* after S. *Martin*, who was not ordained till towards the latter end of the fifth Century, long after the Death of S. *Paulinus*, Biſhop of *Nola*. There is in the Rules of *Benedictus Anianenſis* an Anſwer to this Queſtion; *What ought to be the Monks Penance*, which is attributed to *Paulinus*, but though it be Eloquent, yet it is not believed to have been written by the Biſhop of *Nola*.

The Writings of S. *Paulinus* are compoſed with a great deal of Art and Elegance, his way of ſpeaking is cloſe and clear, his Terms are pure and choice, his Diſcourſe ſententious and lively: He excites the Attention of his Readers and keeps them awake. He paſſes inſenſibly from one thing to another, all hangs well together, one Sentence depending upon the other, and the end of one Thought is the beginning of the next. S. *Jerom* adviſed him, upon his Converſion, to learn the holy Scripture and to make uſe of it. He made great uſe of that Counſel; for after that he made it ſo familiar to him, that in all his Diſcourſes he inſerts a vaſt Number of Paſſages of Scripture, and adapts them to his Subject, by giving them often a Sence very different from their natural one. They are as ſo many precious Stones, ſet in, and ſo curiouſly wrought that they raiſe the Diſcourſe and give it a new Luſtre. Yet it muſt be confeſſed that he doth it too often, and that his Alluſions and Allegories are ſometimes too far fetch'd. He turns things agreeably and finely: His Letters are pleaſant and cheerful, they move, and they divert, rather than inſtruct. It is hard to judge, ſaith S. *Auguſtin*, whether they have more Sweetneſs or Fire, more Fruitfulneſs or Light. They ſoften and give Heat at the ſame time, they ſtrengthen and mollify. Yet it muſt be owned that his Notions are not always ſolid and exact; and often pleaſe becauſe of a falſe Luſtre. He often plays with Words, and uſes ſeveral Childiſh Allegories. He is excellent in his Draughts and Deſcriptions. He doth not penetrate into Dogmatical Matters, nor carry points of Morality very far, but only points at them ſuperficially. All his Writings are ſhort, but they are many, and all carefully compoſed. *Auſonius* highly commends his Poems, yet can they not paſs for perfect in that kind, eſpecially thoſe which he made after his Converſion. He underſtood Greek but indifferently, and was very little converſant with Hiſtory or the Sciences. He was eſteemed, beloved, and careſſed by all the great Men of that Age, of what party ſoever they were, and he kept Correſpondency with them without falling out with any. We may ſay, with Cardinal *Perron*, that he was the Delight of his time. He led a retired and very frugal Life, yet without great Auſterity. He was the Admiration of his own Age by Reaſon of his voluntary Poverty, and his Beſtowing his great Eſtate upon the Poor.

He was very pious, and had a very tender Conſcience. One finds in all his Letters the Character of an humble, modeſt and meek Spirit, he was much affected with the Senſe of his own Weakneſs, and the Neceſſity of God's Help. He had much Devotion for the Saints, was inclinable to believe miraculous Stories, and to reverence Relicks.

The firſt Edition of this Author's Works was made at *Paris* by *Badius* in the year 1516. The ſecond was printed at *Colen*, by the Care of *Gravius*. After that they were inſerted into the *Orthodoxographa*, and the *Bibliotheca Patrum*. *Roſweidus* cauſed them to be printed at *Antwerp* in 1622. but at laſt there was an Edition of them in *quarto* at *Paris*. It is to be wiſhed, that the Bookſellers who printed it had taken as much care to have it upon good Paper and in a fair Character as he that took care of the Edition did to render it Correct and Uſeful. He hath divided it into two Volumes; in the former are the Letters and Poems, generally owned to belong to S. *Paulinus*, which are ſet down ſeparately according to the Order of Time. He hath reviſed and corrected the Letters and the Poems by ſeveral Manuſcripts. He hath added ſome new Letters, ſome he hath divided into two, and in ſome places he hath made one of two.

The ſecond Volume contains the doubtful Works, Notes upon the Epiſtles and Poems that are in the firſt Volume; the Teſtimones both of Ancient and Modern Authors concerning S. *Paulinus*, with a new Account of this Saint's Life, very large, and taken out of his own Writings: Seven Diſſertations, whereof the two firſt are to juſtify the Chronological Order, wherein he hath ſet the Letters and the Poems. The three following contain the Lives of *Sulpicius Severus*, *Alethius*, *Victricius*, and *Aper*, to whom S. *Paulinus* writ moſt of his Letters. The ſixth is concerning S. *Paulinus* his Works, which are either loſt or dubious, or ſuppoſititious. The laſt contains an Examination of the Hiſtory of S. *Paulinus* his Captivity. After this comes a Catalogue of various Readings, and ſeveral very uſeful Tables. There is a *French* Tranſlation of S. *Paulinus*, his Letters preparing, which will be uſeful and diverting.

PELAGIUS.

PELAGIUS.

Pelagius.

PELAGIUS, an *English* Monk, (*a*) *Rufinus*'s Disciple, Head of the Heresy called by his Name, hath his place amongst Ecclesiastical Authors, because of some Books that he hath written, of which we have spoken already. His Treatises are a Commentary upon S. *Paul*'s Epistles (*b*), attributed to S. *Jerom* (*c*). The Letter to *Demetrias* (*d*) and some others, in the last Volume of S. *Jerom*'s Works. A Treatise *concerning the power of Nature*, refuted by S. *Augustin* in the Book *of Nature and of Grace*. Several Books about Free-Will; part whereof S. *Augustin* refuteth in the Book *of the Grace of Jesus Christ*; and a Confession of Faith, directed to Pope *Innocent* (*e*) which is in S. *Jerom*, in S. *Augustin*, and in the second Volume of Councils of the last Edition, pag. 1563. This Author's Style is dry, flat, and barren. He was not learned, but he was a Man of good Sence: His Reflections are short and judicious.

(*a*) Pelagius, *an English Monk.*] S. *Augustin*, *Ep.* 106. *Marius Mercator*, S. *Prosper* in his *Chronicon*, and in the Poem of ungrateful Men, call him *Britonem*, or *Britannum*. S. *Augustin* in several places gives him the Quality of Monk. He was of the Monastery of *Bangor* in *England*, not in *Ireland*. He began to publish his Error in *Rome* towards the latter end of the fourth Century, if *Marius Mercator* may be believed.

(*b*) *A Commentary upon S.* Paul's *Epistles.*] S. *Augustin* and *Marius Mercator* speak of his Commentaries, and the latter observes that he composed them before the taking of *Rome*, which happened in the year 410.

(*c*) *Attributed to S.* Jerom.] Some question whether this Commentary be the same which S. *Augustin* quoteth under *Pelagius* his Name. 1. Because that among S. *Ambrose*'s Works there is also a *Pelagian* Commentary upon S. *Paul*'s Epistles. 2. Because all the passages cited by S. *Augustin* out of *Pelagius*'s Commentaries are not to be found there, or at least they are not there in the same Terms. The former of these two Reasons is very weak, it being possible that a *Pelagian* Author might write Commentaries upon S. *Paul*, different from *Pelagius*'s. The second would be of some weight, if in that Commentary attributed to S. *Jerom*, there were not most of the passages quoted by S. *Augustin*. For in the first place, S. *Augustin* in the 16th chapter of *Pelagius* his Acts, saith, that that Heretick had expounded these Words of the 9th chapter of the *Romans*, *Neque volentis, neque currentis est Dei*, by saying that S. *Paul* spake thus by way of Interrogation, *Voce interrogantis & redarguentis.* This very Exposition, and these very Words are in the Commentary we are now speaking of. 2. S. *Augustin*, in the 3d Book of the Merits of Sins, ch. 12. saith, that *Pelagius* expounding that place of the 7th Chapter of the Epistle to the *Corinthians*, *Sanctificatus est vir fidelis*, observes that there were several Examples of believing Women who had converted their unbelieving Husbands. The same Remark is in this Commentary. 3. S. *Augustin*, in the same Book, chap. 4. saith, that *Pelagius* tells us upon these Words, *Rom.* 5. *Quæ est forma futuri*, that they may be understood several ways: the same thing is mentioned in this Commentary: But what puts the matter out of doubt, is that *Marius Mercator* in his Commentaries, cites a long Passage out of *Pelagius*'s Commentaries, which is found intire in this. It is true that S. *Augustin* in the 3d Book *of the Merits of Sins*, chap. 2. produces an Argument against Original Sin which is not in this Commentary, and that he quotes in the 3d chap. a place taken notice of by *Marius Mercator*, which likewise is not in this Commentary ascribed to S. *Jerom*; but those places may possibly have been blotted out by some Catholicks.

(*d*) *The Letter to* Demetrias.] It is certainly *Pelagius*'s. See what is said of it in the Account of S. *Jerom*.

(*e*) *The Confession of Faith directed to Pope* Innocent.] This Confession of Faith was delivered to *Zosimus* Successor to *Innocent*, who sent it to the *African* Bishops.

CELESTIUS.

COELESTIUS.

Cœleſtius.

COELESTIUS, *Pelagius* his Country-man and Diſciple (*a*), was guilty of the ſame Errors; yea, he carried them farther, and maintained them with greater Boldneſs. He was of a ſubtil and cunning Temper (*b*). He included his whole Doctrine in ſix propoſitions, which *Hilary* of *Syracuſe* ſent to S. *Auguſtin*, who refutes them in the Eighty ninth Epiſtle. They are related likewiſe by *Marius Mercator*; and were condemned in the Synod of *Paleſtine* where, *Pelagius* himſelf was conſtrained to Anathematize them. S. *Auguſtin* publiſhed, and withal anſwered eight Definitions, or Reaſonings of this Author. He preſented a kind of Confeſſion of Faith to Pope *Zoſimus*, out of which S. *Auguſtin* produces ſome Fragments in the fifth, ſixth, and twenty third Chapters of the ſecond Book *of Grace, and Original Sin.*

(*a*) Cœleſtius, Pelagius *his Country-man and Diſciple.*] S. *Jerom* ſays that he was of *Scotland* or *Ireland*; that he was a Diſciple of *Pelagius*, and afterwards Head of the *Pelagians*. *Marius Mercator* ſays that he was of a good Family, and born an Eunuch, and wanted no Learning.

(*b*) *He was of a ſubtil and cunning Temper.*] S. *Jerom* in his Letter to *Cteſiphon* obſerves that his Diſciples ſaid that he went over the Thorns of Logick. He profeſſeth to deſpiſe him much, and calleth him ignorant Calumniator, in his Preface upon *Jeremy*. But S. *Auguſtin*, in his Book to *Boniface*, Chap. 3. takes notice that he had a great deal of Wit.

NICEAS.

Niceas.

THE Account which *Gennadius* gives of this Author is this. " *Niceas*, Biſhop of ſome " Town in *Romania*, hath written after a plain and eaſy manner, ſix Books of Inſtructions " for thoſe that were preparing for Baptiſm. The Firſt is concerning the Diſpoſitions of *Catechu-* " *mens*, who deſired to be baptized. The Second of the Errors of the *Gentiles*. He obſerves that " in his time they put into the number of the Gods one *Melchidius*, a Houſe-keeper, becauſe of his " Liberality; and one *Gadarius*, a Peaſant, becauſe of his Strength. The Third Book is of Faith in " one only God. The Fourth is againſt Calculating of Nativities. The Fifth is concerning the " Creed. The Sixth concerning the Victim of the Paſchal Lamb. The ſame Author writ a " Letter to a Virgin that was fallen into Sin. Which Diſcourſe may ſerve for an Exhortation " to all thoſe that commit Sin. This Author lived about the beginning of the Fifth Century. And this is all that we know of him.

OLYMPIUS.

Olympius.

OLYMPIUS, a Biſhop, and a *Spaniard* by Birth, hath written a Doctrinal Treatiſe againſt thoſe that aſcribe Sin to Nature, and not to Free-will: Where he ſhows, That not by Nature, but by Diſobedience, Evil was mingled with our Nature. This Biſhop was preſent at the Council of *Toledo* in 405. S. *Auguſtin* commends him for a Man of great repute, in the Firſt Book againſt *Julianus*, Chap. 3d. and 7th. and he quoteth his Writings in the 2d. Chapter of the ſame Work.

BACHI-

BACHIARIUS.

" *BACHIARIUS*, a Christian Philosopher, saith *Gennadius*, who was desirous wholly to dis- *Bachiarius.*
" ingage himself from the World, and to fix his Thoughts entirely upon God; and there-
" fore often changed his Habitation that he might be the less in love with any. It is said that he
" writ several small Books. I have read but One, concerning Faith, directed to the Bishop of *Rome*,
" wherein he applauds himself for his way of living; affirming, That it was not the fear of Men, that
" made him chuse a Pilgrim's life, but that he might imitate *Abraham* when he left his Country,
" and parted with his Kindred. There is in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* a Letter of this Author's di-
rected to Bishop *Januarius*, written about a *Monk*, who had abused a Nun. The Bishop to whom he writes, would receive him no more, nor admit him to Penance: *Bachiarius* telleth him, that such Severity is contrary to the Scripture, and exhorteth the Monk to quit the Nun whom he had abused, and doe Penance. This is a learned Letter, and well written; there are many happy Applications of both the Ceremonies and the Histories of the Old Testament. *Ivo Carnutensis*, Epist. 64. mentions another Letter of this Author's upon *Solomon*'s latter end.

SABBATIUS.

SABBATIUS, a Bishop in *Gaul*, at the request of a Virgin that was Consecrated to God, whose Name was *Secunda*, wrote a Book *of Faith* against *Marcion*, *Valentinus*, *Aëtius*, and *Eunomius*; wherein he demonstrates both by Reason and Testimonies of Holy Scripture, That there is but one only God who made Heaven and Earth out of nothing: He proves also that Jesus Christ was very Man, having had a real Body, subject to the same infirmities with our's, to the necessity of Eating and Drinking, to Weariness, Sorrow, Sufferings and Death. He opposes these Truths to the Errors of *Marcion* and *Valentinus*, who admitted two Principles, and affirmed that Jesus Christ had onely the Similitude of Flesh: He sheweth against *Aëtius* and *Eunomius*, That the Father and the Son are not two different Natures, nor two Divinities, but that they have but one and the same Essence; That the Son proceedeth from the Father, and yet is co-eternal with him. This is what *Gennadius* saith of this Author, whom he places among those who flourished in the beginning of the Fifth Century. *Sabbatius.*

ISAAC.

THis *ISAAC* is mentioned by none but *Gennadius*: He ranks him among the Authors that lived in the beginning of the Fifth Century, and says, that he writ a Book of the Trinity and the Incarnation; whose dark Reasonings and intricate Discourses show that he owned Three Persons in one and the same Divinity; yet so, as that each of them had something proper and peculiar, which the others had not: *Viz.* That it was peculiar to the Father to be without beginning, and to be the Original of the rest: That it was the Property of the Son to be begotten, and yet neither created nor posterior to him that begot him: And Lastly, That the Property of the Holy Ghost was, that though he was neither created nor begotten, yet he proceeded from another: And, as to the Incarnation, he wrote so, as that it appeared that he owned two Natures in one and the same Person. *Sirmondus* published this Book from a Manuscript in *Pithœus*'s Library, which tells us that this Author had been a *Jew*; for this Treatise is intituled of *Isaac*'s Faith, who had been a *Jew*. It contains those things whereof *Gennadius* hath made an Extract: There are very subtil Reasonings upon the Mysteries of the Trinity and of the Incarnation. *Isaac.*

PAULUS OROSIUS.

Paulus Oroſius.

PAULUS OROSIUS, a *Spaniſh* Prieſt of *Tarracon*, S. *Auguſtin*'s Diſciple, flouriſhed under the Emperors *Arcadius* and *Honorius*.

S. *Auguſtin* ſent him into *Paleſtine* in the Year 415, to deſire S. *Jerom*'s Opinion concerning the Original of the Soul: He brought from thence S. *Steven*'s Relicks. The City of *Rome* having been taken in the Year 410, by *Alaric*, King of the *Goths*, the Heathens, willing to render the Chriſtians odious, accuſed them of being the cauſe of that misfortune, and of all the other calamities that oppreſſed the *Roman* Empire. To defend them againſt that reproach, *Paulus Oroſius*, at S. *Auguſtin*'s requeſt, undertook to write the Hiſtory of the greateſt Events that occurred from Jeſus Chriſt to his own Time, to ſhow that great Calamities had happened from time to time in the World, and that the *Roman* Empire had never been ſo free as ſince the Nativity of Jeſus Chriſt. This Work is intituled *Hormeſta* in ſome Manuſcripts, and is cited under that Name by ſome Authors; the Original and Explication of which Title is very uncertain. It is a kind of Univerſal Hiſtory, divided into Seven Books, which may be of ſome uſe. It is not ill written, but not exact. It has many faults againſt Hiſtory and againſt Chronology. He had not read the Greek Hiſtorians, and eaſily credited whatſoever might help his Subject, without examining whether it was well atteſted or not.

This Author hath written beſides a ſmall Treatiſe, intituled, *An Apology for Free-will againſt Pelagius*, which was Printed with his Hiſtory in the *Colen* Edition of the Year 1582. By a miſtake they inſerted ſeveral Chapters of S. *Auguſtin*'s Treatiſe *of Nature and Grace*, which were ſeparated by *Andreas Schottus* in his Edition of it, in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*.

There is alſo, among S. *Auguſtin*'s Works, before the Treatiſe againſt the *Priſcillianiſts* and *Origeniſts*, a Letter of *Oroſius* to S. *Auguſtin* concerning theſe Hereticks.

Some, upon the credit of certain Manuſcripts, aſcribe to him a Commentary upon the Book of *Canticles*, which is amongſt *Origen*'s Works, and a Treatiſe *of Illuſtrious Men*; but this was becauſe they put *Oroſius*'s Name for *Honorius*'s.

S. *Auguſtin* in his 166th. Letter, ſaith, That *Oroſius* had great livelineſs of ſpirit, a wonderfull facility of ſpeaking, and a fervent zeal. *Vigil ingenio, promptus eloquio, flagrans ſtudio.* His Style is cloſe, and his Language pure enough.

Oroſius's Hiſtory was Printed at *Paris* in 1506, by *Petit*. *The Apology for Free-will* was Printed by it ſelf at *Louvain* in 1558. The beſt Edition of both theſe Works, is that of *Colen*, of the Year 1582. The latter is found in the *Bibliothecæ Patrum*, and the former in the Collections of Hiſtorians.

LUCIANUS, AVITUS, EVODIUS, SEVERUS.

Lucianus, Avitus, Evodius, Severus.

THeſe four Authors are to be joyned with *Oroſius*, becauſe they writ concerning a particular Circumſtance of his Life, that related to the Relicks of S. *Steven*.

The Firſt is a *Grecian* Prieſt, one *Lucianus*, who writ an Hiſtory of the finding of S. *Steven*'s Relicks: His Book was Tranſlated into Latin by *Avitus*, a *Spaniſh* Prieſt, *Oroſius*'s friend, the Second of thoſe Authors we are now ſpeaking of. The Third is *Evodius*, Biſhop of *Uzala*, in *Africa*, One of the Five that writ to *Innocent* the Firſt, the 95th. Letter in S. *Auguſtin*; he wrote a ſmall Treatiſe concerning the Miracles of S. *Steven*'s Relicks, which *Oroſius* had brought into the Weſt. He is likewiſe the Author of a ſmall Treatiſe *of Faith*, or *the Unity of the Trinity*, againſt the *Manichees*, which is in the Eighth Volume of S. *Auguſtin*'s Works, as *Sirmondus* proves upon the credit of MSS. S. *Auguſtin* mentions *Evodius*'s Book, touching S. *Steven*'s Miracles, in the 8th. Chapt. l. 22. *Of the City of God*; and *Sigebert* placeth *Evodius* amongſt the Eccleſiaſtical Writers.

The laſt Author here named, is one *Severus*, a Biſhop of the Iſland *Minorca*, who wrote a Circular Letter of the *Jew*'s Converſion in that Iſland; and of the Miracles wrought in that place, by S. *Steven*'s Relicks, which *Oroſius* left there.

Lucianus's Book and *Avitus*'s Letter, are printed by *Surius* upon the Third day of *Auguſt*.

Both theſe Books, attributed to *Evodius*, are none of his, ſince they doe not bear his Name as the Author, but only becauſe they are directed to him. *Baronius* publiſhed *Severus*'s Letter from a MS. in the *Vatican* Library. Theſe Relations are ſo incredible, that were they not authorized by the Teſtimonies of S. *Auguſtin* and *Gennadius*, we ſhould ſcarce give any credit to them. They are all at the end of the Seventh Volume of the new Edition of S. *Auguſtin*.

MAR-

MARCELLUS MEMORIALIS.

THis Author wrote the Acts of the Conference held at *Carthage*, betwixt the *Catholicks* and the *Donatiſts*, in the Year 1411. Part of them were printed by *Papirius Maſſonus*, and printed with *Optatus*, and in the laſt Collection of the Councils; but *Baluzius* printed them more exactly in his new Collection of Councils. *Marcellus Memorialis.*

EUSEBIUS.

THis *Euſebius* is not much known. *Gennadius* doth not tell us whence he was, nor what he was; but only obſerves, that he writ a Treatiſe *of the Myſtery of the Croſs*, and *of the Conſtancy which the Apoſtles*, and particularly S. *Peter*, had, by virtue of the Croſs. He places this Author among thoſe that flouriſhed in the beginning of the Fifth Century. *Euſebius.*

URSINUS.

URSINUS the Monk wrote a Treatiſe againſt thoſe who affirm, That Hereticks are to be rebaptized; wherein he teacheth, That thoſe ought not to be baptized again, who were baptized in the Name of Jeſus Chriſt, or the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghoſt; though they that baptized them were in an error, becauſe it is enough to have been baptized either in the Name of Chriſt, or in the Name of the Trinity, to give a right to receive the Impoſition of hands from the Biſhop. This Treatiſe is among S. *Cyprian*'s Works; I am apt to believe that the Author of it is more ancient, than to agree to this place. *Urſinus.*

MACARIUS.

GEnnadius mentions one *Macarius* a Monk, who writ a Treatiſe againſt Aſtrologers in *Rome*; *Wherein*, ſaith he, *he ſought the help of the Scripture by the labours of thoſe of the Eaſt.* This *Macarius* is he, probably, to whom *Ruſinus* addreſſes his Apology, and his Tranſlation of the Books of *Origen*'s Principles; of whom S. *Jerom* ſaith in his Second Apology: *Had you not returned from the Eaſt, this able Man would yet have been among the Aſtrologers.* His Book is not extant. *Macarius.*

HELIODORUS.

HELIODORUS, a Prieſt of *Antioch*, wrote an excellent Book *of Virginity*, grounded upon Scripture-teſtimonies. *Gennadius*, Chap. 29. *Heliodorus.*

PAULUS.

" *PAULUS*, a Biſhop (ſaith the ſame *Gennadius*, Chap. 31.) wrote a ſmall Treatiſe *of Repentance*; wherein he maintains, That Sinners are not ſo to afflict themſelves for their Sins, " as to fall into deſpair. *Paulus.*

HELVI-

HELVIDIUS *and* VIGILANTIUS.

Helvidius and *Vigilantius.*

HEre are two Hereticks refuted by S. *Jerom*, reckoned by *Gennadius* amongſt the Eccleſiaſtical Writers. *Helvidius*, ſaith he, Chap. 32. *Auxentius* his Diſciple, an imitator of *Symmachus*, writ a Book that ſhows ſome Zeal for Religion, but an indiſcreet one: His Style and Arguments are very intricate. He cites ſeveral paſſages of Scripture, whence he concludes, That the Virgin *Mary* having brought forth *Jeſus Chriſt*, had other Children by *Joſeph*, that were called *the Lord's brethren*. S. *Jerom* confuted that Error, and writ a Treatiſe full of Teſtimonies out of the Scriptures againſt this Author.

Vigilantius, a Prieſt, Originally of *Gaul*, a Pariſh-prieſt, in the Dioceſs of *Barcelona* in *Spain*, hath written likewiſe ſome Treatiſes, whereby he ſhows his Zeal for Religion; but he was deceived with Ambition, and an Opinion of himſelf, becauſe he had a fine Style. Not being well verſed in the Scriptures, he made a very bad Expoſition of *Daniel's* Viſions, publiſhing ſeveral impertinent things, wherefore he is numbred amongſt Hereticks. S. *Jerom* anſwered him likewiſe.

S. AUGUSTIN.

St. *AUGUSTIN.*

ST. *AUGUSTIN* was born at *Tagaſta*, a City of *Numidia*, in the Reign of *Conſtantius*, the 13th. of *November*, in the Year 354. which had for Conſuls the Emperour himſelf the Seventh time, and *Gallus Cæſar* the Third. St. *Auguſtin*'s Father, an ordinary Citizen of that Town, was called *Patricius*; and his Mother, a very vertuous Woman, was named *Monica*. This holy Woman took care to inſtill into her Son the Principles of the Chriſtian Religion, and placed him among the *Catechumens*: ſo that falling dangerouſly ſick, he earneſtly deſired to be Baptized; but the violence of the Diſtemper abating, it was put off to another time. His Father being yet Unbaptized, and wanting that Senſe of Religion that his Mother had, intended only to promote his Son in the World; and though he was not very Rich, yet he ſpared nothing to inſtruct and give him Learning: He made him learn the Rudiments of Grammar at *Tagaſta*; and then ſent him to *Madaura*, to ſtudy Humanity-Learning. This Child had no mind to Study, and particularly hated the *Greek* Tongue; but his love for the Poets, made him firſt take a pleaſure in it. At Sixteen Years of Age, having gone through his Humanity-Courſe, his Father took him from *Madaura*, and ſent him to *Carthage* to learn Rhetorick; but wanting a Fond for this neceſſary Expence for ſome time, St. *Auguſtin* tarried a whole Year at *Tagaſta*; where Idleneſs diſordered him. He went away at the latter end of the Year 371. for *Carthage*, where he applied himſelf to ſtudy Rhetorick, with much Application and Succeſs. In the mean while his Father died, quickly after he was baptized. The reading of *Cicero*'s *Hortenſius*, inſpir'd St. *Auguſtin* with a love of Wiſdom: But not finding there the Name of Jeſus Chriſt, which he had printed in his Heart from his Infancy, he betook himſelf to the reading of the Holy Scripture: But meeting not there with the flowers of profane Eloquence, he could not reliſh it, and ſo ſuffered himſelf to be led away by the *Manichees*. Being Nineteen Years old, he returned to *Tagaſta*; where he taught Grammar, and frequented the Barr. This Exerciſe having fitted him for ſome noble Employment, he went to *Carthage*, at the Age of Twenty five, about the latter end of the Year 379. where he taught Rhetorick with Applauſe. He was ſtill engaged in the *Manichean* Errors; but he began to be better informed, by a Conference which he had with *Fauſtus*, about the Year 383. The Inſolence of the *Carthaginian* Scholars, made him reſolve to go to *Rome*, though againſt his Mother's Will, who deſired either to keep him there, or to go with him. Being come to *Rome*, he fell ſick in the Houſe of a *Manichee* where he lodged: Being recover'd, he got ſome Scholars about him; but finding that moſt part of them were ſo baſe, to go away without Paying, he ſought to ſettle ſomewhere elſe. The Inhabitants of *Milan* having ſent to *Symmachus*, the Præfect of the City, deſiring that he would find a Rhetorick-Profeſſor for them, St. *Auguſtin* procured himſelf to be Choſen for that Employment. Being in *Milan*, he was ſo wrought upon by St. *Ambroſe*'s Diſcourſes, that he reſolved to be converted, and quit the Sect of the *Manichees*: He diſcovered this Deſign to his Mother, who came to him to *Milan*. *Plato*'s Books confirm'd him in his Reſolution. His Converſation with *Simplicianus* and *Petilian* did much further his Converſion; and the reading of St. *Paul*'s Epiſtles brought this great Work to Perfection, in the 32d. year of his Age. Before the Vacation, in the year 386. he ſtay'd only a few Days, to make an end of his Publick Lectures, which he was to read before the Vacation: Which no ſooner came, but he withdrew to *Verecundus* his Houſe; where he betook himſelf ſeriouſly to ſtudying of the Truth, and to fit himſelf for Baptiſm; which he received at *Eaſter*, in the year 387. having utterly renounced his Profeſſion. Afterwards, he reſolved to return into his own Countrey; and having tarried ſome time at *Rome*; he embark'd at *Oſtia*, where his Mother died. However, he continued his Voyage, and arrived in *Africa* towards the end of the year 388. He went through *Carthage*, where he lodged in a Magiſtrate's Houſe, named *Innocent*; who was miraculouſly cured, as he gives the Account, in the 8th. Chap. of the 22d. Book of *The City of God*. He went to dwell at *Tagaſta*,; where he abode three years, living in common with ſome of his Friends, exerciſing himſelf by Faſtings, Prayers, and other Works of Piety, and applying himſelf Day and Night to the Meditation of the Law of God. The Fame of his Piety was ſo great, that as all that deſigned to embrace Spiritual Life, addreſſed themſelves to him: Among the reſt, a Perſon of Quality in *Hippo*, who was willing to give up himſelf to God, deſired to entertain him, and to bring him to that Town. St. *Auguſtin* did not find himſelf diſpoſed to follow his Advice: yet God did not permit his Journey to prove in vain; for *Valerius*, Biſhop of *Hippo*, having propoſed to the People to chuſe a Prieſt whom that Church ſtood in need of, he choſe St. *Auguſtin*, when he did not think of it; and he Ordained him, againſt his Will, about the beginning of the year 391. St. *Auguſtin* immediately retir'd to prepare himſelf for the worthy diſcharging of the Sacerdotal Function, and begg'd of *Valerius* time till *Eaſter*: In which ſpace, he eſtabliſhed a Monaſtery, or Community of Perſons that had all things Common, renouncing the Property of any thing. *Valerius*, who deſigned that St. *Auguſtin* ſhould preach in his room, permitted him to do it in his Preſence, contrary to the Cuſtom of the *African* Churches. This did not pleaſe ſome of his

St. *Auguſtin.*

St. Auguſtin. his Brethren; but he excus'd it, by the Uſage of the *Eaſtern* Churches, and the need he had that ſome body ſhould preach the Word of God in his place; becauſe he being a *Greek*, could not do it ſo well in *Latin*. This Cuſtom was found ſo reaſonable, that ſeveral Biſhops in *Africa* followed his Example; admitting Prieſts to Preach in their Preſence: yea they did St. *Auguſtin* the Honour, to make him Speak in a General Council of *Africa*, held at *Carthage*, in the year 393. where he Expounded the *Creed*, in the Preſence of the Biſhops; who conceived ſo great an Eſteem of his Learning, that they judged him worthy of a more excellent Dignity. But *Valerius* fearing leſt a Perſon ſo neceſſary for the Government of his Dioceſs, ſhould be taken away from him, reſolved to make him his Co-adjutor; and accordingly, two years after, he cauſed him to be Ordained Biſhop of *Hippo*, by *Megalius*, Biſhop of *Calama*, then Primate of *Numidia*, in the year 395. With much difficulty St. *Auguſtin* conſented to that Ordination, though he did not then know, as he afterwards declar'd, that it was contrary to the Laws of the Church, and to a Canon of the Council of *Nice*, which forbids the Ordaining Two Biſhops in the ſame Church. I ſhall not now give any Account of what he did and wrote whil'ſt he was Biſhop, becauſe that will come in, in the Abridgment of his Works: Neither will I enlarge upon the Praiſes which may be given him, nor upon his Holineſs and his Vertues, which were known and admir'd by all the World, both before and after his Death. This is no part of my Deſign; beſides, the Name only of St. *Auguſtin*, is the greateſt Commendation that can be given him; and whatſoever may be ſaid after that, can ſerve only to leſſen the Opinion Men have conceived of his rare Merit, and his great Piety. He died as Holily as he had liv'd, the 28th. day of *Auguſt*, 430. aged Seventy ſix Years, with Grief to ſee his Countrey Invaded by the *Vandals*; and the City, whereof he was Biſhop, Beſieged for ſeveral Months.

St. *Auguſtin*'s Works make up ſeveral Volumes, wherein they are divided according to that order which was judged to be moſt natural. We ſhall follow that which is obſerved in the laſt Edition, ſet forth by the *Benedictines* of St. *Germans*.

The Firſt TOME of St. *Auguſtin*'s Works.

Tome I. THE Firſt Volume containeth the Works which he wrote before he was a Prieſt; with his *Retractations* and *Confeſſions*: which ſerve as *Prefaces* to his Works; becauſe the Firſt giveth an Account of his Writings, and is uſeful to underſtand the moſt difficult places of his Works; and the Second diſcovers his Genius, and takes notice of the principal Circumſtances of his Life.

The Book of *Retractations*, is a Critical Review of his Works. He tells you there the Title, and ſets down the firſt Words of them: He gives a Catalogue according to the Time, and he obſerves upon what Occaſion, and wherefore he writ them: he tells the Subject and the Deſign which he had in compoſing them: he clears thoſe places which ſeem to be obſcure: he ſoftens thoſe which he thinks are too hard, gives a good Sence to ſuch as ſeem capable of having a bad one, and rectifies them where he thinks that he erred from the Truth. In one word; He confeſſeth ingenuouſly the Errours or Miſtakes which he committed. The *Preface* to this Work is very humble: He ſays, That his Deſign is, to review his Works with the Severity of a Cenſor, and to reprove his own Faults himſelf; following therein the Apoſtle's Advice, who ſaith, *That if we judge our ſelves, we ſhould not be judged of the Lord.* That he is frighted with thoſe words of the Wiſe-man, *That it is difficult to avoid committing Faults in much ſpeaking.* That he is not terrify'd with the great number of his Writings; ſince none can be ſaid to Write or Speak too much, when he Speaks and Writes only things that are neceſſary: but he is afraid, leſt there ſhould be in his Writings many falſe things, or at leaſt, unprofitable ones. That if now being Old, he thinketh not himſelf free from Errour, it is impoſſible but that he muſt have committed Faults when he was Young, either in Speaking or in Writing; and ſo much the rather, becauſe he was then obliged to Speak often. That therefore he is reſolved to judge himſelf, according to the Rules of Jeſus Chriſt, his Maſter, whoſe Judgments he deſires to avoid.

The Body of this Work is divided into Two Books. In the former, he reviſeth the Works which he writ before he was Biſhop: And in the latter, he ſpeaketh of thoſe which he compoſed afterwards, to the Year 427. which is the time when he made his Book of *Retractations*. I need ſay no more at preſent, becauſe in diſcourſing of each of them, I ſhall mention what St. *Auguſtin* hath obſerved in his *Retractations*.

His Confeſſions are an excellent Picture of his Life; he draweth himſelf with lively and natural Shapes, repreſenting his Infancy, his Youth, and Converſion, very critically. He diſcovers both his Vices, and his Vertues, ſhewing plainly the inward Bent of his Heart; with the ſeveral Motions wherewith he was agitated: As he ſpeaks to God, ſo he often lifts up his Spirit towards him, and intermixes his Narration with Prayers, Inſtructions, and Reflections. He tells us himſelf, That he would have us view him in that Book, as in a Looking-Glaſs that repreſents him to the Life; and that his Deſign in the Writing of it, was to Praiſe both the Juſtice, and the Mercy of God, with Reſpect to the Good and Evil which he had done, and to lift up his Heart, and Spirit to God. That this is the Effect that it produced in him when he compoſed it, and

that

that which it produceth now, when he readeth it. *Others* (ſaith he) *may have what Opinion of it they pleaſe; but I know that ſeveral Pious Perſons have loved my Confeſſions very much, and do love them ſtill.* As indeed, all ſpiritual Perſons have ever ſince read that Work with Delight and Admiration. This Book is not full of whimſical Imaginations, and, empty, obſcure uſeleſs Spiritualities, as moſt Works of this Nature are: It contains, on the contrary, excellent Prayers; ſublime Notions of the Greatneſs, Wiſdom, Goodneſs, and Providence of God; ſolid Reflections upon the Vanity, Weakneſs, and Corruption of Man; proper Remedies for his Miſery, and Darkneſs; and moſt uſeful Inſtructions to further him in a ſpiritual Life. In one word, It may be ſaid, that of all ſpiritual Books, there is none more ſublime or ſtronger than this. Yet there are ſome Notions too Metaphyſical, above the reach of ſome devout Men; and there appeareth too great an Affectation of Eloquence: There is, perhaps, too much Wit; and Heat, and not enough of Meekneſs, and Simplicity. St. *Auguſtin.* Tome I.

St. *Auguſtin's* Confeſſions are divided into Thirteen Books; whereof the Ten firſt treat of his Actions, and the Three laſt contain Reflections upon the beginning of *Geneſis.* In the Firſt Book, after an excellent Prayer to God, he deſcribeth his Infancy, diſcovering the Sins he committed at that time, as well as the evil Inclinations that were in him. He repreſents, with all the beauty, and exactneſs imaginable, the things that are incident to Children; their Motions of Joy, and Sorrow, their Jealouſie before they can ſpeak, how hardly they learn to ſpeak; their averſion to Study, their love of Play, and the fear of Chaſtiſement. He charges himſelf with loving the Study of Fables, and Poetical Fictions; and hating the Principles of Grammar, and particularly the Greek Tongue, tho' theſe Things were infinitely more profitable, than thoſe Fables, whereof he diſcovers the danger. He ſays, That being fallen dangerouſly Sick, he deſired to be Baptized; but coming to have ſome Eaſe, they deferred it, fearing he might defile himſelf again with new Crimes: *Becauſe* (ſaith he) *the Sins committed after Baptiſm, are greater, and more dangerous, than ſuch as are committed before.*

In the Second, he begins to deſcribe the Diſorders of his Youth; he ſays, That being returned to his Father's Houſe at Sixteen years of Age, he gave himſelf to debauchery, notwithſtanding his Mother's Admonitions; That he was guilty of Theft, by robbing an Apple-tree in a Neighbour's Orchard with his Companions, with ſeveral Reflections upon the Motives that put him upon that Action.

In the Third he confeſſeth, That at *Carthage*, whither he was gone to finiſh his Studies; he was tranſported with the fire of Luſt. He laments the love which he had for Stage-Plays and Publick Shows, and the Pleaſure he found when they affected him at any time with Paſſion. He declares afterwards, That he read one of *Cicero's* Books, Entituled *Hortenſius*, that inſpired him with the love of Wiſdom; but not finding in that Book the Name of Jeſus Chriſt, which remained engraven in his Heart, and which he had as it were ſuck'd in with his Milk, he applied himſelf to the Holy Scripture; but that having read it with a Spirit of Pride, he reliſhed it not, becauſe of the plainneſs of it's Stile; and then he hearkened to the Dreams of the *Manichees*, who promiſed to bring him to the Knowledge of the Truth. He refutes their Errors, and ſpeaks with great tenderneſs of the Prayers which his Mother made, and the Tears that ſhe ſhed for his Converſion.

He continued however Nine years in that Hereſie, being deceived, and endeavouring to deceive others. He taught Rhetorick at *Tagaſta*. There he loſt one of his intimate Friends, whoſe Death grieved him exceedingly; whereof he deſcribeth the Exceſs in the Fourth Book, where he ſays many fine Things concerning true and counterfeit Friendſhip. There he mentions the Treatiſe of *Comelineſs and Beauty*, which he made at Twenty five years of Age; and gives an Account how eaſily he came to underſtand *Ariſtotle's* Categories. And he ſhews the Unprofitableneſs of Learning.

In the Fifth he deſcribes the degrees by which he came to be delivered from the *Manichæan* Hereſie, how he diſcovered *Fauſtus* his Ignorance who was the Head of that Hereſie. He adds, That having taught Rhetorick at *Carthage*, he went to *Rome* with a deſign to follow there the ſame Profeſſion; but having been diſheartened by the unhandſom uſage of the Scholars, who refuſed to pay their Maſters, he obtain'd of *Symmachus* the place of Rhetorick-Profeſſor at *Milan*, where he heard St. *Ambroſe* Preach, who perfectly diſabuſed him of the Errors of the *Manichees*, and made him reſolve abſolutely to quit that Sect, and become a *Catechumen.*

He goeth on in the Sixth Book, to deſcribe the Progreſs of his Converſion; which was much furthered by the Prayers and Admonitions of his Mother S. *Monica*, who came to find him at *Milan*, and contracted a ſtrict Friendſhip with St. *Ambroſe*. He obſerves, That this Holy Biſhop kept her from carrying Meat to the Graves of the Martyrs, as ſhe uſed to do in her own Country. He deſcribeth the Manners of two of his good Friends, *Alypius* and *Nebridius*, and the Agitations that were cauſed in himſelf by the knowledge of his Miſeries, and the deſign which he had to alter his courſe of Life.

In the Seventh Book, he declares his Condition in the 31ſt year of his Age, how much he was yet in the dark as to the Nature of God, and the Spring of Evil: how he was perfectly weaned from Judicial Aſtrology, by hearing of the Hiſtory of two Children that were born at the ſame moment of time, whoſe lot proved quite different: And laſtly, by what degrees he rid himſelf of his Prejudices, and came to the knowledge of God, though he had not as yet thoſe thoughts of Jeſus Chriſt, which he ought to have had.

He

St. *Auguſtin.* Tome I.

He declares, That he found the Divinity of the Word in the Books of the *Platoniſts*, but not his Incarnation: And afterwards comparing the Books of thoſe Philoſophers with the Books of the Holy Scripture, which he began to read, he obſerveth that the former had made him more knowing, but alſo more preſumptuous. Whereas the others inſtructed him in true Humility, and in the way which Men ought to follow to obtain Salvation.

At laſt he comes in the Eighth Book to the beſt Paſſage of his Life, to that which happened in the Two and thirtieth year of his Age, which was his Converſion. Firſt of all he was wrought upon by a Conference which he had with a holy Old Man, *Simplicianus*, who related to him the Converſion of a famous Rhetorick-Profeſſor named *Victorinus*. He was further moved by the Story which *Potitianus* told him of another Converſion. And at laſt feeling himſelf agitated, and diſtracted, by ſeveral contrary thoughts, he withdrew into a Garden, where he heard a Voice from Heaven, commanding him, to open St. *Paul*'s Epiſtles; whereof he had no ſooner read ſome Lines, but he found himſelf wholly converted, and freed from the Agitations which till then had troubled him: Nothing can be more noble than the Deſcription which he makes in that Book, of the Combats and Agitations which that man feels that is engaged in Vice, and hath formed a deſign of being converted to God.

St. *Auguſtin* was no ſooner converted, but he reſolved to leave his Profeſſion. The Vacation being come, he retired to the Country-Houſe of one of his Friends called *Verecundus*, to prepare himſelf for Baptiſm, which he received at *Eaſter* with *Alypius*, and his Son *Adeodatus*, whom he had by a Concubine. This he relateth in the Ninth Book, where he diſcourſeth again of the Death of *Verecundus*, and *Nebridius*, and *Adeodatus*, which happened ſhortly after his Baptiſm; He ſpeaketh likewiſe, of the Original of the Singing in the Church of *Milan*, that was eſtabliſhed by St. *Ambroſe*, when he was perſecuted by *Juſtina* an *Arian* Princeſs; concerning the diſcovering of the Bodies of the Martyrs, St. *Gervaſius* and St. *Protaſius*, and of the Miracles done at the time of their Tranſlation; of the diſcourſe he had with his Mother S. *Monica*, about the Felicities of the other Life, and of the Death of that holy Widow which happened at *Oſtia*, when he was returning into *Africa*; of her Burial; of the Prayers that were made for her; and of the Sacrifice which was offered. He concludes this Book by recommending her to the Prayers of thoſe that ſhall read his Confeſſions.

Having ſet forth in the foregoing Books what he was before his Converſion, he ſheweth in the Tenth what he was at the time of his writing. He finds that his Conſcience gave an unqueſtionable Teſtimony of his love to God. He explains the Reaſons that oblige Men to love God, reckoning up all the Faculties of his Soul that can lead him to know God, eſpecially Memory, whereof he makes a wonderful Deſcription: He ſays, amongſt other things, that it ſerves to teach us many things, which entred not into the Mind by the Senſes, and that it may lift us up to God. He occaſionally ſpeaks of Happineſs, and of the Idea that Men have of God; afterwards he examineth himſelf about the three main Paſſions of Man, the love of Pleaſures, of Knowledge, and of Glory. He ſincerely confeſſeth what was his diſpoſition with reſpect to theſe Paſſions, preſcribing at the ſame time excellent Rules, to keep our ſelves from them. Laſtly, He diſcovers the knowledge of the true Mediatour, and of the Graces which he merited for us.

The Three laſt Books are about leſs ſenſible Matters: He waves the Hiſtory of his Life to ſpeak of the love which he had for the Sacred Books, and of the Knowledge that God had given him of them; which to ſhow, he undertakes to explain the beginning of *Geneſis*, upon which occaſion he ſtarts ſeveral very ſubtil Queſtions.

In the Eleventh, he refuteth thoſe that asked, what God was doing before he created the World, and how God on a ſudden formed the deſign of creating any thing; whereupon he enters into a long Diſcourſe concerning the Nature of Time.

In the Twelfth Book he treateth of the firſt Matter. He pretends that by the Heavens and the Earth, which God is ſaid to have created in the beginning, we are to underſtand ſpiritual Subſtances, and the ſhapeleſs Matter of corporeal things; that the Scripture ſpeaking of the Creation of theſe two ſorts of Beings, makes no mention of days; becauſe there is no time with reſpect to them. He affirms, That whatſoever he hath ſaid concerning the World's Creation cannot be denied, though the beginning of *Geneſis* were otherwiſe expounded, becauſe theſe are undoubted Truths. He treateth here of the different Explications which may be made of the Holy Scripture, affirming, That there is ſufficient reaſon to believe, that the Canonical Authors foreſaw all the Truths that might be drawn from their words, and though they had not foreſeen theſe Truths, yet the Holy Ghoſt foreſaw them: Whence he ſeems to conclude, that we are not to reject any ſence that may be given to the holy Scripture, provided it is conformable to the Truth.

At laſt, having admired the Goodneſs of God, who ſtanding in no need of the Creatures, had given them not only a Being, but alſo all the Perfections of that Being; he diſcovereth in the laſt Book the Myſtery of the Trinity in the firſt words of *Geneſis*, and even the Perſonal Property of the Holy Ghoſt; which gives him an admirable opportunity of deſcribing the Actions of Charity in our ſelves. He concludes with a curious Allegory upon the beginning of *Geneſis*, and finds in the Creation the Syſtem and Oeconomy of whatſoever God hath done for the Eſtabliſhment of his Church, and the Sanctification of Men; the only end which he propoſed to himſelf in all his Works.

St. *Auguſtin*

St. *Auguſtin* placeth the Books of Confeſſions before thoſe againſt *Fauſtus*, which were written about the Year 400, in his Retractations, from whence we may conclude, that theſe were both written about the ſame time. St. *Auguſtin.* Tome I.

After theſe two, which ſerve, as we have ſaid, for a Preface to all St. *Auguſtin*'s Works, you find in this firſt Volume, the Books that St. *Auguſtin* writ in his Youth, before he was a Prieſt, in the ſame order in which they were written.

The three Books *againſt the Academici*, are the firſt after the Treatiſe *of Beauty and Comelineſs*, which is loſt. He compoſed them in the Year 386, in his ſolitude, when he prepared himſelf for Baptiſm. They are written in imitation of *Cicero*, in the form of a Dialogue, and directed to *Romanianus* his Countryman, whom he adviſeth to Study Philoſophy. The diſpute beginneth betwixt *Licentius* Son to *Romanianus*, and *Trygetius*; after them *Alypius* and St. *Auguſtin* begin to ſpeak.

Having obſerved in the firſt Book, that the good things of Fortune do not render men happy, he exhorts *Romanianus* to the Study of Wiſdom, whoſe ſweetneſs he then taſted. He afterwards gives an Account of three Conferences which *Licentius* and *Trygetius* had had about Happineſs. *Licentius* held with the *Academici*, That to be happy it was enough to ſeek after the Truth; but *Trygetius* pretended, That it was neceſſary to know it perfectly; both being agreed, That Wiſdom is that which makes Men happy, they begin to diſpute about the definition of Wiſdom. *Trygetius* gives ſeveral, all diſapproved by *Licentius*, who aſſerts, That Wiſdom conſiſted not only in Knowledge, but alſo in the purſuit of the Truth: whereupon St. *Auguſtin* concludes, That ſince we cannot be happy without knowing and enquiring after the Truth, our only application ſhould be to ſeek for it.

In the Second Book, having again exhorted *Romanianus* to the Study of Philoſophy, he ſets down three other Conferences, wherein *Alypius* produces the ſeveral Opinions of both the Ancient and Modern Academicks. And becauſe the latter ſaid, That ſome things were probable, though the Truth was not known, they laughed at that Opinion, it being impoſſible, ſay they, to know whether a thing is like the Truth, without knowing the Truth it ſelf. And this very thing obligeth Men to enquire the more carefully after likely and probable things, according to the Principles of the Academicks.

The Third Book begins with Reflections upon Fortune. St. *Auguſtin* ſhews, That the Goods of Fortune are of no uſe to get Wiſdom: and that the Wiſe Man ought at leaſt to know Wiſdom, refuting withall, the Principles both of *Cicero*, and of the other Academicks, who affirmed, That we know nothing, and that nothing ought to be aſſerted. He blames the damnable Maxim of thoſe who permitted Men to follow every thing that ſeemed probable, without being certain of any thing. He ſhews the dangerous Conſequences of ſuch Principles, and endeavours to prove that neither the ancient Academicks, nor *Cicero* himſelf, were of that Opinion.

Theſe three Books are written with all imaginable Elegance and Purity: The Method and Reaſonings are juſt: The Matter treated of is well cleared and made intelligible for all Men; it is beautified with agreeable Suppoſitions and pleaſant Stories. It may be ſaid, That theſe Dialogues are not much inferior to *Tully*'s for ſtile, but much above them for the exactneſs and ſolidity of the Arguments and Notions. In his Retractations he findeth fault with ſeveral places in them, which ſeemed not to him ſufficiently to favour of Chriſtianity, but might be born with in a Philoſophical Work.

The Book of *a Happy Life*, or, *of Felicity*, is a Work of the ſame Nature, written by St. *Auguſtin* at the ſame time, in the 33d. year of his Age. It is dedicated to *Manlius Theodorus*, whom he had known at *Milan*. In the beginning he makes a diſtinction of three ſorts of Perſons. Some to avoid the Troubles of this Life, fly into Harbour as ſoon as they come to the uſe of Reaſon, that they may live quietly. Others on the contrary, having been a while ingaged in the Storms of this Life, carried away with Paſſions, Pleaſures, or Glory, find themſelves happily driven into Harbour by ſome Storm. The third ſort are they, who in the midſt of Storms and Tempeſts, have always had an eye to ſome Star, with a deſign to return into Harbour. The moſt dangerous Rock to be feared in this Navigation, is that of Vain-Glory, which we meet with at the firſt ſetting out, and where it is difficult to avoid Shipwrack. Theſe Reflections St. *Auguſtin* applies to himſelf, and ſaith, That at Twenty five Years of Age, having conceived a ſtrong Paſſion for Philoſophy, by reading of *Tully*'s *Hortenſius*, he reſolved to give up himſelf to that Study: but that having been ſome time wrap'd up with the dark Clouds of the Errors of the *Manichees*, which hid from him the Star that ſhould have guided him: At laſt that miſt was diſſipated. That the Academicks had long detain'd him in the midſt of the Sea, in a continual Agitation; but he had now diſcover'd a lucky Star that ſhewed him the Truth, by the Diſcourſes, both of St. *Ambroſe*, and *Theodorus*, to whom he writeth, That the love both of Pleaſure, and of Glory, had for ſometime detain'd him; but, in the end, he weighed all his Anchors to come into Port.

After this fair beginning, he acquaints *Theodorus* with a Diſcourſe, which he ſuppoſeth to be held upon the 15th of *November*, his Birth-day, with his Mother, his Brother, his Son, his Couſins, and his Two Diſciples, *Trygetius* and *Licentius*, who appeared already in the foregoing Dialogues. That they might enter upon the Matter the ſooner, St. *Auguſtin* introduces them agreed in this Point, That Man being made up of Body, and Soul, the Soul is to be fed as well as the Body, becauſe it hath equal need of Nouriſhment. After this he propounds the ſubject of

St. *Auguſtin.* Tome I.

their Conference, ſaying, That ſince all Men deſire to be happy, it is certain, that all that want what they would have, are not happy; but he asketh, Whether they be happy that have what they deſire? St. *Auſtin*'s Mother having anſwered, That they are happy, if that which they deſire be good, *Si bona, inquit, velit & habeat, beatus eſt*: He replies immediately, That ſhe had found out the greateſt Secret in Philoſophy; *Ipſam prorſus, mater, arcem Philoſophiæ tenuiſti.* Upon theſe Principles, he ſhews, in the Three Dialogues of this Book, That true Felicity conſiſts in the Knowledge of God: For, in the firſt place, the Goods of Fortune cannot make us happy, ſince we cannot have them when we would. The Academicks cannot be happy in their enquiry after Truth, ſince they have not what they would find; but they that ſeek God are happy, becauſe they no ſooner ſeek to him, but he begins to ſhew them Mercy. All thoſe whoſe Souls want any thing, are not happy: None but God can fill the Soul; therefore none but God can make us happy: None is happy without Wiſdom; And can Wiſdom be had without God? Is there any other Wiſdom than that which cometh from him? Is he not VViſdom and Truth?

He concludes with Exhorting thoſe to whom he ſpeaks, to ſeek after God, that they may come to the perfect Knowledge of him, wherein conſiſts the Soveraign Felicity of Life, and the true Happineſs of the Soul. He corrects this Paſſage in his Retractations, obſerving that Man cannot be entirely and perfectly happy in this Life; becauſe he cannot know God perfectly, till he comes to the other VVorld.

St. *Auſtin* treateth of Providence in his Two Books *of Order*: Shewing, That all good, and evil Things come to paſs, according to the Order of divine Providence. Theſe Books are written Dialogue wiſe: In the Firſt, he diſcourſes of Providence in general; in the Second, he begins to enquire, What Order is; but immediately digreſſes to ſpeak of the Love of Glory: And his Mother coming in, he puts an end to the Conference; ſhewing, That Women ſhould not be forbidden to Study VViſdom.

In the Third Dialogue, which begins the Second Book, St. *Auguſtin* clears ſeveral particular Difficulties, about the Order of Providence. He enquires what it is to be with God, and in God's Order; in what Sence a wiſe Man may be ſaid to abide with God, and to be immoveable: He maintains, That fooliſh, and wicked Actions come into the Order of Providence, becauſe they have their Uſe for the good of the Univerſe, and manifeſt God's Juſtice.

In the Fourth Dialogue he proves, That God was always Juſt, tho' there was no occaſion for the exerciſe of his Juſtice before there were wicked Men: That Evil was introduced againſt God's Order; but that the Juſtice of God ſubmitted it to its Orders. Having bandied theſe Metaphyſical Queſtions, he enters upon Morals; exhorting his Diſciples to follow God's Order, both in their Behaviour, and in their Studies. He ſays, Men ought to live after the following Pattern. "'Tis neceſſary (*ſaith he*) for young Men to avoid Debauches, and Exceſs; "to deſpiſe gay Cloths, and rich Attire; to be careful not to loſe their time, either at Play, "or unprofitable Recreations; not to be Idle, or Sleepy; to be free from Jealouſie, Envy, and "Ambition; in one word, not to ſuffer themſelves to be tranſported by any violent Paſſion: "They ſhould be perſwaded, That love of Riches, is the worſt Poyſon that can infect their "Hearts. They ought to do nothing, either with Cowardice, or with Raſhneſs. If they are "offended, let them refrain their Anger. They ought to correct all Vices, but to hate no Body; not to be too ſevere, or too yielding. Let their Reproofs be always for a good End; and "their Meekneſs never Authorize Vice: Let them look upon all that are committed to their "Charge, as their own: Let them ſerve others without Affectation of Dominion; and when "they become Maſters, let them ſtill be willing to ſerve: Let them carefully avoid making "Enemies; and if they have any, let them bear with them patiently, and endeavour to be "quickly reconciled: In all their Buſineſs with others, and their whole Behaviour, let them obſerve that Maxim of the Law of Nature: *Do not that to others, which you would not have done "to you.* Let them not meddle with Publick Affairs, except they are very capable.∴· and "ſtudy to get Friends in what Employment ſoever they be; take a delight in ſerving thoſe that "deſerve it, even when they leaſt look for it: Let them live orderly, honour God, think of him "and ſeek him by Faith, Hope, and Charity.

Having thus given Precepts for the Manners of Youth, he preſcribeth Rules for their Studies. He ſaith, That Learning is got by Authority and Reaſon; and, That there is a Two-fold Authority, that of God, and that of Men. Theſe may deceive us; but God never affirmeth any thing but what is True. He treateth afterwards of Reaſon; and having given a Definition of it, he ſhews, That all Learning is nothing but Reaſon occupied in the conſideration of different Objects. He draws up a Catalogue of all the Sciences, and gives a ſhort Account, both of the object and uſe of each of them: From thence he paſſes to the Knowledge of the Soul, and of God; wherein he places true Wiſdom, and concludes his Diſcourſe with an Exhortation to Vertue.

His Two Books *of Soliloquies*, were likewiſe written by S. *Auguſtin* in his Retirement, about the beginning of the Year 387. His Deſign is to grow more perfect in the Knowledge, both of God and his own Soul. To this end, after an excellent Prayer to God, he examines his Reaſon, and makes it return Anſwers. In the firſt Book he treateth, particularly, of the neceſſary Diſpoſitions in the Soul, to deſerve the Knowledge of God. He teaches, That it arrives to that Knowledge by Faith, Hope, and Charity, and by turning away the Heart, and Thoughts from Earthly

Earthly Things, to ſeek and love nothing but God. At the latter end, he falls upon the Queſtion of the Immortality of the Soul, which he proſecutes in the Second Book. He concludes, That the Soul is Immortal, becauſe it is the Habitation of Truth, which is Eternal: Which puts him upon making ſeveral Reflections, both upon Truth and Falſhood. This laſt Volume is not compleat, as S. *Auguſtin* himſelf obſerves in his Retractations; where he corrects ſome faulty Expreſſions that he uſed at a time when he was not throughly inſtructed in Religion. St. *Auguſtin.* Tome I.

Sometime after the Books *of Soliloquies*, St. *Auguſtin* being returned to *Milan*, writ the Book *Of the Immortality of the Soul*: *Which is* (ſaith he in his Retractations) *as a Memorial which I made to compleat my Soliloquies, that were imperfect: But I know not how it came to be Publick againſt my Will; ſo that it is now amongſt my Works. This Book* (addeth he) *is ſo dark in the beginning, both by reaſon of the Expreſſions, and the brevity of the Reaſonings, that it wearieth the Reader; and requires ſo great an Attention, that I can ſcarce underſtand it my ſelf with much Application.* The reading of it will diſcover, that it is rather Memoirs, than a finiſh'd Work. He has Collected ſeveral, dry, barren Arguments, to prove the Immortality of the Soul.

Theſe are ſome of his Principles. Knowledge is Eternal; wherefore the Soul, which is the Seat of Knowledge, is Immortal. Reaſon, and the Soul, are all one; but Reaſon is Immutable and Eternal. Matter cannot be annihilated, let it be divided never ſo much; ye it abideth. And, Who can believe the Soul to be in a worſe Condition? Nothing can create it ſelf, and nothing can annihilate it ſelf. Life is the Eſſence of the Soul; therefore it cannot be deprived of it. The Soul is not the Diſpoſition of the Parts of the Body; ſeeing the more we endeavour to abſtract it from Senſe, the more eaſily we comprehend Things? Neither can it be changed into a Body; for were this Change poſſible, it muſt be either becauſe the Soul is willing, or becauſe it may be forced to it by the Body; but both theſe Notions are equally abſurd. Theſe are the Principles, whereupon St. *Auſtin* enlargeth in this Treatiſe, and which he applies to his purpoſe with great ſubtility, and fineneſs. This Book is a convincing Evidence of his Skill in Logick.

The following Treatiſe is Intituled, *Of the Quantity of the Soul*: It is placed here, becauſe it treateth of the ſame Matter with the foregoing; for, according to the order of time, it ought to be placed after that *Of the Manners of the Church*, as St. *Auguſtin* obſerves in his Retractations. He gives this Account of this Treatiſe *Of the Quantity of the Soul*, writ whilſt he was in that City (*Rome.*) *A Dialogue, wherein I raiſe ſeveral Queſtions concerning the Soul*, viz. *What is its Original; What its Nature; Whether it is extended; Why it was united with the Body; What alterations happen to it, either when it comes into, or goeth out of the Body. But, becauſe I undertook to Examine with exactneſs and curioſity, Whether it was extended; deſigning to ſhew, That it is not, after the manner of Bodies, tho' it is ſome great Thing. This only Queſtion hath given the Name to the whole Book; which therefore hath been Intituled*, Of the Quantity of the Soul. *Evodius* is the Perſon whom St. *Auguſtin* introduceth, ſpeaking in this Dialogue; as he ſays in the 101*ſt.* Letter: And ſo it was a Miſtake, to put in the common Editions, the Name of *Adeodatus*, which is not found in the Ancient Manuſcripts; and with much Reaſon they have reſtor'd the Name of *Evodius* in the Laſt Edition. This Man propounds to St. *Auguſtin* Six Queſtions: The Firſt, *Whence is the Soul?* St. *Auguſtin* anſwereth, That this Queſtion may be taken two ways; *Where is the Habitation of the Soul?* And, *What is the Matter it is made of?* *Evodius* deſiring to have both theſe Queſtions clear'd to him, he ſaith, *That the Habitation of the Soul is God, who created it.* As for the Nature thereof, he declares, That he can neither Name nor Explain it, becauſe it hath nothing like Corporeal Beings; and that it is ſingle in its kind. *Evodius* his Second Queſtion, is, *What is the Quality of the Soul?* St. *Auguſtin* anſwereth, *That it is like God.* The Third Queſtion propoſed by *Evodius*, coneerns the *Quantity of the Soul*: St. *Auguſtin* affirms, That the Soul hath no *Quantity*, if by *Quantity* be underſtood Corporeal Extention; but that it hath, if by that Term is meant ſpiritual Greatneſs, Strength, and Power. St. *Auguſtin*, here diſcuſſes the Queſtion of the Soul's Extention with care; and ſhews, by ſeveral Reaſons, that it hath no Corporeal Dimenſions. He diſtinguiſhes Men's Souls from thoſe of Beaſts; and grants to the Latter, Senſe without Reaſon: Afterwards, he reckons up the excellent Qualities of Man's Soul, which he reduces to Seven Heads; whence he concludes, That of all Creatures, Man's Soul is that which comes neareſt to the Nature of God. With this he endeth this Treatiſe, without medling with the other Three Queſtions propoſed by *Evodius*, viz. The Fourth, *Why the Soul was united with the Body.* The Fifth, *What it is at the entrance into the Body:* And the Sixth, *What becomes of it when it goes out of it.* This Treatiſe was compoſed by St. *Auguſtin*, in 388.

St. *Auguſtin* having left his Retirement, and being come back to *Milan* in the Year 381. began to write Treatiſes upon the Sciences, as he tells us in his Retractations. He could finiſh none but a Treatiſe *of Grammar*; but he began ſeveral others *of Logick*, *Rhetorick*, *Geometry*, *Arithmetick*, and *Philoſophy*. He did not know himſelf, what was become of theſe Diſcourſes, when he compoſed his Retractations. At the ſame time he began, alſo, the Six Books *of Muſick*; which he compleated after his return into *Africa*, about the Year 389. In the Firſt Book he ſpeaks of Muſick in general: In the Second, of Syllables, and Feet: In the Three following, he diſcourſes of Meaſure, Harmony, and Verſes: In the Laſt he ſhows, That Muſick ought to raiſe up the Mind, and Heart, to a Divine, and Heavenly Harmony.

St. *Auguſtin's*

St. *Auguſtin*. Tome I.

St. *Auguſtin*'s Diſcourſe *of a Maſter*, was written about the Year 395. It is a Dialogue betwixt himſelf, and his Son *Adeodatus*; wherein he ſhews, That it is not by Men's Words that we receive Inſtruction, but from the eternal Truth, *viz.* Jeſus Chriſt the Word of God, who informeth us inwardly of all Truth.

The Firſt of the Three Books *of Free-Will*, was compoſed at *Rome*, in 387. and the Two others in *Africa*, in 395. In the Firſt, St. *Auguſtin* reſolves that hard Queſtion, touching the original of Evil: And having explained what it is to do Evil, he ſhews, That all manner of Evil comes from the Free-Will, which readily followeth the Suggeſtions of Luſt; adding, That our Will makes us either happy, or unhappy: That if we are not happy, though we deſire to be ſo, it is becauſe we will not live conformably to the Law of God; without which, it is impoſſible to be Happy.

In the Second Book, the Difficulty alledged by *Evodius*, VVhy God hath left in Man a Liberty of Sinning, which is ſo prejudicial to him, hath ſtarted theſe Three other Queſtions, How we are ſure that there is a God? Doth all Good come from him? Is the VVill free to do Good, as well as Evil? St. *Auguſtin* clears all theſe Difficulties, proving, That Free-VVill was given for a good End, and that we received it of God; that there is a Being more perfect than our Soul; that this Being is Truth it ſelf, Goodneſs, VViſdom it ſelf; that every good and perfect Thing cometh from it; and that Free-VVill is to be reckoned among the good Things. That there are Three ſorts of Goods: The greateſt are the Vertues that make us live VVell; the *Idea's* of Corporeal Objects, without which we cannot live VVell, are the leaſt, and the Power of the Soul are the middle Ones: That the Firſt cannot be abuſed; but both the Second, and the Laſt may be put to ill Uſes: That Free-VVill is of the Number of theſe middle Goods. When the VVill adheres to the ſovereign Good, it renders Man Happy; but when it departeth from that, to cleave to other Objects, then Man becometh Criminal, and ſo Unhappy. VVherefore neither the VVill, nor the Objects it embraceth, are Evil; but it is a Separation from God, that makes all Evil, and Sin; but God is not the Author of this Separation. From whence then is this Principle of Averſion? This St. *Auguſtin* clears in the Third Book. It is not Natural, ſince it is Guilty: It is Free, and Voluntary; and it is enough to ſay, That we may chuſe, whether we will follow it, or no, to juſtifie God's Juſtice: But, how can this Liberty agree with the fore-knowledge of God? Nothing is more eaſie, according to St. *Auguſtin*, in this Place. VVe are Free when we do what we pleaſe: But Preſcience doth not take away our Will; on the contrary it ſuppoſes it, ſince it is a Knowledge of our Will. But are not the Creature's Faults to be imputed to the Creator? Why did he not make it impeccable? Had not Men been more perfect, if they had been created at firſt in the ſame condition with the Angels, and the glorified Saints that cannot be ſeparated from the love of God? But St. *Auguſtin* replies, Doth it therefore follow, That becauſe we may conceive a more Perfect State, therefore God was obliged to create us in that State? Should we not rather believe that he had his Reaſons why he did not create us more Perfect? There are ſeveral ſorts of Perfections. If the State of a Creature, that enjoyeth God, makes Soveraign Felicity; then the State of a Creature that is ſubject to Sin, which liveth in hope of recovering the Happineſs which it loſt, is alſo in God's Order, and exceedingly above that of a Creature that lies under the neceſſity of ſinning eternally. The Condition of theſe laſt, is the worſt of all; and yet God cannot be accuſed of Injuſtice, for giving a Being to Creatures which he knew would be eternally miſerable: He is not the Cauſe of their Sin: That Being which he gave them, is ſtill a Perfection; their Sins and their Miſery contribute to the Perfection of the Univerſe, and to exalt the Juſtice of God by the Puniſhment of their Sins. What then is the Cauſe of Sins? There is none but the Will it ſelf, which freely and knowingly inclineth to do Evil. For if Sin, could not be reſiſted, it were impoſſible to know or to avoid it; and then there would be no Sin. Wherefore then doth God puniſh Sins of Ignorance? How cometh it to paſs that he blameth thoſe Actions that are done out of Neceſſity? What mean thoſe words of the Apoſtle, *I do not the Good that I would, but the evil that I would not*? All that, ſaith St. *Auguſtin*, is ſpoken of Men born ſince Mankind was condemned to Death, becauſe of the Firſt Man's Sin. For were this Natural to Man, and not a Puniſhment for his Sin; it is certain, there would be no Sin of Ignorance nor Neceſſity: But when we ſpeak here of Liberty, we ſpeak of that which Man had when God created him.

Here St. *Auguſtin* anſwers the greateſt Objection that can be urged againſt Original Sin: Though, ſay they, both *Adam* and *Eve* have ſinned, yet what had we done, wretched Perſons that we are, to be thus abandoned to Ignorance and to Luſt? Muſt we therefore be deprived of the knowledge of the Precepts of Righteouſneſs? and when we begin to know them, Muſt we ſee our ſelves under a kind of Neceſſity not to keep them, by reaſon of the reſiſtance of Luſt? " St. *Auguſtin* confeſſeth, That this Complaint were juſt, if Men were under an impoſſibility " of overcoming their Ignorance and Luſt. But God being preſent every where to call his " Creature to his Service, to teach him what he ought to believe, to Comfort him in his hopes, " to confirm him in his Love, to help his Endeavours, and to hear his Prayers; man cannot " complain, That that is imputed to him which he is unavoidably ignorant of; but then that " he muſt blame himſelf, if he neglects to ſeek after that which he knows not. It is none of his " fault, that he cannot uſe his broken Members; but he is guilty if he deſpiſeth the Phyſician " that proffers to cure him: for none can be ignorant that Man may profitably ſeek for the

Knowledge

" Knowledge of what he knows not, and which he thinks to be neceſſary: And it is well enough " known that Men ought humbly to acknowledge their Weakneſs, to obtain Help. In a word, " If Men do that which is Evil out of Ignorance, or if it ſo happens, that they cannot do the Good " which they would, there is Sin in that; becauſe it is in conſequence of the Firſt Man's Sin " committed with full liberty. This firſt Sin deſerved the following. St. Auguſtin. Tome I.

There remained yet a conſiderable Difficulty, Why the Innocent Soul becometh ſubject unto Sin by it's Union with the Body? To explain this, St. *Auguſtin* mentions four ſeveral Opinions concerning the Original of Souls. The Firſt is, That the Soul is formed from the Parents. The Second is, That God creates new ones at Mens Birth. The Third is, That Souls being created beforehand, God cauſeth them to enter their reſpective Bodies. The Fourth is, That they come down into the Bodies of their own accord: Now, he judging all theſe Opinions equally probable, and that it was as yet undecided, he endeavoureth to prove, that a Reaſon may be given for Original Sin, what Opinion ſoever one holds of the Original of the Soul.

He cometh at laſt to that particular Difficulty concerning the Children that die as ſoon as they are born. As for thoſe that have received Baptiſm, though without knowledge, he ſaith, That it is Piouſly and Juſtly believed (for theſe are the terms he makes uſe of *Satis pie rectèq; Creditur*) that the Faith of thoſe who preſent the Child to be baptized, ſupplies for that of the Child: As to the Pain and Sorrow which they ſuffer, having not deſerved them by their Sins, St. *Auguſtin* ſaith, That God hath his Ends in permitting their Sufferings, and that perhaps he will recompence them for theſe Sufferings, as the Church believeth of the holy Innocents killed by *Herod*, who are reckoned among the Martyrs; having thus ſalved theſe Difficulties, he makes other uſeleſs Queries concerning the Sin of *Adam*.

St. *Auguſtin* obſerves in his Retractations, that he deſigned nothing in theſe Books, but to oppoſe their Opinion, who deny the original of Evil to be from Free-Will; pretending that if this were true, God muſt be the Author of it, introducing thereby an Eternal and Immutable Subſiſtency o Evil; That he did not enlarge upon it, nor treat of Predeſtination or Grace, whereby God prepares the Wills of Men, that they might make good uſe of their Liberty. Yet, when there was occaſion to ſpeak of it, he ſays ſomething by the by, without making any ſtop to defend it. Wherefore *Pelagius* and the *Pelagians*, alledged ſeveral Expreſſions in favour of Free-Will, which St. *Auguſtin* had uſed in his Books: But St. *Auguſtin* ſhews, That what he ſaid of Free-Will, is conſiſtent enough with his Syſtem of Grace, and that he eſtabliſhed all the Principles of it: This he proves by Paſſages taken out of theſe Books, where he affirms, That every good thing comes from God, and that Man cannot be delivered from Ignorance, and the neceſſity of Sinning, but by God's help.

The two Books upon *Geneſis* againſt the *Manichees*, were compoſed by St. *Auguſtin* after his return into *Africa*, about the Year 389. There he refuteth thoſe impertinent Objections which the *Manichees* made concerning the Three firſt Chapters of *Geneſis*, by giving a reaſonable Expoſition of them. He inſiſts moſt upon the literal ſence; but ſometimes he goes out of the way, and only gives an Allegorical one. As St. *Auguſtin* deſigned to benefit all Men by this Book; and particularly, to inform the common People that were abuſed by the *Manichees*, ſo he writ it with all the clearneſs and ſimplicity he could: In his Retractations, he explaineth ſome Paſſages that were miſconſtrued by the *Pelagians*; eſpecially two, one againſt the Neceſſity of Grace, and the other againſt Original Sin.

The Books *of the Manners of the Church, and of the Manichees*, were compoſed at *Rome* by St. *Auguſtin*, ſoon after his Baptiſm, about the Year 387. as himſelf witneſſeth in his Retractations. It is very probable that he reviſed them after his return into *Africa*, ſeeing he mentions them in the firſt of thoſe Treatiſes lately named. His deſign was to confound the Inſolence and Vanity of the *Manichees*, who gloried in a vain Temperance; and under that Pretence, exalted themſelves above the Catholicks: Wherefore in theſe two Books he ſhews the oppoſition of the true Chriſtian's Manners, to thoſe of the *Manichees*; proving how much the counterfeit Vertues which theſe made their boaſt of, were inferior to the real Vertue of Chriſt's Diſciples.

In the Book of the *Manners of the Church*, he layeth down, as the firſt ground of Morality, That God alone is the Soveraign Good of our Souls; from which truth, he inferrs, That all things muſt have reſpect to God, and that we are to love him above all things; and proves this firſt Principle of Chriſtian Ethicks by Teſtimonies of the Old and New Teſtament. He ſhews, That all the Vertues are but ſo many different Expreſſions of this Love; That Temperance is that love, which keeps it ſelf pure and uncorrupt for God: Fortitude, is a love that endureth all things with eaſe, for God's ſake: Juſtice is a love that ſerveth God only, and by reaſon of that, procures Good to all Creatures that are ſubjected to him: Prudence is a love which has a light, to diſtinguiſh that which may help to bring us to God, from that which may hinder us in that way; even the love of our Neighbour is not a Vertue, but ſo far as it relates to God. He alone that loveth God, is capable of loving himſelf and his Neighbour, as he ought to do. This Reflection giveth St. *Auguſtin* an Opportunity of ſpeaking of the Duties of Society, and of what Chriſtians owe one to another. Laſtly, as Examples do often affect more than Precepts; ſo he produces ſeveral Precedents of vertuous Men in the Church, that he may raiſe a higher Notion of the Manners of the Catholicks. He ſets forth the Examples of Hermits, Monks, and Nuns, who have quite ſevered themſelves from the World, to ſpend their Lives in conſtant Abſtinence, and in Exerciſes of Piety. He adds the Example of ſeveral vertuous

St. *Auguſtin.* Tome I.

Eccleſiaſticks, and of many holy Prelates, who kept themſelves pure in the midſt of a corrupt Age; and of an infinite Number of Chriſtians, that led moſt exemplary Lives. He concludes this Book, by ſhewing, That the Examples of Evil Catholicks can be no pretence for Hereticks to ſeparate from the Church; and that the Notions of the *Manichees* touching Marriage, are contrary to thoſe of the Apoſtles.

He obſerveth much the ſame Method in his Book of the Manners of the *Manichees*: He begins it by refuting their Doctrine about the Nature and Original of Good and Evil: Afterwards he diſcovers their impious and ſuperſtitious Practices, in ſuch a manner as renders them ridiculous and abominable; and then gives a relation of the Diſorders whereof the greateſt part of that Sect had been Convicted

The Book *of true Religion*, is the laſt of thoſe which St. *Auguſtin* writ before he was a Prieſt; He therefore made it about the Year 390. there he ſhews both the Excellencies and the Duties of the true Religion; That the Chriſtian Religion is the only true one: and he refutes the Errors of other Religions, and particularly of the *Manichees* concerning the two Natures. He ſpeaks of Jeſus Chriſt's Religion, in that lofty manner, as gives a very high Notion of it. I ſhall give an Analyſis of his Principles. Religion is the only thing that can guide us to the Truth, to Vertue and Happineſs. The Heathen Philoſophers acknowledge the Falſhood of the popular Religion, and yet approve the ſame by their outward worſhip. Since the Eſtabliſhment of Chriſtianity, none can doubt but that it is the Religion which ought to be followed. *Plato* himſelf would have owned it, ſeeing that the loftieſt Maxims of Philoſophy, concerning the Divinity, and the neceſſity of Purifying the Soul, whereof he deſpaired of perſwading the People, are not only Preached throughout the Earth, but alſo embraced and followed by an infinite number of Perſons. The Philoſophers muſt needs know God upon this occaſion, and give place to him that did this Miracle. Neither Curioſity, nor Vain-glory ought to keep them from acknowledging the difference between the Proud Conjectures of a few Philoſophers, and the Publication of a Doctrine that Cures the Soul, and reforms the Errors of all Nations. Religion is not to be ſought for either among the Philoſophers, ſince they approve by their Actions, the ſame Worſhip which they condemn in their Writings; nor among the Hereticks, who have no ſhare in the Sacraments of the Church; nor among Schiſmaticks, who have ſeparated themſelves from the Church; nor among the Jews, who expect from God none but Temporal and Tranſitory Rewards; but only in the Church univerſally diſperſed throughout the Earth, which makes uſe of the Errors of others for its own Good. The Church makes uſe of the Pagans, as the Matter of her Works; Of Hereticks, as a Proof of the Purity of her Doctrine; Of Schiſmaticks, as a Mark of her Stability; and of the Jews, as an Evidence of her Excellency: And ſo ſhe inviteth the Heathen, thruſts out Hereticks, forſakes Schiſmaticks, goes before the Jews, and yet ſhe openeth to all an entrance into the Myſteries, and a door of Grace, either by forming the Faith of the former, or by reforming the Errors of the latter, or by cauſing the laſt to return into her Boſom, or admitting the others into the Society of her Children. As for carnal Chriſtians, ſhe beareth with them for a time, as Straw which is ſerviceable to the Wheat upon the Floor; and becauſe every one is either Straw or Wheat, according to the Motions of his Will, ſhe ſuffers thoſe that are in Sin or in Error till they are Accuſed, or till they undertake to defend their falſe Opinions with obſtinate Animoſity. But ſuch as are cut off from the Church, do either return by Penance, or being carried away by a miſchievous Liberty, they give up themſelves to Vice; or they make a Schiſm, or frame an Hereſie. Yea, very often God's Providence permits ſome vertuous Chriſtians to be put out of the Communion of the Church, by Tumults and Diſturbances excited againſt them by carnal Perſons: but this Separation is not imputed unto them, and God notwithſtanding crowneth them in ſecret, when they bear with that Injury patiently, without making a Schiſm from the Church, or ſetting up any new Hereſie; *Such Examples*, ſaith St. *Auguſtin*, *ſeem rare, but yet there are ſome, and more than can be believed.* Having thus rejected the falſe Religions, he concludes, That we muſt hold to that of Chriſt, and to that Church which is Catholick; and which is ſo called, not only by her own Children, but alſo by her very Enemies. The firſt Ground of this Religion is Hiſtory and Prophecy, which diſcovers to us the Oeconomy that God's Providence hath made uſe of in proceſs of times for the Salvation of Men. That after this Belief, we ought to purifie our Hearts, to render them capable of knowing the Trinity, the Incarnation, and other Articles of the Creed. That Hereſies ſerve to clear the Myſteries. After this, he diſcourſeth of the Soul; ſhewing after what manner it becometh, as it were, Earthly and Carnal by loving the Body; and how it gets out of that Unhappy State, by turning to God and overcoming diſorderly Affections by the Grace of God. He treateth of the Nature and Fall of Angels. He ſhews, That Sin muſt be voluntary; That Death, Weakneſs, and Pain, are Puniſhments for Sin; and yet are not unprofitable, becauſe they wean us from Corporeal Things. He reſumes his Diſcourſe of the Myſtery of the Incarnation, and ſaith, That God's Bounty towards Men, never appeared ſo much as in that Myſtery; That the Word of God of the ſame Subſtance and Co-eternal with the Father, vouchſafed to make himſelf Man like unto us, to deliver us from our Sins: That he hath uſed no force or violence to draw us to himſelf; That he hath manifeſted himſelf to be God by Miracles, and Man by his Sufferings; That he hath appointed his Example for a Remedy againſt all the diſorderly Paſſions of Men; That his Life is a continual Inſtruction, and his Reſurrection, an Evidence that we may hope to be one day delivered from all ſorts of Evils; That he hath taken off the Veil from the

the Figures of the Old Law; That he hath aboliſhed the Ceremonial Ordinances, with which the Jews were over-loaden; That he hath inſtituted few Sacraments indeed, but very wholſom ones to preſerve Society in his Church; That he hath perfected our Morals, by encreaſing the number of Precepts, but that at the ſame time he hath given Men ſtrength to practiſe them. He treateth here of the Nature and Original of Evil, ſhewing that it is not a Corporeal Subſtance, but conſiſts in a vicious adhæſion of the Will to Corporeal Beings. He runs through the ſeveral Conditions of Men, and the Means to find out Remedies for all their Diſtempers. He diſcovereth the Uſe that is to be made both of Authority and Reaſon to cure Man, and applieth both to take him off from the Creature. He hath ſeveral curious Speculations upon the Knowledge and the Affections of Men; and particularly he examines the three principal Paſſions, Pleaſure, Ambition and Curioſity, and layeth down very profitable Precepts for Piety and Manners. He recommends the Reading of the holy Scripture, diſtinguiſhing the ſeveral Explications, and giving ſome Rules for the underſtanding of it. The whole Work is concluded with an Exhortation to all Men to embrace the True Religion. St. *Auguſtin.* Tome I.

In his *Retractations* he maketh ſome Remarks upon this Treatiſe; moſt of them are of ſmall conſequence; theſe are ſome of the moſt important. He had ſaid, That Sin was ſo neceſſarily Voluntary, that an Action could not be Sin, if it was not Voluntary. He juſtifies this Aſſertion in his *Retractations*: but he adds, That Sins committed through Ignorance or Luſt, are in ſome ſort Voluntary, becauſe they cannot be committed without Will: and that even Original Sin is Voluntary, in this ſence, becauſe it was the Will of the Firſt Man, that made it Hereditary to all his Poſterity. He obſerveth likewiſe, upon what he had ſaid, That Jeſus Chriſt had done nothing by Violence, but only uſed Counſels and Exhortations: That he did not then reflect upon the Action of Jeſus Chriſt, when he drove the Merchants out of the Temple with Scourges, that came thither to Buy and Sell; but ſaith he, That cannot be looked upon as a violent Action: *Sed quid hoc aut quantum eſt?* Upon what he had ſaid, *That Miracles were ceaſed in his time, leſt Men ſhould ſtill cleave to Senſible Things, and their Minds be too much accuſtomed to them*; he noteth, That theſe words are not to be taken ſtrictly, ſeeing that Miracles are ſtill wrought in the Church, and that himſelf had ſeen ſome at *Milan*.

The Rule, which is the laſt Piece of this *Tome*, is indeed St. *Auguſtin*'s; but he wrote it for Nuns, and not for Monks. Some body took it out of the 109th. *Epiſtle*, and fitted it for Men. This Alteration has been long made.

As they have placed by themſelves, at the latter end of each *Tome*, thoſe Pieces which are none of St. *Auguſtin*'s, and yet have ſome relation to thoſe contained in that Volume; ſo at the end of this, there are the Treatiſes of Grammar, Logick, Categories and Rhetorick, that were attributed to St. *Auguſtin* in the former Editions; perhaps, becauſe he ſaith himſelf, in his *Retractations*, That he had began ſome Treatiſes upon thoſe Sciences: but his Diſcourſes were written in the form of Dialogues, and like that of *Muſick*; where he makes uſe of that Science, to raiſe up the Mind of Man to his Creator; but theſe are neither Dialogue-wiſe, nor fit to lift up Mens Minds towards God. The Manner how they are written, and the Methods obſerv'd in them, are very different from thoſe of St. *Auguſtin*. In a word, There are in thoſe Treatiſes ſeveral Obſervations unworthy of that Father, and contrary to his Opinions. The Diſcourſe of *Grammar*, begins indeed with the ſame words that St. *Auguſtin* hath noted in his *Retractations*; but they have been added, and are not to be found in the Manuſcripts.

The Author of the Book of *Categories*, has a great Eſteem for *Ariſtotle*'s Philoſophy; and ſaith, That he could ſcare underſtand his Book of *Categories* with *Themiſtius* his help: Whereas St. *Auguſtin*, who had no great Eſteem for *Ariſtotle*'s Philoſophy, aſſureth us, That he underſtood his *Categories*, without Labour, and without a Tutor. The Name of *Adeodatus*, that was inſerted into the Printed Copies, is not found in the Manuſcripts.

The *Monaſtick Rules*, which are at the latter end of this Volume, are rejected with Common Conſent. The laſt, wherein St. *Benedict*'s Rule is quoted, is, if we believe *Holſtenius*, written by *Alredus Rievallenſis*, an Abbot in *England*, who flouriſhed in the *Twelfth Century*; and indeed it is in the Catalogue of this Author's Works, publiſhed [by *Bale*,] in the *Second Century* of *Engliſh Writers*: part of it is among St. *Anſelm*'s Works.

The SECOND TOME.

THE *Second Tome* of St. *Auguſtin*'s Works, containeth his Letters; which do not only repreſent the Genius and Character of that holy Father, but contain alſo very important Points of Doctrine, Diſcipline and Morality. In the laſt Edition, they are placed according to the Order of Time; for which Arguments are brought in a Preface. They are divided into *Four Claſſes*. The Firſt contains thoſe which he writ before he was Biſhop, from the Year 386. to 395. In the *Second*, are thoſe which he writ from the Year 396. to the time when the Catholick Biſhops had a Conference at *Carthage* with the *Donatiſts*, and the breaking out of the *Pelagian* Hereſie in *Africa*, that is, to the Year 410. The *Third* comprehends thoſe that were written Tome II.

St. *Auguſtin.* Tome II.

written from the Year 411. to the end of his Life, that is, to 430. And the *Fourth* contains thoſe whereof the time is not juſtly known, though they were certainly written after he was made Biſhop. There are Two hundred and ſeventy in all. The *Benedictines* have taken away ſome Treatiſes, which were put among the Letters; and they have added thoſe which he Anſwered. And laſtly, Some are added, that were not publiſhed before.

The thirteen or fourteen firſt are about Philoſophical Matters that St. *Auguſtin* uſed to diſcourſe about with his Friends, when he was firſt Converted.

The Firſt was written by St. *Auguſtin* to *Hermogenianus*, about the latter end of the Year 380. concerning the Books that he wrote againſt the Academicks. He tells him what his Aim was in writing them, and asketh his Advice about what he had ſaid concerning thoſe Philoſophers. About the latter end of the Third Book, he commends the Academicks, and ſaith, That he was ſo far from Condemning them, that he had Imitated them. He blameth the falſe Academicks of his own time, and calleth them *ſtupid* who believed the Soul to be Corporeal. He concludes, with ſaying, That he flatter'd not himſelf with triumphing over the Academicks, as *Hermogenianus* ſaid; but that he thought himſelf happy, for being above deſpair of finding the Truth, which is the Food of the Soul; and that he had thereby broken that troubleſome Chain which hinder'd him from faſtning, as one may ſay, to the Breaſts of the True Philoſophy.

In the Second Letter, to *Zenobius*, he teſtifies his Sorrow for his being Abſent, and his Impatience to ſee him again, that they might reſolve a Queſtion which he had begun to examine. This Letter was written the ſame time with the foregoing.

The Third, to *Nebridius*, is about his Books of *Soliloquies*, compoſed in the beginning of the year 387. He ſpeaketh there of his Happineſs of having attained to the Knowledge of ſome particular Truths, and particularly of thoſe concerning our Nature; confeſſing withal, That he was ignorant of many things. Among things unknown to Man, he propoſeth theſe: Why the World is of ſuch Bigneſs? or rather, How big it is? Why it is where it is, rather than any where elſe? He obſerves, That Bodies may be infinitely divided; and, That there is no Quantity but may be both infinitely encreaſed and diminiſhed: That it is not ſo with Numbers, which may be infinitely encreaſed, but not diminiſhed proportionably, ſeeing there is nothing below Unity.

In the next, directed to the ſame, and written about the ſame time, St. *Auguſtin* acquaints him with the Progreſs that he had made in the Knowledge of the Truth, during the time of his Retirement. We have not the other Letters, which he writ at that time to *Nebridius*, as appears by the Ninth Book of *Confeſſions*.

The Fifth and Sixth, are Letters written in *Africa*, by *Nebridius*, to St. *Auguſtin*, about the end of the Year 388. or the beginning of 389. In the Firſt, *Nebridius* pitieth St. *Auſtin*, that he was interrupted in the Contemplation of the Truth by other Buſineſſes. And in the Second, he tells him his Notion, That Memory cannot act without Imagination; and, That the Imagination draws her Images of Things from it ſelf, and not from the Senſes. St. *Auguſtin* reſolves both theſe Queſtions in the Seventh Letter. To the former, he anſwereth, That we remember things which cannot be repreſented by Senſible Idea's: whence he concludes, That there is a Memory independent upon the Imagination. To the latter, That there are Three ſorts of Images or Phantoms, in our Imagination; that ſome are tranſmitted by the Senſes, and theſe repreſent ſuch things as we have ſeen and felt. That the Second, that are formed by Imagination, repreſent ſuch things as we never ſaw; and which, perhaps, are not, but which we fanſie, or ſuppoſe to be, or to have been: And that the laſt ariſe from the Conſideration of ſome Speculative Truths, as Numbers and Dimenſions. That without doubt, the firſt ſort do not proceed from Senſe; but we muſt grant, that the Second have their Original from Senſe, ſince they repreſent nothing but what is true. That the laſt, though they ſeem to ſpring from the Reaſons and Principles of Sciences, which lead not into Error, yet are falſe; becauſe they repreſent Spiritual Things, as if they were Corporeal and Extended. Whence he concludes, That the Soul doth not imagine the things that it does not ſee, and that it doth not feel, but either by leſſening or by encreaſing the Images of what it hath ſeen or felt.

The following Letters, to the Thirteenth, are directed to *Nebridius*, though the Years are not preciſely known: it is certain, that they were written before St. *Auguſtin* was Ordained, becauſe *Nebridius* died before that time. In the Eighth, *Nebridius* asketh St. *Auguſtin*, How *Dæmons* can make us Dream? St. *Auguſtin* anſwers him in the Ninth, That they do it, by ſtirring thoſe Parts of the Body which can make an Impreſſion upon the Soul, after the ſame manner as Muſical Inſtruments excite in us certain Thoughts, Paſſions and Affections. In the Tenth, St. *Auguſtin* propoſes to *Nebridius*, To live together retired: And he ſetteth forth the Advantages of Solitude. In the Eleventh, he endeavours to explain that Queſtion in Divinity, How the Three Perſons being inſeparable, the Son alone was made Man? Having diligently ſtudied how to anſwer it, he tells *Nebridius*, That the underſtanding of Myſteries, is got only by Piety: That this is the ſureſt way to compaſs it, and therefore that Men ought chiefly to give up themſelves to the Practice thereof. He had alſo handled that Queſtion in the Twelfth Letter, but it is imperfect. In the Thirteenth, he adviſes *Nebridius* not to think any longer, that the Soul hath another thinner Body than that which we ſee, it being impoſſible to reſolve that Queſtion, ſince our Senſes cannot diſcern ſuch a Body, and Reaſon cannot diſcover any ſuch thing to us.

In

In the Fourteenth, he answers Two other Questions proposed by *Nebridius*. The First, concerning the *Sun*; which is of small importance, and hath no difficulty. The Second deserves more Reflection: *Nebridius* asks St. *Augustin*, *Whether the Knowledge of God, includeth not only a general Idea of Mankind, but also an Idea of every Man in particular?* St. *Augustin* answereth, That in the Creation, God had only a Prospect of the *general* Idea of Mankind; but yet that there is in God a *particular* Idea of every Man. He clears his Answer by this Example: The Idea of an Angle, is one single Notion, as well as that of a Square: so when I design to make an Angle, one only Idea offers it self; and yet when I go about to describe a Square, I must have in my Mind the Notion of Four Angles joined together: Even so each Man was Formed after the *particular* Idea of a Man; but in the Creation of People, it is no longer the *particular* Idea of *one* Man, but the *general* Idea of *many* seen and conceived all at once. This is refined Metaphysicks. St. *Augustin.* Tome II.

The Fifteenth Letter is written to *Romanianus*; to whom St. *Augustin* promiseth his Book of *The True Religion*, which he finished not long before he was Ordained Priest. Which proves, That this Letter was written about the Year 390. He exhorts *Romanianus* to renounce the Cares of the World, and to seek after solid and lasting Goods.

The Sixteenth Letter, is a Discourse written by *Maximus*, a Grammarian of *Madaura*, who disputeth against the Christian Religion. He owns, That there is but One Sovereign Being, and One only God; but pretends, That it is the same God whom the Heathen worship under several Names, which signifie his several Attributes. He cannot endure, that in the Christian Religion, they should preferr Martyrs of obscure and strange Names, before those Immortal Gods whose Names are so famous. He desires of St. *Austin* to let him know who that particular God is, whom the Christians suppose to be present in secret and retired places.

St. *Augustin* answereth this in the Seventeenth Letter, discovering the Falshood of this Pagans Rallery, by other Ralleries that are more Spiritual. At the latter end of his Letter, he declares, *That among Christians and Catholicks the Dead are not adored*: And, *That no Divine Honours are done to any Creature, but only to God, who created all things.* These Letters were written before the Worship of the Gods was prohibited by the Imperial-Law of the Year 391. whil'st St. *Augustin* was retir'd at *Tagasta*, near *Madaura*, and before he was a Priest, namely, about the Year 390.

It is believed, that the Eighteenth, Nineteenth, and Twentieth Letters, were written before St. *Augustin* was Ordained Priest; because he gives himself no Title in the Inscription, and because they seem more florid than those which he wrote after he was in Orders. The Eighteenth is directed to *Cœlestinus*. There he distinguishes Beings into Three Natures: The First Moveable in Place and Time, and that's Body: The Second Moveable in Time, but not in Place, and that is the Soul: And the Third is Immoveable in Time and Place. and this is God. The First is incapable either of Happiness or Unhappiness: The Last is essentially Happy: The Middle Being is Unhappy when it cleaveth to the Beings of the First sort, but Happy when it carries it self to the Supreme Being. In the Nineteenth Letter, he exhorteth *Caius*, to whom he sendeth his Works, to continue in those good Dispositions of Mind wherein he left him. In the Twentieth, he giveth *Antoninus* Thanks for his Love, and for the good Opinion he had of him; with excellent Instructions, desiring the Conversion of his whole Family.

St. *Austin* was Ordained Priest by *Valerius*, Bishop of *Hippo*, who being a *Greek*, and not able to speak Latin fluently enough to Preach to the People, cast his Eyes upon St. *Augustin* to Preach in his room. St. *Augustin* being sensible how hard it was to discharge the Duties of that Station, entreateth *Valerius*, in the Twenty first Letter, to let him withdraw for a time, that he might fit himself, by Study and Prayer, for the Employment which he had laid upon him. This Letter is very instructive for those that are to be promoted to Ecclesiastical Dignities: It begins with this curious Reflection; *That there is nothing more acceptable, especially at this time, than the Dignity of a Priest, a Bishop and a Deacon; nothing more pleasant and easie than the Exercise of these Offices, when Men will do things only of Course, and flatter others in their Disorders: But on the other side, That there is nothing more mischievous, pernicious and damnable before God. On the contrary, nothing is more glorious and happy in God's account; but at the same time, nothing more difficult, painful and dangerous, especially at this time, than the Exercise of those Functions, when Men resolve to discharge them according to the Rules of that holy Warfare which we profess to follow.* He declareth, That though he wept very heartily on the Day of his Ordination, foreseeing the Dangers he was exposed unto; yet he did not then know his Weakness so well as he has done since.

He observes, That he was Ordained, when he thought to have taken some time to study the Scriptures. He begs time till *Easter*, to prepare himself for Preaching, by Study and Prayer. This Letter was written about the beginning of the Year 391.

The Twenty second, to *Aurelius*, Bishop of *Carthage*, was written the following Year. St. *Augustin* laments the Feasts which they made in Church-Yards, and at the Martyrs Graves, under pretence of Religion, desiring *Aurelius* to give Order about them. He observes, That of the Three Vices condemned by St. *Paul*, in the *Epistle to the Romans*, namely, *Drunkenness*, *Uncleanness* and *Discord*, they seemed to punish but One in the Church, that was, *Uncleanness*: That the others were tolerated; yea, they thought to honour the Martyrs by their Drunkenness: That this Abuse was never in the Churches of *Italy*, or else it had been reformed by the

St. *Auguſtin.* Tome II.

Care and Vigilancy of their Biſhops; and that his Biſhop wanted neither Zeal, nor Knowledge, to correct it in his Dioceſs: but that this Diſorder was ſo rooted, that he thought there was no hope to ſee it aboliſhed, but by the Authority of a Council. That if any particular Church was to do it, that of *Carthage* ought to begin. Yet, that ſuch Abuſes were not to be oppoſed by ſharpneſs, roughneſs, or imperiouſneſs; that Inſtructions were to be uſed, rather than Commands; and Counſels, rather than Threatnings: That if there be need of Threatnings, they muſt be uſed in a lamenting manner, and only ſuch as are found in Scripture; not to inſpire them by Words, with the fear of Eccleſiaſtical Power, but with a Dread of the Divine Vengeance. And ſince the People was perſwaded, That theſe Feaſts were not only to the Honour of the Martyrs, but alſo gave eaſe to the Dead, he would have the Offerings, made in the Church for the Dead, to be done modeſtly, without Pomp and Affectation. He would not have them ſold, but that the Money that was offered, ſhould be immediately diſtributed to the Poor. Afterwards he reproves the Quarrels and Enmities betwixt the African Clergy.

The Twenty third Letter was written by St. *Auguſtin*, during his being a Prieſt, but what Year, is unknown. It is directed to a Donatiſt Biſhop, called *Maximinus*, who had Re-baptiz'd a Deacon of the Church that was become a Donatiſt. St. *Auguſtin* having been informed, That this Biſhop did not do Things like the other Donatiſts, prayeth him to let him know the Truth, and exhorts him, either to declare himſelf a Catholick, if he were not in that Point of the other Donatiſts Opinion; or to hold a Conference with him about his Separation from the Catholick Church.

The 24*th.* and 25*th.* are Two Letters of *Paulinus* to *Alypius*, and to St. *Auguſtin*, written in the Year 394.

The 26*th* is a Letter from St. *Auguſtin*, to his old Diſciple *Licentius*; wherein he exhorts him to deſpiſe the World, making uſe of the Verſes which *Licentius* had Dedicated to him. It was written after St. *Paulinus*, and St. *Auguſtin* were acquainted, about the Year 395.

The 27*th.* is an Anſwer from St. *Auguſtin*, to St. *Paulinus*, written the ſame Year.

The 28*th.* to St. *Jerom*, was the beginning of their Quarrel. St. *Auguſtin* adviſeth him rather to Tranſlate into Latin the beſt of the Greek Authors, than to make a New Tranſlation of the Scripture upon the Hebrew Text. He beginneth alſo the Diſpute, about that Place, to the *Galatians*, which ſpeaks of St. *Peter's* Diſſembling; reproving St. *Jerom* for approving an officious Lye. This Letter was written in the Year 395.

The 29*th.* lately Publiſhed by the *Benedictines* from a Manuſcript in the Library at St. *Croſſe*, is directed to *Alypius*, then Biſhop of *Tagaſta*. There St. *Auguſtin* acquaints him, how he had, at laſt, compaſſed his Deſign of putting down, in the Church of *Hippo*, thoſe Feaſts that they were wont to make in the Church upon the Feſtival Days of the Martyrs: He repeats the Arguments that he uſed in his Sermons upon that Subject, that ſo *Alypius* might take the ſame Courſe, to aboliſh the ſame Abuſe in his own Church. St. *Auguſtin* was but Prieſt, when he writ this Letter, and *Alypius* was newly choſen Biſhop; which ſhews that it was written in the Year 395.

The 30*th.* is a Letter of St. *Paulinus's*, written to St. *Auguſtin* before he was Biſhop. Theſe are all the Letters of the *Firſt Claſſe*.

The Second Claſſe.

THE *Second Claſſe* containeth the Letters written by St. *Auguſtin*, from the time of his being made Biſhop, to the Conference at *Carthage*, before the breaking out of the Pelagian Hereſie in *Africa*, that is from the Year of our Lord 396, to 410.

The Firſt of the Letter, which is the 31*ſt.* written at the beginning of the Year 396. ſhortly after his Ordination, is directed to *Paulinus*. He thanks him for his Second Letters; and takes notice, That he was ordained Coadjutor to *Valerius* in the Biſhoprick of *Hippo*, and invites him to come over into *Africa*.

The 32*d.* is *Paulinus's* Anſwer.

The 33*d.* is to *Proculianus*, a Donatiſt Biſhop at *Hippo*. St. *Auguſtin* being informed, That he deſigned to clear his Doubts by a Conference with him, offereth it to him, that they might agree, and put an end to the Schiſm. This Letter was written ſoon after he was made Biſhop, *Valerius* being yet alive.

The 34*th.* was written, not long after the former: There he complaineth to *Euſebius*, That *Proculianus*, a Donatiſt Biſhop at *Hippo*, to whom the foregoing Letter was directed, had admitted into his Sect, and Re-baptiz'd a young Man, that uſed to beat his Mother, and threatned to kill her; declaring, towards the end, That he was ready to conferr amicably with him, about the pretended Reaſons of their Separation.

This *Euſebius*, who, in all Probability, was a Man of Note, that ſided with the Donatiſts, having returned St. *Auguſtin* this Anſwer, That he would be no Judge betwixt Biſhops; this Saint writ to him again, by the 35*th.* Letter, That he might be on that occaſion, where there was no need of Judging; but only to know, Whether it was by *Proculianus* his Order, that the young Man was Re-baptiz'd; and, Whether he would enter upon a Conference? He Complains

plains likewiſe, That the ſame Biſhop had received, and Re-baptized a Sub-Deacon of the Church of *Iſpana*; who being accuſed of having an infamous Commerce with ſome Virgins that were conſecrated to God, was gone over to the Donatiſts to avoid the Chaſtiſement which he deſerved; and ever ſince led a ſcandalous Life. St. *Auguſtin* takes notice, that he dealt not ſo with thoſe that proffered to come into the Church: If they be found guilty of any Crime, they are not admitted, but upon Condition that they ſubmit themſelves to the humiliation of Penance. He ſhews how abominable this Cuſtom of the Donatiſts was, to perſwade ſuch as were to be chaſtiſed for their Diſordets, to come over to them, and be Re-baptized. At laſt he tells *Euſebius*, That if, by this means, he doth not obtain an Anſwer from *Proculianus*, he will cauſe theſe Things to be notifi'd to him, formally by a publick Officer: He ſpeaks, beſide, of a Donatiſt Prieſt, who had been troubleſome to one of the Church's Tenants; and of a Woman of that Party that had affronted him. St. *Auguſtin.* Tome II.

The Thirty ſixth Letter to *Caſulanus*, concerning *Saturday's* Faſt, ſeems to have been written before St. *Ambroſe*'s Death, of whom he ſpeaketh, as holding ſtill the See of *Milan*; whereby it appears, that it belongs to the Year 396, or 397. There he refuteth the Writings of a certain Roman, who had aſſerted, That all Men were obliged to faſt on *Saturdays*, according to the Practice of the Church of *Rome*. St. *Auguſtin* lays down this Rule, That in thoſe Things, where the Scripture hath determined nothing certain, the Cuſtoms received among Chriſtians, or ſettled by our Anceſtors, are to be inſtead of a Law, and no Conteſts ought to be admitted about ſuch Matters. Afterwards he examineth the Writing which *Caſulanus* ſent him, and ſhews, that it is made up of falſe Suppoſitions, and unconcluding Conſequences. Having anſwered this Writing, he explains his own Notion, ſaying, That he finds indeed, that Faſting is enjoyn'd in the Goſpel, and in the Writings of the Apoſtles: but that neither Jeſus Chriſt, nor the Apoſtles, ever appointed the days wherein we ſhould faſt, nor the days in which we ought to forbear. That he thinks it more convenient not to faſt upon the *Saturday*; and yet whether we faſt or faſt not, we ought to maintain Peace; and this Precept of the Apoſtle is to be obſerved, *Let not him that eateth, condemn him that eateth not; neither let him that eateth not, condemn him that eateth.* That there is no great Inconvenience in obſerving the *Saturday*'s Faſt, ſince the Church of *Rome* obſerves it as well as ſome other Churches: But it would prove a great Scandal to faſt upon *Sundays*; eſpecially, ſince the *Manichees* affect to command their Diſciples to faſt upon that day: That notwithſtanding, it were pardonable to faſt upon *Sunday*, for thoſe who are able to carry Faſting ſo far, as to be more than a week without eating, that ſo they draw nearer to the Faſt of Forty Days. St. *Auguſtin* ſaith, that ſome have done it, and that he was inform'd, That a certain Perſon had continued faſting full Forty Days. This is hard to be believ'd, yet St *Auguſtin* ſaith, that he heard it from credible Perſons. Having refuted the Reaſons of the *Manichees*, who affirming, That *Sunday* is to be kept as a Faſt; he ſaith, that the Church obſerves faſting upon *Wedneſdays* and *Fridays*; becauſe the Jews reſolved upon *Wedneſday* to put Chriſt to Death, and Executed it upon *Friday*. That on *Saturday*, the Body of Jeſus Chriſt having reſted in the Grave, gave occaſion to ſome to forbear faſting on that day, to mark thereby the reſting of Chriſt's Fleſh; and that others faſt upon it, becauſe of that Humiliation of our Saviour: but that the former Celebrate that Faſt once only, on the *Saturday* before *Eaſter*, to renew the Remembrance of the Diſciple's Sorrow. All theſe Notions having but little Solidity, he concludes with an excellent Rule which St. *Ambroſe* had taught him upon that Subject: For having asked his Opinion, concerning his Mother's Scruple, who being at *Milan*, doubted whether ſhe ought to obſerve *Saturday*'s Faſt, according to the Cuſtom of her own Church, or according to the Cuſtom of the Church of *Milan*, that obſerved no Faſt on that day. This Holy Biſhop anſwer'd him, *Let her do as I do. When I am here, I do not faſt upon* Saturdays; *when I am at* Rome, *I faſt upon that day: and ſo in what Church ſoever you are, keep to its Cuſtoms, if you mean to ſcandalize no body, or to be ſcandalized at no body.* But becauſe he was then in *Africa*, and that among the Churches of the ſame Countrey, and even among the Chriſtians of the ſame Church, ſome faſted upon *Saturdays*, and others not, St. *Auguſtin* ſaith, That we muſt conform our ſelves to thoſe that bear Rule over the People; and ſo he adviſeth him to whom he writeth, not to reſiſt his Biſhop in that Caſe, but to do as he did.

The Thirty ſeventh Letter to *Simplicianus*, is a Preface to the Books that he Dedicated to that Biſhop that were written in 397.

In the Thirty eighth to *Profuturus*, St. *Auguſtin* being ſick, recommends himſelf to his Prayers, and deſires to know what Biſhop ſucceeded in the Primacy of *Numidia*, after the death of *Megalius* Biſhop of *Calama*, who had been dead Twenty days. In the Council of *Carthage*, aſſembled in *Auguſt*, 397. *Creſcentianus* wrote, that he was Primate of *Numidia*. Thus, the death of *Megalius* happening ſome time before, ſerves to fix the date of this Letter. There are two excellent Notions of Morality; the one of Patience, and the other againſt Anger. The former is this: *Tho' I ſuffer, yet I am well, becauſe I am as God would have me to be, for when we will not what he wills, 'tis we that are in the fault, and not he, who can neither do, nor permit any thing but what is juſt.* The latter is equally valuable: *It is incomparably better to ſhut the door of our Heart againſt juſt Anger when it offers to come in, than to give it entrance, being uncertain whether we can turn it out again, when we find it growing from a Thread to a Beam.*

The

St. *Auguſtin.* Tome II.

The Thirty ninth Letter, is a Note from St. *Jerom*, who recommends *Præſidius*, and preſents his Service to *Alypius*. It is written in the Year 397.

The Fortieth from St. *Auguſtin* to St. *Jerom*, is about their Diſagreement, concerning St. *Peter*'s Action. St. *Auguſtin* alſo deſires to know the Title of his Book of Eccleſiaſtical Writers, and exhorts him to make a Collection of *Origen*'s Errours, and of thoſe of other Hereticks.

The Forty firſt Letter written in *Alypius* and St. *Auguſtin*'s Name, to *Aurelius* Biſhop of *Carthage*, commending that Biſhop for preferring the good of the Church, before the Honour of the Epiſcopal Order; by permitting, contrary to Cuſtom, that Prieſts ſhould Preach God's Word in his preſence. This Letter was written within few Years after St. *Auguſtin* was a Biſhop.

The Forty ſecond, is a Note from St. *Auguſtin* to St. *Paulinus*, never before Publiſhed, intreating him to write to him, and to ſend him his Book againſt the Gentiles. It is of the latter end of the Year 397.

The Forty third, and forty fourth Letters to *Glorius Eleuſius*, give an Account of a Conference, which St. *Auguſtin* held in the City of *Tuburſica*, with ſome Donatiſts, in the Year 397, or 398. as it is proved in the Preface to the Letters. In the firſt, he produces the Judgments that were given againſt the Donatiſts: He juſtifies *Cæcilian*'s Innocency, and ſhews, that thoſe who condemned him, were ſuſpected Judges; and that the Authors of the Donatiſt Schiſm, were guilty of the Crime which they charged upon others. He adds, That it was to no purpoſe to impute to the Church the pretended Crimes of the dead; ſince the Church may tolerate wicked men, without ceaſing to be a Church. That the Donatiſts themſelves ſuffer among them very diſorderly Perſons; that *Maximianus* had cauſed *Primianus* to be condemned, as *Majorinus* had formerly procured a Sentence againſt *Cæcilian*, by caballing and Intrigue: That the Sect of the Donatiſts being limited within *Africa*, and having no Communion with the Churches that were diſperſed throughout the VVorld, cannot be the Catholick Church. In this Letter, there is that famous Sentence concerning the Authority of Councils. *Let us ſuppoſe, that Pope* Miltiades, *and the other Biſhops, who gave Judgment with him, have not judged right, then we may have recourſe to a Plenary Council of the whole Church, in which the cauſe of the Donatiſts ought to be debated again with thoſe that judged it, and their Sentence reverſed, if it ſhall be found that they have given a wrong Judgment.*

The Second Letter contains a particular Conference of St. *Auguſtin* with *Fortunius* a Donatiſt Biſhop, which was ſpent in Reproaches on both ſides, for the Villainies that were committed on both ſides, without medling with the main Queſtion, *of the Schiſm.* St. *Auguſtin* requeſted, that the Diſpute might be ended in a greater Aſſembly, and in what place they pleaſed, where Chriſtians of all Parties might meet. In this Letter, there is an Account of a Letter of the falſe Council of *Sardica*, of Eaſtern Biſhops; which *Fortunius* quoted, becauſe it was directed to *Donatus*: St. *Auguſtin* not knowing the Story, was perplexed; but finding that St. *Athanaſius* was condemned in that Letter, he did not mind it.

The Forty fifth Letter, is a Note to *Paulinus*, written a Year after the foregoing, in 398.

The Forty ſixth, from *Publicola* to St. *Auguſtin*, contains ſeveral Caſes of Conſcience, which this Lord propoſed concerning the Oath, whereby they obliged the Barbarians to ſwear by their Gods, That they would preſerve the Fruits of the ground faithfully, which they would not otherwiſe have preſerv'd, had they not been bound by that Oath: About the uſe of Meats, and other Things offered to Idols; and concerning the killing of one that aſſaults, or robs us.

In the next, St. *Auguſtin* endeavours to decide the Queſtions propoſed by *Publicola*, concerning thoſe Matters. Upon the firſt he ſaith, That that Oath ought not to be required of the Barbarians, but that uſe may be made of them, after they have taken it; and he that uſes their Service, hath no ſhare in the Oath. that thoſe that ſwear by falſe Gods, are doubly guilty, if they keep not their Oath, both of an abominable Oath, and of Perjury. As to things offered to Idols, he anſwereth *Publicola* upon ſeveral Particulars, as that there is no danger in making uſe of the Meats offered to them, when it is not known, and it is too nice a ſcruple to forbear the uſe of thoſe things which have been applyed to prophane uſes, if it be not done with reſpect to that. To the Laſt Query he ſaith, That no man ought to kill any Man, upon any Account whatſoever; except perhaps, ſays he, Soldiers, or ſuch as are obliged to it by the Duties of ſome publick Office. But that we are not forbidden to ſecure our ſelves againſt the Violences of others, by making uſe of VValls, and, That if a Thief be killed or wounded with the VVall falling upon him, or he falling from the VVall, the thing is not to be imputed to him that built the VVall. This Letter was written before the Temples of Idols were quite demoliſhed, in 399.

In the Forty eighth Letter to *Eudoxius*, Abbot of a Monaſtery in the Iſland of *Capraria*, St. *Auguſtin* exhorteth both him and his Monks to make good uſe of the Quiet they enjoy'd, that ſo they might be ready to leave it whenſoever the Church ſhould have need of them. This Letter is ſuppoſed to have been writ in the Year 398.

In the 49th. He asketh of *Honoratus* a Donatiſt Biſhop, a Reaſon, Why the Catholick Church, which ought to be Univerſal over the whole Earth, came to be limited to *Africa*, and was no where to be found but among the Donatiſts? The time of this Letter is not very certain.

The

The 50th. Letter to the Principal Perſons of the Colony of *Suffectum*, is a Complaint upon the account of a Murder of 60 Chriſtians whom they Maſſacred, becauſe their *Hercules* was taken away; He jeſts upon them, promiſing to have another made for them: But he concludes with theſe upbraiding words, *But do you alſo reſtore to us that great number of our Brethren, whoſe Lives you have taken away; for if we reſtore to you your* Hercules, *it is reaſonable you ſhould reſtore them to us.* *Baronius* thinketh that this Maſſacre happened upon occaſion of an Edict made againſt Idolatry in 399. But the Tranſlator of St. *Auguſtin*'s Letters, affirms, That this is none of his, for two Reaſons; Firſt, Becauſe he thinks it is Impertinent; Secondly, Becauſe it is not written in St. *Auguſtin*'s Stile. I am much of his mind as to the Second Point, but I cannot allow the Firſt; for though this Letter does not ſeem to be grave enough for ſuch a Subject, yet the Rallery is ſharp, which ſometimes is more effectual than a Pathetical Diſcourſe. However it is ancient, and of St. *Auguſtin*'s time. St. *Auguſtin.* Tome II.

In the 51ſt. Letter, St. *Auguſtin* objects to *Criſpinus*, a Donatiſt Biſhop at *Calama*, the Diſſention between the Primianiſts, and the Maximianiſts, as an Anſwer to what the Donatiſts urged againſt the Church. It was written after the Death of *Optatus Gildonianus* in 399, and before that of *Pratextatus*, who died in 400, when St. *Auguſtin* wrote his Books againſt *Parmenianus.*

In the 52d. He exhorts *Severinus*, his Kinſman, to forſake the Donatiſts, and to come into the Catholick Church. It may be of the ſame time with the foregoing.

The 53d. is written in St. *Auguſtin*'s Name, and of two of his Collegues, *Fortunatus* and *Alypius*, to *Generoſus*, a Catholick of *Conſtantina*; and contains an Anſwer to a Letter written by a Donatiſt Prieſt to this Man, to ſeduce him; wherein he pretends to have received an Order by an Angel from Heaven, to oblige him to embrace the Donatiſt's Party.

St. *Auguſtin* proves in that Letter, That the Donatiſt's Party cannot be the true Church. 1. Becauſe they have no Succeſſion of Biſhops from the Apoſtles. To prove this, he produces the Succeſſion of the Biſhops of *Rome*, from St. *Peter* to *Anaſtaſius.* 2. He quoteth the Acts of *Minutius Felix*, which ſhew, That *Silvianus* the Predeceſſor of a Donatiſt Biſhop of *Cirta* was a Traditor. 3. He urges all the Determinations that had been made againſt the Donatiſts. 4. He confeſſes, That there may be wicked Men in the Church, and urges againſt the Donatiſts the Diſſentions between the Primianiſts, and the Maximianiſts.

The 54th. and 55th. Letters to *Januarius*, are mentioned in St. *Auguſtin*'s Detractations; where they are placed among the Books that were written about the Year 400: They contain ſeveral very uſeful Deciſions about Church-Diſcipline: He layeth it down at firſt as a Principal Matter, That Jeſus Chriſt, whoſe yoke is eaſie, his burthen light, hath inſtituted but few Sacraments; the obſervation whereof is as Eaſie, as the Wonders which they repreſent to us, are Sublime. Such is Baptiſm, the Communion of his Body and Blood, and other things which the Scripture enjoyns us to obſerve, excepting thoſe that belong to *Moſes*'s Law. But as to thoſe that are obſerved by Tradition, being not written, if they be univerſally obſerved, we ought to look upon them as ſettled either by the Apoſtles themſelves, or by General Councils, whoſe Authority is very great in the Church; as the Annual Celebration of the Paſſion, Reſurrection, and Aſcenſion of Jeſus Chriſt, and of the coming of the Holy Ghoſt, and of other things of this Nature, which are generally obſerved through the whole Church. As to thoſe that are variouſly obſerved in divers places, as Faſting upon *Saturdays*, which is practiſed in ſome places, and in others not, Communicating every Day, or only upon certain Days; offering daily or only upon *Sundays* and *Saturdays*: There is a Liberty for thoſe Things, and for all others of the like Nature. And there is no better Rule for a Wiſe and Prudent Chriſtian, than to follow what he ſeeth practiſed in the Church where he is. For what is clearly ſeen to be neither againſt Faith, nor good Manners, ought to be indifferently received; and the good of a Society requireth, That Men ſhould hold to what they find eſtabliſhed among thoſe with whom they live. He gives an Account of what he had heard St. *Ambroſe* ſay in that caſe; and having laid down this Rule as the Ground of all that he was to ſay, he ſpeaks particularly of frequent Communion; That ſome believe, That it is good to Communicate daily; but to do it more worthily, certain Days are to be ſet apart, in which they live after a purer and more reſerved manner: Others, on the contrary judge, That when Men are not Guilty of thoſe Sins for which Penance is enjoyned, and themſelves forbidden to come to the Communion of the Body of Jeſus Chriſt; that they ought to come daily to the Euchariſt, as a Remedy to preſerve them ſtill. He reconcileth theſe two, by adding a third Advice; in which he exhorts them both to Peace, and leaves it to every one, to act according as he ſhall be guided by the light both of Faith and of Piety, ſince neither of them Profane the Body of Chriſt; but on the contrary ſtrive to honour it. He propoſes the Examples of *Zacchæus* and the Centurion, whereof the one preſently received Jeſus Chriſt with Joy into his Houſe; and the other, judged not himſelf worthy, that he ſhould come under his Roof.

Secondly, St. *Auguſtin* ſaith, That a Traveller ought to obſerve the Cuſtoms of the Place where he is, and not require thoſe of his own Country. Thus when a Man comes into a Country where they Faſt upon *Thurſdays* in *Lent*; he ought to Faſt with them, though they Faſt not in his Country; for fear of diſturbing the Peace by unprofitable Diſputes.

Theſe Principles being laid down, he anſwereth *Januarius*, his Queſtions. The Firſt is about the Hour of Offering upon the *Holy Thurſday*, Whether it ſhould be done in the Morning or in the Evening? Or, Whether we ought to Faſt and not to Offer till after Supper; becauſe it is

St. *Auguſtin.* Tome II.

ſaid, That it was after Supper that Jeſus Chriſt took Bread; or, whether we ought not to Sup till the Offering be over? St. *Auguſtin* anſwereth, That this is one of thoſe things which are neither ſettled by Scripture, nor univerſally obſerved throughout the Church; and ſo every one is to follow the Cuſtom of his own Church, there being nothing of either ſide inconſiſtent either with Faith or Good Manners; and that Alterations, though Uſeful in themſelves, cauſe Diſturbances: That Chriſt's Example is no Law in this caſe, otherwiſe the whole Church is in an Error to enjoyn the receiving the Euchariſt faſting, which the Apoſtles firſt received after Supper; but that ſince it ſeemed good to the Holy Ghoſt, out of reverence to ſo great a Sacrament, that the Body of Jeſus Chriſt ſhould be received into Chriſtian's Mouths before any other Meat: and therefore this Cuſtom is obſerved throughout the World. And yet ſome others believing upon good Grounds. That for a more exact Commemoration of Chriſt's Death, it was convenient to offer and receive once a Year upon *Holy Thurſday* after Eating: This Cuſtom can no more be Condemned, than that of Bathing upon that Day; neither are they to blame that Faſt and Bathe not; wherefore the Sacrifice is offered twice, once in the Morning for theſe laſt, and once in the Evening for the firſt.

In the Second Letter to *Januarius*, which is the 55th. St. *Auguſtin* goeth on to treat of the Ceremonies of the Church: Shewing, Why *Eaſter* is always celebrated after the Fourteenth Day of the Moon in *March*; Why Chriſt would riſe again the Third Day, and the next Day after the Sabbath; What ſignifieth the Day of Chriſt's Crucifixion, and that in which his Body remained in the Grave, and that of his Reſurrection; Why Lent is kept before the Reſurrection; Why the Holy Ghoſt came down the Fiftieth Day after the Reſurrection, with many other things, whereof he gives Myſtical Reaſons, very edifying and very proper to ſhew how both our Saviour's Death and Reſurrection ought to operate upon us.

He adds ſeveral things concerning the Ceremonies of the Church: He obſerves, That *Lent* is kept throughout the whole Church, as well as the Solemnity of the Holy Days which were deſigned for thoſe that are newly Baptized: That the Cuſtom of Singing *Hallelujah* from *Eaſter* to *Whitſuntide* is not general; becauſe, though it is Sung every where at that time; yet in ſome Churches it is Sung at other times alſo. As to the Praying Standing at the ſame time, he durſt not affirm it to be an univerſal Cuſtom. The Waſhing of Feet was not conſtantly uſed every where. He approves of Singing in the Church, though it was not univerſally eſtabliſhed. He Condemns thoſe that introduce new Cuſtoms, if they are uſeleſs; and declares how much he is troubled, to ſee thoſe Wholeſome Things neglected which the Church preſcribes; and that all is full of Humane Inſtitutions. He affirms, That endeavour ſhould be uſed, to aboliſh all ſorts of things, which are neither Expreſſed in Scripture, nor Enjoined by Councils, nor Confirmed by the univerſal Practice of the Church; but are done after different manners, according to the difference of Places, though no reaſon can be ſhewed why they were at firſt eſtabliſhed. *For*, ſaith he, *though it doth not appear that they are contrary to the Faith, yet it is ſufficient to make us reject them; That they are ſervile Cuſtoms and Burdens to our Holy Religion: And which from that Liberty, wherein God's Mercy hath eſtabliſhed it, preſcribing but few Sacraments; the deſign and Vertue whereof are clearly Manifeſt, make it fall into a kind of Slavery, worſe than that of the Jews.*** But as the Church encloſeth much Straw, ſo it is forced to tolerate many things, yet without doing, or approving, yea without palliating, what it finds to be contrary to Faith or Good Manners.* He afterwards blameth thoſe who through Superſtition abſtain from certain Meats; and thoſe who, that they may know what they have to do, will at all Adventures open the Book of the Goſpel out of a Superſtitious Cuſtom. Laſtly, He tells *Januarius*, That all Knowledge muſt have reſpect to Charity, which is the only end of all our Actions.

The 56th. and 57th. Letters were written to *Celer*, before the Conference at *Carthage*. He exhorts him to the Study of the Holy Scriptures, and to forſake the Donatiſts.

In the 58th. He applauds *Pammachius*, a Senator, for cauſing his Vaſſals that were Donatiſts to return to the Church. It ſeems to have been written at the latter end of 401, and ſent by the Legates of the Council of *Carthage* the ſame Year.

The 59th. Is an Anſwer to *Victorinus* a Biſhop; who writ to him, to come to a Council which he was then calling. He ſaith, That he could not be there, becauſe he was indiſpoſed; and beſides, he would not have gone otherwiſe, upon the account of his Letter; becauſe *Xantippus* Biſhop of *Tagoſa*, pretended to the Primacy, which ought firſt to be determined. It appears by the 65th. Letter, that *Xantippus* was in the right, and that he was acknowledged Primate in 402. which ſhews that this Letter was written in 401. Now to underſtand this Letter, and all the reſt of St. *Auguſtin*'s, that ſpeak of Primacy or Metropolitical Rights, we are to obſerve, That this Right belonged not in *Africa* to the Dignity of Towns, but to the Seniority of the Biſhops.

In the 60th. St. *Auguſtin* acquaints *Aurelius* Biſhop of *Carthage*, That *Donatus* and his Brother had left a Monaſtery againſt his will; and that ſuch falls being ordinary to Men of that Profeſſion, thoſe do the Clergy an Injury, who admit Deſerters from Monaſteries into the Church again. That an ill Monk is ſo far from making a good Churchman, that on the contrary, it is hard to make a good Churchman of a good Monk; becauſe, though there may be Purity enough on the one ſide, yet there is often want of Inſtruction on the other; or at leaſt ſome other Imperfections which may make him unworthy of coming into the Church. Yet *Aurelius* had ordained *Donatus*, ſuppoſing that he had left the Monaſtery, by

St. *Auguſtin's*

St. *Auguſtin*'s order, before that Canon was made; whereby it was forbidden to ordain a Monk of another Dioceſs. Wherefore St. *Auguſtin* writes to *Donatus*, That he was at liberty, to do what he pleaſed, if he was not acted by a Spirit of Pride: But as to his Brother, who was the cauſe of his deſertion, *You know*, ſaith St. *Auguſtin*, *what I think of it, but I have nothing to ſay to you as to that matter; for I dare not contradict the Opinions of ſo Wiſe and Charitable a Man as you are, and whom I ought to reverence ſo much.* The Canon mentioned in that Letter, is that of the Council held the 13th. of *September* 401. and it is in the *African* Code, *Chap.* 80. which ſhews, That the Letter was written ſoon after. St. *Auguſtin.* Tome I.

The 61ſt. is written to *Theodorus*, to aſſure the Donatiſt Clergy, That if they returned to the Church, they ſhould be admitted to the ſame Rank and Dignity, which they held before in their own Party. St. *Auguſtin* promiſes it ſolemnly and with an Oath. He confeſſeth, That there was no Evil in the Donatiſts, but only their Separation from the Church: That their Baptiſm, their Ordination, their Vows and all their Sacraments were good; though unprofitable to them whil'ſt they wanted Charity.

Both the following Letters directed to *Severus*, Biſhop of *Milevis*, are written about a Clerk, called *Timothy*, who had ſworn, That he would never leave *Severus*, though he was of the Church of *Hippo*, and had performed the Office of Reader in that Dioceſs. St. *Auguſtin* pretends, That the Oath which this Prieſt had taken, being diſapproved by his Biſhop, and not received by him with whom he had Sworn to abide, did not oblige him, nor free him from the Obligation which he was under to remain in that Church to which he belong'd. Yet he dealt very civilly with *Severus*; and though he cauſed *Timothy* to be ordained Sub-Deacon at *Suſanna*, which belonged to the Dioceſs of *Hippo*, yet he ſent him back to *Severus*, that he might have no occaſion to complain of him. It was upon this occaſion, probably, that a Canon was made in the Council of *Milevis*, of the 27*th.* of *September*, 402. whereby a Biſhop is forbidden to detain a Clerk, who had performed the Office of Reader in another Dioceſs.

In the 64*th.* Letter to *Quintianus*, he exhorts him not to be Impatient, becauſe *Aurelius* deferred to give Judgment in his Cauſe; declaring, That he could not admit him to his Communion before *Aurelius* had admitted him to his; adviſing him, likewiſe, not to ſuffer the Apocryphal Books to be read in his Church; and Anſwers the Complaint that was made againſt St. *Auguſtin*, for receiving into his Monaſtery, Perſons of another Dioceſs, againſt the Canon of the Council of *Carthage*, that was held in the Year 401.

In the 65*th* Letter, St. *Auguſtin* acquaints *Xantippus*, Primate of *Numidia*, That he had given Judgment againſt *Abundantius* the Prieſt, who was convicted of ſtaying, and eating upon a Faſt-Day in the Houſe of a Woman of ill Reputation. He ſaith farther, That he had admoniſhed him, and aſſured him, That according to the Canon of the Council of *Carthage*, in 401. he might, within the Year, have his Cauſe examin'd again: but he declares to *Xantippus*, That what Judgment ſoever, might intervene in his behalf, yet he would never truſt him with a Church in his Juriſdiction. It is obſerved in that Letter, that *Eaſter Day*, in that Year, wherein it was written, happen'd upon the 6*th.* of *April*, which is an infallible Proof, That this Letter was written in the Year 402.

In the 66*th.* St. *Auguſtin* upbraideth *Criſpinus*, a Donatiſt Biſhop at *Calama*, becauſe he Rebaptized thoſe of *Mappalia*, whom with Threatnings, he had forced to embrace his Communion. It appears by the Second Book againſt *Petilianus*, written in 402, that this happened not long before that ſame Year.

The 67*th.* and 68*th.* are Letters which St. *Auguſtin*, and St. *Jerom* writ to one another, in the Year 402.

In the 69*th.* both *Alypius*, and St. *Auguſtin*, exhort *Caſtorius* to fill up the Biſhoprick of *Vaga* or *Bagaia*, which was then vacant by the Demiſſion of his Brother *Maximian*; who, for Quietneſs ſake, being obliged to quit the Biſhoprick, had generouſly done it, as appears likewiſe by a Canon of the Council of *Milevis*, in the Year 402. which is the 88*th.* in the African *Code.*

The 71*ſt.* 72*d.* 73*d.* 74*th.* and 75*th.* of St. *Auguſtin*, to St. *Jerom*, and of St. *Jerom*, to St. *Auguſtin*, are about that Diſpute that was between them: Of which we gave an Account in the Abridgment of St. *Jerom*'s Works.

The 76*th.* Is an Exhortation, in the Church's Name, to all Donatiſts, which contains the moſt prevailing Motives to make them return to the Church. It was written after the Donatiſt Biſhops had refuſed a Conference that was offered, in purſuance of the Order of the general Council of *Africa*, in the Year 403.

The 77*th.* and 78*th.* are concerning a Scandal that happened in the Church of *Hippo.* One *Spes* of St. *Auguſtin*'s Monaſtery, had been accuſed of Uncleanneſs, by *Boniface*, a Prieſt. This Man charged the Crime upon the Prieſt; affirming, That he was the guilty Perſon. St. *Auguſtin* finding no Proof to Convict either of them, remited the Judgment to God. But *Spes* deſiring to come into the Clergy; and being denyed by St. *Auguſtin*, inſiſted, That if he might not be admitted, becauſe he had been accuſed, neither was *Boniface* to continue in the Order of Prieſthood. St. *Auguſtin* thought fit to oblige them both, to go to the Grave of St. *Felix* of *Nola*, that God might be pleaſed to diſcover the Truth by ſome Miracle. Now he intended, that this ſhould be kept Secret: but the Thing taking vent, St. *Auguſtin* wrote about it to the Clergy of *Hippo*, and to Two private Men, That none ought to be diſturbed at the Scandals happening in the Church; That no Man ſhould be raſhly Condemned; That there was no

Proof

St. *Auguſtin.* Tome II.

Proof againſt the Prieſt *Boniface*: So that he could neither be Condemned nor Degraded before Conviction; yet he profers, till the thing be cleared, not to let the Name of *Boniface* be read with the Names of the other Prieſts, if that be judged convenient, not to ſcandalize the Weak: and ſo much the rather, becauſe it ſignify'd but little to *Boniface*, not to have his Name read in a Table that was written with his Hand, if the Impurity of his Conſcience did not cauſe it to be blotted out of the Book of Life.

The Seventy ninth is directed to a Manichæan Prieſt, who is thought to be that *Felix* with whom St. *Auguſtin* had a Conference in 404. whom he challenges to Anſwer that Difficulty wherewith he had exerciſed another Manichee, called *Fortunatus*.

By the Eightieth Letter, to St. *Paulinus*, he entreateth him to explain more clearly than he had done already, How it may be known what that is which God requireth of us, ſince we are always to preferr it before what we would our ſelves? This was written in the Year 405.

The Eighty firſt, is a Letter of Complement, from St. *Jerom* to St. *Auguſtin*, concerning the Diſpute that was betwixt them. He exhorts him to give over ſuch Queſtions, and to exerciſe himſelf about the Scriptures.

The Eighty ſecond, is the laſt of St. *Auguſtin*'s Letters to St. *Jerom*, about their Conteſts. He inſiſts eſpecially upon what concerns the Expoſition of the Epiſtle to the *Galatians*; having delared, "That he valued none but Canonical Books ſo far, as to believe that the Authors of "them were never deceived: And as for other Authors, how holy ſoever they might be, he "doth not think, that what they ſay is a Rule to him, becauſe they believed it to be true; "but that he dependeth no further upon them, than the Reaſons and Authorities of Canonical "Books, which they lean upon, perſuade him that their Aſſertions are conformable to Truth. Having laid down this Principle, he proves, That St. *Paul*'s correcting of St. *Peter* was ſerious: becauſe St. *Paul* ſaith it in his Epiſtle to the *Galatians*; at the beginning of which, he declares, that he *lyes not*; and takes God to witneſs what he ſaith. He endeavours to anſwer St. *Jerom*'s chief Reaſon, grounded upon this, That it is incredible, that St. *Paul* would reprove in St. *Peter* what he did himſelf, by ſhewing that the Circumſtances were very different. He maintains, That the Ceremonies of the Law being of themſelves indifferent, neither good nor bad, the Uſe of them becomes good or bad, according to Times and Occaſions: That they were neceſſary to the Jews, before Chriſt came: That they ſignified, That he being come, it was not convenient immediately to forbid them, as Sacrilegious, and that it was ſufficient to let them die, and go out of themſelves; but that they were now neither to be looked upon nor practiſed, as neceſſary to Salvation: That St. *Peter*'s Fearfulneſs having made him obſerve Legal Ceremonies, in ſuch Circumſtances as might have perſuaded others that he believed them neceſſary; St. *Paul* was in the right, to accuſe him of not walking uprightly, according to the Truth of the Goſpel, and to oblige the Gentiles to Judaize; whereas St. *Paul* could not be reproached with the like Fault, ſince he had kept them, only to ſhew that they were not to be condemned, as Criminal Superſtitions: And yet, That it is not now permitted to obſerve theſe Ceremonies, under any pretence, or for any purpoſe whatſoever, he does not examine the caſe of an officious Lye, and doth not decide whether it is permitted to tell a Lye at any time. He leaves to every Man to take what Side he pleaſes, provided that this be believed and laid down as an unalterable Principle, That there is no Lye in the Authors of the holy Scriptures. He ſets St. *Cyprian* and St. *Ambroſe* againſt the Authors that St. *Jerom* had alledged to juſtifie his Opinion; but chiefly he citeth St. *Paul* againſt them, who ſaith and declares at the beginning of his Epiſtle, That he *lyes not*; and, That God is *Witneſs* of the Truth of what he affirms. He concludes his Argument with a Complement, and Expreſſions of the high Eſteem and Reſpect that he had for St. *Jerom*: He approves of his Tranſlations of the Scripture, propoſing withal ſome Objections concerning the Correction of the Hebrew Text, repreſenting the difficulty of having his new Tranſlation publickly read to People who were accuſtomed to that from the Septuagint, which was authoriſed by the Apoſtles themſelves, who made uſe of it.

The Argument of the Eighty third Letter, as it is explained by the Tranſlator, is this; The Men of *Thiana* having renounced the Donatiſts Schiſm, they wanted a Prieſt to govern them: One *Honoratus* was Choſen, and for that purpoſe taken out of the Monaſtery at *Tagaſta*, and was Ordained Prieſt of *Thiana*. The Cuſtom was, That thoſe who enter'd into Monaſteries, did begin with parting with all they had, for the benefit of the Poor, or of the Monaſtery it ſelf: That if any offer'd to come in, that was not yet in a Condition to diſpoſe of his Eſtate, they refuſed him not, provided he was ſincerely reſolved to execute the Order as ſoon as he could. *Honoratus* was in this Condition, and Owner of his Eſtate when he was Ordained Prieſt of *Thiana*. The Queſtion was, Who ſhould have this Eſtate? The Men of *Thiana* pretended to have it by the Rule of thoſe Times: That the Goods of ſuch as were Ordained Prieſts of any Church, ſhould be converted to the Uſe of that Church. *Alypius*, on the contrary, pretended, That *Honoratus*'s Eſtate belonged to the Monaſtery of *Tagaſta*; and was afraid, that if the Church of *Thiana* had it, and it were look'd upon as *Honoratus*'s Eſtate, that Example would ſerve for a Pretence to thoſe that ſhould come into Monaſteries, to deferr the parting with their Eſtates; wherefore his Opinion was, That at leaſt they ſhould divide it, and that the Church of *Thiana* ſhould have but half. St. *Auguſtin* tells him, That he was not of that mind, but deſireth him to Sign the Letter which he had written to the Church of *Thiana*; whereby he utterly renounced all Pretenſions upon *Honoratus*'s Eſtate; and he profers

St. Augustin. Tome II.

fers to return Half of it to the Monastery of *Tagasta*, when any considerable Donation should be conferred upon the Monastery of *Hippo*. This Letter is placed in the Year 405.

In the Eighty fourth Letter, he excuses himself towards *Novatus*, (who is supposed to be the Bishop of *Sitifi*, that was present at the Conference in *Carthage*,) for detaining *Lucillius* the Deacon, his Brother, because he understood and spake the Punick Language well; the Use whereof being common at *Sitifi*, and not at *Hippo*, it was easie for *Novatus* to find a Churchman in those Parts, to Preach in that Tongue; whereas St. *Augustin* could not so readily meet with such a One in his Country. Thus is this Letter to be understood, as the Translator observeth, after a very Learned Man. It seems to belong to the same Year as the foregoing.

In the Eighty fifth, St. *Augustin* reproves *Paul* of *Catagnæ*, for parting with his own Estate when he was made a Bishop, that he might abuse the Revenue of his Church, to live more at ease; telling him, That so long as he liveth thus, he will not communicate with him. In this Letter there is this excellent Advice; *Non est Episcopatus artificium transigendæ vitæ fallacis:* "Episcopacy ought not to be look'd upon as an Establishment, or a Means to procure the "deceitful Pleasures of this Life." This *Paul* being dead before the Year 408. as is plain by the Ninety sixth Letter, this Letter must have been written about the Year 405.

In the Eighty sixth, he solliciteth *Cæcilian*, Governor of *Numidia*, to restrain the *Donatists* about *Hippo*, as he had done in other Places under his Government. It was written after the Edict of *Honorius*, of the Year 403. before *Cæcilianus* was created *Præfectus Prætorio*, in the Year 409.

In the Eighty seventh Letter, that was written about the same time, St. *Augustin* presses *Emeritus*, a *Donatist* Bishop at *Cæsarea*, to tell the Reasons which made him separate from the Church; and refuteth those which he used to alledge.

The Eighty eighth was written by St. *Augustin*, in the Name of the Clergy of *Hippo*, to *Januarius*, a *Donatist* Bishop, after the *Donatists* Deputies, that were sent in 406. to the Emperors, were rejected. It contains several Complaints against the Violences of some *Donatist* Clerks; and the authentick Acts of what happen'd in *Constantine*'s time, concerning the business of the *Donatists*. About the end of the Letter, they propose a Conference.

The Eighty ninth Letter, to *Festus*, is much upon the same Subject. St. *Augustin* begins, by justifying the Emperor's Edicts against the *Donatists*: Then he relates the Original of that Schism, and the Judgments whereby it was condemned. He proves, That the *Donatists* had no Grounds for their Separation, nor for Re-baptizing Catholicks. Lastly, He giveth *Festus* notice, That the People about *Hippo* still persisted in the Schism, notwithstanding his Letters, and continued their Violences.

The Ninetieth Letter is from an Heathen, one *Nectarius*, who interceded with St. *Augustin* for his Fellow-Citizens that dwelt at *Calama*, who had sacrificed to Idols, contrary to the Emperor's Inhibitions, and offered Violence to some Christians. The Reason that this Pagan uses to prevail with St. *Augustin*, is, *That it is the Duty of a Bishop to do nothing but Good to Mankind: Not to meddle with their Affairs, unless it be to make them better, and to intercede with God to pardon their Faults.* *Baronius* is of Opinion, That this Letter was written immediately after the Laws of 399. In the last Edition it is placed in the Year 408. and what is said there of the Laws newly published, is apply'd to the Law of the 24th. of *November*, 407. directed to *Curtius*; which is the 19th. of the 10th. Title of the 16th. Book of the *Theodosian* Code.

The next Letter is St. *Augustin*'s Answer to *Nectarius*; whereby he exhorts him to turn Christian; promising, That though the Violences of those at *Calama* had proceeded very far, yet he would contribute, as much as the Interest of publick Security would permit, to have them treated gently. He owns and approves the Maxim which he alledged concerning Episcopal Meekness; yet he asserts, That there must be Examples: The most guilty cannot be spared: That Christians do not desire to see them punished out of Revenge, but Charity obligeth them to provide for the future; yet however, they do not desire the Death of those that abused them, they desire only their Conversion: And they are but little concerned for the Losses which they sustained, but they seek after their Souls. *This is* (saith he in the Conclusion of his Letter) *what we are seeking with the Price of our Blood: This is that Harvest which we would make plentiful at* Calama; *or at least, that what happened in that place, might not hinder us to make it any where else.*

In the Ninety second, to *Italica*, a Lady, he comforts her upon the Death of her Husband; telling her, That God cannot be seen, either in this World or in the next, with bodily Eyes. This Letter is before the Ninety ninth, directed to the same Lady, which is written in 408.

The Ninety third, to *Vincentius*, a *Donatist* Bishop, containeth several Reasons to show that Secular Authority, and the Severity of the Laws, may be used against Schismaticks, to oblige them to return into the Church. One of the chiefest, is, The Usefulness and the good Effects which the Terror of the Imperial Laws had produced, since they caused the Conversion of several whole Cities.

St. *Augustin* confesses, That this Reason affected him most; *That by such Examples his Collegues brought him to their Opinions: That it was his Opinion formerly, That no Man ought to be forced: That Words only were to be used; for otherwise they could make none but counterfeit Catholicks: But that having withstood all Reasons, he finally yielded to Experience.* That the Laws had brought back those that continued in the Schism, only by Interest, Fear, Negligence, or

St. *Auguſtin.* Tome II.

other Conſiderations of the ſame Nature. Afterwards, he exhorts *Vincentius* to return to the Church; ſhewing, That the true Church is that which is ſpred throughout the Earth. He Anſwers what the *Donatiſts* objected, to prove that it might be comprehended within a ſmall number of Righteous Men; He ſhews, That it muſt neceſſarily be mix'd with both bad and good; And at laſt, declares againſt Re-baptizing. This Letter was written about the Year 408.

The 94th. Letter, is by St. *Paulinus* Biſhop of *Nola*; and the 95th. is St. *Auguſtin's* Anſwer to that of *Paulinus*. He diſcourſeth of the Nature of Bodies after the Reſurrection; and of that of Angels. It is incertain whether they have Bodies, or whether they are pure Spirits. Theſe Letters are of the Year 408.

The 96th. Letter, is an Excellent Example; ſhewing, How little Biſhops in St. *Auguſtin's* time, were given to Intereſt. *Paulus* Biſhop of *Catagnæ*, had bought an Eſtate in the Church's Name, with a Summ which he recovered; though he had Surrendered his own Eſtate for what he owed to the Royal Treaſure. *Boniface* his Succeſſor, not willing to benefit himſelf by that Fraud, declared the thing as it was; chuſing either to have nothing, or to receive the whole from the Emperor's Liberality, rather than keep a thing gotten by Fraud. St. *Auguſtin* writeth this Letter to *Olympius*, Surveyor of the Buildings, to obtain by his means this Gratification from the Emperour, in the behalf of *Boniface*. *Olympius* not being in that Employment before the Death of *Stilico*, which happen'd in *Auguſt* 408, this Letter cannot have been written till towards the latter end of that Year. To the ſame Magiſtrate, and at the ſame time, was the following written; whereby he prayeth him to ſee the Laws maintained that were Publiſhed in *Africa*, in the time of *Stilico* his Predeceſſor; and to let the Church's Enemies know, That theſe Laws having been Enacted freely by the Emperour himſelf, they were in full force after *Stilico's* Death.

In the 98th. to *Boniface*, St. *Auguſtin* reſolves a Queſtion that was made to him by that Biſhop, namely, How the Faith of Parents can ſerve for their Children that are admitted to Baptiſm, though the incredulity of Parents can be no Prejudice to their Children, when they offer them to *Dæmons*. St. *Auguſtin* Anſwers, That it is moſt certain, that after a Child is born, he partakes no longer of other Men's Sins; but before, he is partaker of *Adam's* Sin, from which he is delivered by the Operation of the Holy Ghoſt in the Sacrament of Baptiſm. That Water repreſents outwardly, both the Myſtery and Grace, but the Holy Spirit produces the Effect. That neither the Faith of Parents, nor yet of Godfathers is the cauſe of this Grace; but the Prayer of the whole Church, that begets Chriſt in each Member. In which ſence, the Godfathers Anſwer for the Child, that he believes, and reſolves to live Chriſtianly, becauſe he receiveth the Sacrament of Faith, and of Converſion to God. He explains this laſt Notion by ſeveral Examples, and among the reſt he alledgeth that of the Euchariſt, ſaying, "That as the "Sacrament of Chriſt's Body, is *in ſome ſort* the Body of Chriſt; ſo the Sacrament of Faith is "Faith it ſelf; and in this ſence it is ſaid, That whoſoever hath the Sacrament of Faith, hath "Faith it ſelf". This Compariſon would not be very Juſt, if St. *Auguſtin* did not conſider ſomething elſe in the Euchariſt, beſides the external and ſenſible part.

The 99th. is written to the Lady *Italica*, on the occaſion of the firſt Siege of *Rome*, by *Alaricus* in 408.

In the 100dth. Letter, St. *Auguſtin* intreateth *Donatus*, Proconſul of *Africa*, to reſtrain the *Donatiſts*; but not to puniſh them with Death. And having expreſſed himſelf with the moſt Pathetical terms that can be uſed to oblige him to Meekneſs, he concludes with theſe curious words: *It is a more troubleſome than profitable Labour, to compel Men to forſake a great Evil, rather by Force, than by Inſtruction.* This Letter was written at the time when they publiſhed new Edicts againſt the *Donatiſts* in 408.

The 101ſt. Letter to *Memorius* a Biſhop, was joyn'd to the Sixth Book of his Treatiſe *of Muſick*, which St. *Auguſtin* ſent by it ſelf to that Biſhop, becauſe he could not find his other Books upon the ſame Subject, that *Memorius* deſired. This *Memorius* was Father to *Julianus*, who writ afterwards againſt St. *Auguſtin*, who was now a Deacon. St. *Auguſtin* gives him great Commendations in that Letter.

The 102d. is placed in the Retractations, amongſt the Books compoſed before the Year 411. There St. *Auguſtin* anſwereth Six Queſtions propoſed by an Heathen to a Prieſt called *Deogratias*.

The Firſt is, concerning the Reſurrection; Whether that which is promiſed to us, ſhall be like that of Jeſus Chriſt, or like that of *Lazarus*; And whether after the Reſurrection, Men ſhall be Subject to the Infirmities and Neceſſities of the Fleſh. St. *Auguſtin* anſwereth, That our Reſurrection ſhall be like that of Jeſus Chriſt, and that after the Reſurrection, we ſhall be freed from all cares and inconveniencies of corruptible Fleſh.

The Second Queſtion is, If none can be Saved but by Jeſus Chriſt, what is become of thoſe that died before his coming? What is become of ſo many Millions of Souls, againſt whom nothing can be objected, ſince Chriſt had not yet appeared among Men? Why did not the Saviour come ſooner? Let it not be ſaid, that the Jewiſh Law ſupplied that want; for there was already an infinite number of Men upon Earth, when it was given, and yet it was neither known, nor practiſed but in a ſmall corner of the World.

St.

St. *Auguſtin* having ſhewed, That the Pagans were not leſs perplexed, with that Queſtion, than the Chriſtians, anſwers, That Jeſus Chriſt being the Word of God, who Governed the World from the beginning, all thoſe that knew him, and lived according to his Precepts, might be ſaved by the Faith which they had, that he was in God, and ſhould come upon the Earth. He adds, *That Jeſus Chriſt would not appear in the World, and cauſe his Doctrine to be Preached, but at ſuch a time, and in ſuch Places, where he knew, that there were thoſe who ſhould believe in him; and that he foreſaw, that in all other Places, or at any other Times, Men would be ſuch as they have been, though the Goſpel had been Preached to them.* This Notion was very favourable to the *Semipelagians*, and they failed not to make uſe of it; as appears by *Hilary*'s Letter to St. *Auguſtin.* But this Father anſwered them in the 9 *Chap.* of the Book *of the Predeſtination of the Saints*; *That he did make uſe of the Word Fore-knowledge only, becauſe he thought it was ſufficient to convince the Infidelity of the Pagans who made this Objection; and therefore he omitted to ſpeak of that which is hid within God's Counſels of the Motives of that Diſpenſation: And ſo when he ſaid, That Jeſus Chriſt would not ſhow himſelf, nor cauſe his Doctrine to be Preached but in thoſe places, and at ſuch a time, he knew thoſe Perſons liv'd, who ſhould believe in him: It is as if he had ſaid, That Jeſus Chriſt did not ſhow himſelf unto Men, nor ſuffer his Doctrine to be Preached, but in thoſe places and at that time, when he knew, that thoſe ſhould live who were Elected before the Creation.* He expounds again in the ſame place, what he had ſaid in this Letter: *That the Chriſtian Religion never failed of being Preached to thoſe that were worthy; and, that if it failed any, it was becauſe they were not worthy of it.* Saying, That he had not declared his Opinion concerning that which renders Men worthy, whether it is the Grace of Jeſus Chriſt, or their own Will.

This is the Third Queſtion: Why ſhould they condemn Victims, Incenſe and Sacrifices, ſeeing that from the beginning God was honoured after this manner; and that he is repreſented as having need of the Firſt-Fruits of the Earth?

Anſw. God hath no need either of our Offerings, or our Sacrifices. The Service we yield to him turns to our own profit, and not to his. At all times Sacrifices have been offered to God, but they ought only to have been offered to the true God. The Sacrifices that are offered to Creatures are Sacrileges. Both the Sacrifices and the Sacraments of the Old Law are changed, and this Alteration was foretold. The New Teſtament is eſtabliſhed upon the Sacrifice of the High-Prieſt; that is, upon the Effuſion of the Blood of Chriſt himſelf; and now all Chriſtians offer a Sacrifice that is ſuitable to the Manifeſtation of the New Covenant.

The Fourth Queſtion is concerning the Eternity of Puniſhments; againſt which this Maxim of the Goſpel was objected; *With what meaſure ye mete, it ſhall be meaſured to you.* Every meaſure, ſay they, is limited to a certain ſpace of time; What mean then thoſe Threatnings of Eternal Sufferings?

St. *Auguſtin* ſhews, That this Queſtion is idle and unworthy of a Philoſopher; That it is impertinent to ſay that all meaſures are limited by a certain ſpace of time, ſince there are other meaſures, beſides thoſe of time; That it is a common Saying, That a Man ſhall be dealt withal, as he dealeth with others, though he receiveth not preciſely the ſame Treatment; That theſe words of Jeſus Chriſt, *It ſhall be meaſured unto you, after the ſame manner that ye meaſure unto others*; ſignifie only, That Men ſhall be Puniſhed or Rewarded, by the ſame Will which made them do Good or Evil to others; that is, by the remorſe of their own Conſciences; That Sins and Puniſhments are not meaſured by time, but by the quality of the Will; That the Puniſhment of Sin is eternal; becauſe, as the Sinner deſired to enjoy Pleaſure for ever, it is juſt that he ſhould be Puniſhed for it for ever.

The Fifth Queſtion was not difficult to ſolve. It was ſuppoſed that *Solomon* had ſaid, That there was no Son of God. St. *Auguſtin* anſwers, That *Solomon* never ſaid it, but the contrary.

The Laſt, is a Serious Anſwer to the Jeſts of the Heathens, about the Hiſtory of *Jonas.*

The 103d. Letter, is a ſecond Letter of *Nectarius* of *Calama*, who reneweth the ſame Requeſt that he made in the 90th. for Pardon of his Heathen Countrymen, who had miſuſed the Chriſtians.

The 104th. is an Anſwer of St. *Auguſtin*, where he particularly refuteth the Opinion of the Stoicks, concerning the Equality of Sins. St. *Auguſtin* received *Nectarius* his Letter upon the 27th. of *March* 409. and it is probable that he returned an Anſwer inſtantly.

The 105th. is an Exhortation to the *Donatiſts.* After he had juſtified the Severity of the Imperial Laws, he examines the ordinary Points of Controverſie that were in diſpute with thoſe Schiſmaticks; Proving, 1. That the Validity of Baptiſm dependeth not upon the holineſs of the Miniſter. 2. That the Catholick Church cannot be confin'd to the *Donatiſts.* 3. That the Wicked, who were tolerated in the Catholick Church, could not hinder it from being the true Church.

In the 106th. St. *Auguſtin* intreateth *Macrobius*, a *Donatiſt* Biſhop at *Hippo*, not to Rebaptize a Sub-deacon that was gone over to their Party. St. *Auguſtin* gave this Letter to *Maximus* and *Theodorus*, who delivered it into *Macrobius* his own hands; who made them no Anſwer, but that he could not refuſe to give the Faith to them that came to him; which Anſwer, they returned to this Saint by the 107th. Letter. St. *Auguſtin* immediately ſet Pen to Paper to reprove that behaviour of the *Donatiſts*, as he doth by the 108th Letter; wherein he proves, That Baptiſm is not to be repeated, alledging chiefly the Example of the *Donatiſts* themſelves, who approved

St. *Auguſtin.* Tome II.

approved the Baptiſm of the *Maximianiſts*, whom themſelves had condemned and put out of their Communion. The time of this Diſpute with *Macrobius*, is not very certain; yet it is ſuppoſed to have happened in 409.

The 109th. is a Letter of Complement written to St. *Auguſtin* by *Severus* Biſhop of *Milevis*, wherein he tells of the Pleaſure that he found in reading his Works. He gives him high Commendations, eſpecially for his love towards God and towards his Neighbour. St. *Auguſtin* anſwers him by the 110th, in a very modeſt and civil manner. The time of theſe Letters is not well known.

The 111th. is a Conſolatory Epiſtle, to *Victorianus* the Prieſt, concerning thoſe Miſeries which the Barbarians, who then waſted both *Italy* and *Spain* in the Year 409. cauſed a great number of holy Perſons and Virgins conſecrated to God to Suffer.

In the 112th. Letter, St. *Auguſtin* exhorteth *Donatus*, who was leaving the Proconſulſhip, in 410, to renounce the Pomps of the World, and to follow Jeſus Chriſt, and to bring back to the Communion of the Church, thoſe that had any Dependency upon him.

The 113th. is a Letter of Recommendation to *Creſconius*, concerning *Frumentius* his Buſineſs, who was taken out of the Sanctuary of a Church, whither he was fled to ſecure himſelf from the Purſuit of one of whom he Rented a Foreſt.

The Three following Letters are about the ſame Buſineſs. St. *Auguſtin* cites a Law that was made by *Honorius* the Emperor, the 21ſt. of *January*, 410. ſo that theſe Letters were written after that Year.

The 117th. is a Note from *Dioſcorus*, to which he joins ſeveral Queſtions to St. *Auguſtin*, taken out of *Cicero*'s Dialogues. St. *Auguſtin* Anſwers him in the next, That it is unworthy of a Biſhop to ſpend time in explaining ſuch kind of Queſtions. He treateth afterwards of the Deſign which Men ought to have in their Studies, and of the chiefeſt Good. He Rejects the Philoſophet's Opinions upon that Subject; and ſhews, That God is the chiefeſt Good. He exhorteth *Dioſcorus* to ſtudy Chriſtian Philoſophy, diſcovering the Blindneſs and the Errours of the Heathen Philoſophers. St. *Auguſtin* ſpeaking in this Letter of the Hereticks he was to Diſpute with, ſaith nothing of the *Pelagians*; which makes it probable, that it was written before the Year 411. but it could not be written long before, becauſe he declares there, that he was growing Grey.

The 119th. containeth *Conſentius* his Queſtions concerning the Myſtery of the Trinity. And the 120th. containeth St. *Auguſtin*'s Anſwers, who expounds the Faith, touching that Myſtery. He treateth there of Faith, and Underſtanding.

The 121ſt. Letter is written by St. *Paulinus*, who propoſes to St. *Auguſtin* ſome Queſtions upon certain Paſſages of the Pſams, of St. *Paul*'s Epiſtles, and the Goſpels.

In the 122d. St. *Auguſtin* excuſeth himſelf to his Clergy, and People, becauſe he was obliged to be abſent. He exhorts them to diminiſh nothing of what they were wont to do for the Poor. This Letter was written in the Year 410. when *Alaric* took *Rome*. I ſuppoſe alſo, that St. *Jerom* hinted at the Calamity, in Ænigmatical Terms, in the following Letter, which is the laſt of the *Second Claſſe* of St. *Auguſtin*'s Letters.

The Third Claſſe.

THE Letters of the *Third Claſſe* are all thoſe that St. *Auguſtin* writ from the Year 411. to the end of his Life.

The Firſt, which is the 124th. is directed to *Albina*, old *Melania*'s Daughter, to *Pinianus*, and to the younger *Melania*, who had retired into *Sicily*, and from thence into *Africa*, after the Death of *Rufinus*, in the Year 411. and were come to *Tagaſta*, when St. *Auguſtin* wrote this Letter; whereby he excuſeth himſelf, that the Condition of the Church at *Hippo*, rather than the Severity of the Winter, hindred him from coming to them.

Pinianus being come to *Hippo*, to ſee St. *Auguſtin*, as he was celebrating the Holy Myſteries, the People demanded, that he ſhould be ordained Prieſt, and obliged him to Swear, That he ſhould not leave the Town of *Hippo*; and that, if he took Orders, he would be ordained no where, but at *Hippo*. *Albina*, and her Children, complained of that Violence; believing, that the Men of *Hippo* had no other Deſign in doing ſo, but to fix in their Church ſo Rich a Man as *Pinianus* was; pretending, that the Oath forced upon him was not binding. St. *Auguſtin* writes to *Alypius*, the 125th. Letter, to juſtifie both himſelf, and his People, of the Suſpicions entertained of him upon that Subject, praying *Alypius* to remove them. He ſpeaketh afterwards of *Pinianus* his Oath, and of the Obligation to keep it; whereupon, he layeth down the following Principles about the Matter of Oaths. Firſt, That none ought to Swear to a Thing forbidden, whatſoever Fear he may be in of Death if he Sweareth not; and that he ought rather to ſuffer Death. 2. That when a Man has Sworn, by conſtraint, to a lawful Thing, he is bound to Diſcharge it; and cannot diſpenſe himſelf from it, without being guilty of Perjury. 3. That the Bond of an Oath is performed, not when we do what is ſignified by the Letter, or the Terms, wherein the Oath is expreſſed, but when we obſerve what the Impoſer of the Oath expects, if it be known when the Oath is taken: and ſo a Man may be Perjured in keeping

what

what is signified by the Terms of the Oath, if he defeats the Expectation of him to whom the Oath is made; and that, on the contrary, this being done, there is no Perjury, though the Letter of the Oath is not observed in its proper Sence. From whence he concludes, That though *Pinianus* is not bound to abide at *Hippo*, as if that City were made a Prison for him; yet he is obliged, by his Oath, to dwell there as an Inhabitant, with Liberty to go and come, but not to go away never to return. St. *Augustin.* Tome II.

In the following Letter to *Albina*, St. *Augustin* justifies himself from the Accusation that was made against his People, for detaining *Pinianus* out of Covetousness. He saith, That such Imputations reflect upon him, because he is Administrator of the Church's Goods, whereas the People neither disposes of, nor profits by them. Wherefore, to clear himself absolutely, he is obliged to make Oath, and to take God to witness, as he doth in this Letter, That the Administration of the Church's Goods is a Charge to him. He discourses again of the Validity of *Pinianus* his Oath, and of the Obligation he lay under to execute it.

The 127th. to *Armentarius*, and *Paulina* his Wife, was written soon after *Rome* was taken. He exhorts them not to regard this present Life; shewing also, how much they were obliged to keep the Vow of Continency, which they had made. This Letter is full of most Excellent Thoughts against the Love of the World, and of Life. Among other things, he particularly takes notice, That if, to prolong this Transitory Life, Men are not afraid to take so much Pains, to undergo so many Dangers, and Losses, much more ought they to expose themselves, for that Life which is Eternal: That all the Pains we take in this Life, to prevent Death, tend to nothing else but to keep us in Misery; that we constantly avoid the present Death; that we may be exposed to the Fear of all possible Ones. *What* (saith he) *do not those Men endure, whom the Physicians force to endure, Fire, and the Knife; and, What is the Consequence of so many Pains? Is it to escape Death? No! but to die a little later. The Pains are certain, but the preserving of Life is uncertain; and very often the Patient dies in those Torments, to which he exposes himself for fear of Death; and chusing to suffer not to die, instead of chusing to die to prevent suffering, it happens that they meet with Death in the midst of those Sufferings, which they chuse to undergo to avoid it ∴ ∴ But the greatest Evil, and the most to be abhorred, is, That to lengthen this wretched Life a little, we displease God who is the Spring of true Life. ∴ ∴ ∴ ∴ Besides, tho such a miserable Life, as this is, could continue for ever, yet were it not to be compared with an happy Life, tho' never so short. In the mean time, the love of this Life, as short as miserable, makes us lose a Life that is not only Happy, but Eternal; tho' in that very Life, which we so unhappily love, we seek for nothing but what we may be secure of in the other, and which the love of this makes us lose. For what do we love, by loving a Life so wretched, and so short? It is not the misery of it, since we desire to be happy, nor the shortness of it, since we fear to see the end. We love it therefore only because it is Life; and this alone, makes us love it, tho' short and miserable.* From these Principles he concludes, That we should love nothing but eternal Life; shake off all Clogs, and Cares of present Things; cleave solely to Jesus Christ, to whom we should have our Recourse, as to the chief Physician, who alone is able to ease our Pains, and satisfie our Desires.

The 128th. Letter, is a Declaration of the *Catholick* Bishops to *Marcellinus*. The Emperor's Commissioner, appointed to be at the Conference betwixt the *Catholick* Bishops, and the *Donatists*, by which Declaration they submit themselves to all the Conditions of the Order, given by *Marcellinus*; and give their consent, That in case the *Donatist* Bishops yield in the Conference, and be convicted of Schism, yet they should be maintained in their Dignity; so that in the Places, where there was a Bishop of each Communion, they should Govern jointly, till the Death of the one; or that both should give up, and a Third be chosen: And, that though they granted this Advantage to the *Donatists*, yet they made no Conditions for themselves, but were contented to lose their Dignity, if the *Donatists* had the better in the Conference.

Marcellinus, by his Order, had appointed a certain Number of Bishops of each Party, to be at the Conference; but the *Donatists* desiring to be all there, made a Solemn Declaration. The *Catholick* Bishops gave their Consent by the 129th. Letter. The time of these Two last cannot be doubted, seeing they relate to the Conference at *Carthage*, appointed the 14th. of *October*, 410. and began the 1st of *June*, 411.

The 130th. is directed to the illustrious and pious Lady *Proba Falconia*, the Widow of *Probus*, *Præfectus Prætorio*, and Consul in 371. who withdrew into *Africa* after the taking of *Rome*. This Holy Widow having desired St. *Augustin* to write to her concerning Prayer, this Saint gives her, by this Letter, excellent Instructions about the manner how we ought to Pray, and the necessary Disposition to do it well. He discourses there of the Contempt of Riches, of renouncing the World, of that true Happiness which ought to be pray'd for, and of love of our Neighbour. He proves, That true Praying is from the Heart. He explains in few Words, the Lord's Prayer; shewing, That it contains what we are to Pray for. He observes that we may desire to be delivered from Pain, Sickness, and Afflictions; but that we are not to desire with impatience, nor to think that God regards us not, when we obtain not that ease which we desire. This Letter is full of very Christian and Sublime Maxims, and Notions, very useful for Pious Persons.

St. *Auguſtin.* Tome II.

The 131ſt. to the ſame Lady, hath nothing Remarkable; he thanks her for enquiring after his Health.

In the 132d. Letter, St. *Auguſtin* exhorts *Voluſian*, to whom it is written, to read the Scriptures, and to propoſe to him thoſe Difficulties which he ſhall meet with.

In the 133d. Letter, St. *Auguſtin* entreateth *Marcellinus* not to puniſh thoſe *Donatiſts* with Death, who had confeſſed their Crimes by Torture; and to have reſpect, in the Choice of Puniſhments, to that Meekneſs which the Church profeſſeth to exerciſe towards all Men.

The next Letter contains the like Entreaties to the Proconſul, *Apringius*. Both theſe were written after the Imperial Law againſt the *Donatiſts* was enacted in 412.

By the 135th. *Voluſianus* deſires a Solution of the Difficulties propoſed againſt the Chriſtian Religion, which centred all in this Objection, *How God ſhould ſo humble himſelf as to become Man?* With this Letter came another from *Marcellinus*, which is the 136*th.* wherein he deſireth St. *Auguſtin*, to anſwer the Queſtions made by *Voluſianus*; adding ſome other Objections of the Enemies of the Chriſtian Religion. They ſaid, That God had aboliſhed the Old Law, either out of Inconſtancy, or becauſe he was weary of it. That the Doctrine of the Goſpel was contrary to States; and that the Chriſtian Emperors had done great Diſ-ſervice to the Affairs of the Common-wealth.

St. *Auguſtin* in the 137th. anſwereth *Voluſianus* his Queſtions. He lays down this Rule at Firſt, That though there are ſuch Deep Things in the Scripture, that a Man may daily make new Diſcoveries, how Learned and Quick ſoever he be; yet it is not difficult to arrive to the Knowledge of what is neceſſary to be known to be Saved. Afterward, he anſwereth *Voluſianus* his Queſtion concerning the Incarnation; ſhewing, That though the Word was made Man; yet he did not give over the Care of Things upon Earth, nor ceaſed to be every where, and to Govern all Things: That the Union of the Soul with the Body, which daily happeneth, is not leſs difficult to be comprehended than that of God with Man; which happened but once to ſave Men from their Sins. Here he lays down very powerful Arguments, to perſwade Men to believe the Incarnation of Jeſus Chriſt; as, The Original of the People of *Iſrael*; God's Dealings with them; his chuſing them to be his beloved People; the Laws and Ceremonies of the Old Teſtament, which had all a relation to Jeſus Chriſt; the Predictions of the Prophets; the Life, Actions, and the Death of Chriſt; the Eſtabliſhment of the Church; its Encreaſe, and Preſervation; the greatneſs and ſublimity of the Morals that were taught in it; the plain Stile of the Scripture, which makes it acceſſable to all Mankind, though there are ſuch Depths, as few Minds can penetrate, and other ſuch Conſiderations which are ſufficient to prove the Truth of the Chriſtian Religion.

In the following Letter, St. *Auguſtin* replies to the Objections made by *Marcellinus*: The Firſt is about the Alteration of the Old Law, which they imputed either to Envy, or to Inconſtancy in God. St. *Auguſtin* ſaith, That God is unchangeable in all that concerns himſelf; and, that as he hath given Precepts, and Ordinances for the Good of Man, ſo it is for the ſame End that he ſometimes changeth them; as he judgeth it may be more convenient for them.

The Second Objection, propoſed by *Marcellinus*, ſeems more difficult. They accuſed Chriſt's Doctrine, as inconſiſtent with the Well-being of the State; becauſe it forbids rendring Evil for Evil; Commands turning the other Cheek; giving the Cloak alſo to them that offer to take our Coats; and to go Two Miles with him that forceth us to go one. Theſe Precepts ſay they, are contrary to the Practice of Common-wealths: For who is he that will ſuffer his Enemy to take away his Goods? Who doth not ſeek to return Evil for Evil to Barbarians, who come to lay the Provinces of the Empire waſte?

St. *Auguſtin* refutes this Objection; ſhowing, that this Maxim here looked upon as contrary to the good of the State, was a Maxim of the Old Romans, who thought it worthy of their Greatneſs, and profitable for the Common-wealth to forgive Injuries: That *Cicero* exalting *Cæſar* for a great Prince, commendeth him for his readineſs to forgive Injuries: That ſuch Things are read with Admiration in Profane Writings, whilſt they are deſpiſed in Chriſtian Books, where they are more Plainly, and more nobly expreſſed. He proves afterwards, That theſe Divine Books are ſo far from being contrary to the Happineſs of Governments, that they are moſt proper to maintain Peace and Concord: That however, they are not to be underſtood literally; and that we are not abſolutely forbidden to defend our ſelves, or to puniſh Crimes; but only, that Men ſhould not act by a Principle of Revenge, but with a Deſign to do good to him that offends us: So that theſe Precepts of Jeſus Chriſt, have reſpect to the Diſpoſition of the Heart, rather than to what is done outwardly, and tend only but to preſerve Patience, and Charity in their Hearts, leaving us the Liberty to do what we think may conduce moſt to the Advantage of thoſe to whom we deſire to do Good.

Having alledged both Chriſt's, and St. *Paul's* Example, to juſtifie ſuch a Carriage; he adds, That this hinders not the Execution of Juſtice againſt Evil Doers, provided it be done with a Spirit of Charity: That War it ſelf may be managed with the ſame Spirit, when Men deſire to Conquer, with a Deſign to do Good to the Vanquiſhed, and keep them from doing Hurt. Then he anſwereth *Marcellinus's* laſt Objection; ſhewing, That the Chriſtian Emperors ought not to be charged with the decay of the Empire; the Heathen themſelves having confeſſed, That their own Manners, and the Vices of the *Romans*, were the main Cauſes of it. He

ſheweth,

ſheweth, likewiſe, how Contemptible the Juglings of *Apollonius*, and *Apuleius* were, in compariſon of the Miracles of Chriſt, and his Apoſtles.

The 139th. Letter is likewiſe directed to the ſame *Marcellinus*, but upon another Subject. He ſpeaks of Publiſhing the Acts of the Conference at *Carthage*: He earneſtly conjures him to hinder the *Donatiſts*, that were caſt into Priſon, from being put to Death. He mentions his Books of *Baptiſm*; *His Abridgment of the Conference of* Carthage; *A Lettter to the* Donatiſts; *Two foregoing Letters*; and that which follows, directed to *Honoratus*: Whereby it appears, that all theſe Diſcourſes belong to the Year 412.

St. *Auſtin.* Tome II.

The 140th. Letter, is this juſt now mentioned, directed to *Honoratus*, and written concerning Five Queſtions. He treats of Grace, of the New Covenant, and of the Deſign of Chriſt's Incarnation. He obſerves, at firſt, that every Man hath a Soul endued with Reaſon; but very different Uſes are made of it. Some uſe their Reaſon with no other proſpect but to pleaſe their Senſes; others on the contrary, ſeek after thoſe good things which concern their Soul, and which are of a Nature above their own. The Soul may make a good uſe of Temporal Happineſs, but that is only when it is apply'd to the Service of the Creator: for all Subſtances being good in their Nature; it is a good thing to uſe them in order, and not thereby to oppoſe the Order of the Creator: And the ill uſe which Men make of good things, doth not hinder the good uſe, which God knows how to make, even of evil ones. For his Juſtice by Puniſhing, brings into order thoſe whoſe Injuſtice put them out of order by Sin. God granted this Temporal Felicity in the Old Covenant, which neither promiſed, nor afforded any but Temporal Advantages; but at the ſame time he revealed the New Covenant, whereof the Old was but a Figure; Tho' but a ſmall number of Saints have taken notice of it, and even theſe, though Miniſters of the Old Covenant, belong'd to the New. But in the fulneſs of time, the Word of God was united with Man to be a Light to the Nations, and thoſe that received it, became the Children of God, not Children by Nature as Jeſus Chriſt is, but Children by Adoption and Grace. It is he that taught us to deſpiſe the things of this Life, and to value none but thoſe which we ſhall enjoy in the other. This is the Oeconomy of the New Covenant, which St. *Auguſtin* explains at large in this Letter. He proveth it by the Expoſition of the 22d. *Pſalm*, which begins with theſe words, *My God, my God, why haſt thou forſaken me*? Which was the Subject of *Honoratus*'s firſt Queſtion. He inſiſts chiefly upon ſhewing, That Chriſtians ought not to put their Truſt and Confidence in the good things of this World; but to love and ſeek after that only which concerns the next. This is almoſt the ſole deſign of this Letter, to juſtifie that the love of Spiritual and Eternal Bleſſings is the only aim of the New Covenant; To the ſame purpoſe he expounds alſo the beginning of St. *John*'s Goſpel; the Parable of the ten Wiſe and ten Fooliſh Virgins; theſe words of St. *Paul*, Eph. 3. *I pray God that being firmly ſettled, rooted and grounded in love, you may be able to comprehend with all Saints, what is the breadth, and length, and heighth, and depth*; and what is ſaid in the Goſpel concerning utter Darkneſs, which were the Subject of *Honoratus*'s five Queſtions. This Man was but a *Catechumen*, and yet St. *Auguſtin* ſets before him the moſt ſublime and the higheſt things of the Chriſtian Religion; and yet when he ſpeaks of the Euchariſt, he doth not clearly explain it; but only tells him, That he ſhall know after Baptiſm, in what time, and after what manner it is offered: But he declareth plainly enough what he believed concerning the Euchariſt, ſaying, That Proud Men who come to the Lord's Table, do indeed receive his Body and Blood, and adore it, but they are not fed therewith; becauſe they imitate him not, and though they eat it, yet they refuſe to become poor as he was. At the latter end of his Letter, he ſpeaketh againſt thoſe who put their Confidence in their own Strength, and not in the Grace of Jeſus Chriſt. This is in ſhort what St. *Auguſtin* treats of in this Letter, which may be looked upon as a Treatiſe, as he ſays himſelf in the Concluſion, and in his *Retractations*; where he places it amongſt his entire Diſcourſes.

The 141ſt. is a Synodical Epiſtle of an Aſſembly of Catholick Biſhops held at *Cirta*, directed to all the *Donatiſts*, whereby they are exhorted to return into the Church; Their Biſhops having been ſo ſolemnly confounded and convicted in the Conference at *Carthage*, of which he gives a ſhort Abridgment in that Letter. It bears Date the 14th. of *June* 412.

The next Letter to *Saturninus*, *Euphratus*, and the Clergy newly returned into the Unity of the Church, is of the ſame time. St. *Auguſtin* Congratulates their re-union, endeavours to confirm them in the good Reſolution they had taken, and exhorts them to diſcharge their Miniſtery faithfully.

In the 143d. Letter, St. *Auguſtin* anſwereth a Queſtion propoſed to him by *Marcellinus*, to whom it is written: namely, where the Magicians of *Egypt* could find VVater to turn into Blood, when *Moſes* had turned all the VVater that was there already. He ſaith, That this Queſtion may be anſwered two ways; either by ſaying, That they took Water out of the Sea; or, by ſuppoſing, That the Plagues of *Egypt* had their Effect only where Egyptians were, but not where the Children of *Iſrael* dwelt. Having thus diſ-entangled himſelf of the Queſtion, he explains ſome Paſſages of his Books concerning Free-Will, and the Original of Souls. He confeſſes, That his Writings having been written with Precipitation, ſome faults could not but creep in. He ſincerely acknowledgeth, That even in Writing he perceived faults, and that he corrects and reproves them, being far from hiding or defending them. He ſaith, That he is not like thoſe, who through exceſſive love of themſelves, and to cover their own Errors, would leave others in theirs; That he would not have his beſt Friends to ſay, That he was not miſtaken.

He

St. Auguſtin. Tome II.

He wiſely obſerveth, That none ought to approve the Commendation given by *Cicero* to one, *That he never uttered one word which he wiſhed afterwards he had not ſpoken.* This ſays he, belongeth to a Mad man, rather than to a Wiſe man; This cannot be applied but to Divine Perſons, by whom the Holy Ghoſt hath ſpoken. He confeſſes, That he is ſtill uncertain concerning the Origin of our Souls; becauſe neither Scripture nor Reaſon have determined the Point. He further ſaith, That Scripture and Reaſon cannot be contrary to one another; That if Reaſon ſeems to be contrary to the Scripture, it is a falſe Light, it is not right Reaſon. That if what is drawn from Scripture, is found directly oppoſed to clear Reaſon; there muſt be a miſunderſtanding of the Scripture. Laſtly, He refutes *Voluſianus*, who would hardly believe what he had writ to him, that the Bleſſed Virgin could conceive Jeſus Chriſt, and remain a Virgin ſtill: This Letter is of the Year 412. for it is written after the 139th. and there St. *Auguſtin* Anſwers a Letter of *Marcellinus*, brought by *Boniface*, who was with *Marcellinus* when St. *Auguſtin* writ the 139th. Letter.

In the 144th. Letter, St. *Auguſtin* Congratulates the Men of *Cirta*, who returned to the Church exhorting them to give God thanks for it, as being the effect of his Mercy. He ſaith, That the Change of thoſe who quit a Debauched Life to lead a better, without giving up themſelves to God; as that of *Polemon* was, ought however to be look'd upon as God's Work. For, ſaith he, nothing but the heighth of Pride and of Ingratitude, can imagine that the Beauty of the Body, Strength, and Health are God's Gifts; and that Chaſtity, which makes the Beauty of the Soul, can be the work of Man. Whence he concludes, That the Converſion of thoſe to whom he writ, is much the rather the Work of God's Mercy. He exhorts them to acknowledge it. *To God*, ſaith he, *you are to give Thanks; fear him if you will be kept from falling, love him if you intend to go forward.* DEUM TIMETE NE DEFICIATIS, AMATE UT PROFICIATIS. This Letter was written after the Conference at *Carthage*.

The 145th. to *Anaſtaſius* comprehendeth moſt of St. *Auguſtin*'s Principles of Juſtification, for having obſerved that the World is more to be feared when it fawns upon us, than when it torments us, he layeth down theſe following Principles, 1. That the love of earthly Goods cannot be totally laid aſide in this Life, and it will always have a ſhare in our beſt Actions. 2. That the Will of Man cannot be called Free, without the aſſiſtance of Grace. 3. That the Law ſerveth to make us know our Impotency, that we may have our recourſe to Grace. That Sin is not overcome whil'ſt Men forbear it meerly for fear of Puniſhment. *For*, ſaith he, *though Men go not ſo far as to the outward Action, yet the ſecret Deſire of doing Evil, in the heart, which is reſtrained only by the fear of Puniſhment, is a Tyrant that keeps us in Slavery, And thus it may be ſaid, That whoſoever abſtaineth from Sin, only for the dread of Suffering, is not altogether an Enemy to Sin; becauſe he is not perfectly in love with Righteouſneſs; and that Sin is not properly hated, but proportionably as Righteouſneſs is loved.* INIMICUS ERGO EST JUSTITIÆ QUI POENÆ TIMORE NON PECCAT... TANTUM PORRO QUISQUE PECCATUM ODIT, QUANTUM JUSTITIAM DILIGIT. 5. That the love of Righteouſneſs ought to go further than the love of Sin; becauſe it ſhould proceed ſo far as that all the Miſchief which can thereby befall our Bodies, may not hinder us from practiſing our Duty; and ſo nothing may ſeparate us from the love of Jeſus Chriſt, and Righteouſneſs. 6. It is the Holy Ghoſt who poureth that Charity into our Hearts; we have it not of our ſelves, and when we find our ſelves deſtitute of it, we muſt, Ask, Seek, and Knock; addreſſing our ſelves to God by Prayer. This Letter was written about the time that the *Pelagian* Hereſie began to be known in *Africa*, in 413.

The following, which is a Letter of Thanks to *Pelagius*, is likewiſe about the ſame time, as St. *Auguſtin* obſerves in the 26th. *Chap.* of the Book of *the Acts of* Pelagius. He having already heard that this Man oppoſed the Grace of Jeſus Chriſt, he hints at ſome thing of it in this Letter; wiſhing, That God would give him ſuch Grace as might make him good always; praying him, That he would beg of God to make him ſuch, as he believed him to be already; adding in the end of the Letter, *I pray God, my Dear Brother*, that he would be pleaſed to make you acceptable in his ſight.

St. *Auguſtin* in his *Retractations*, mentions the two following Letters; The 147th. to *Paulina*, and the 148th. to *Fortunatianus* Biſhop of *Sicca*, and placeth them after the Books compoſed in 412. And indeed, this Biſhop of *Sicca*, who was at the Conference of *Carthage*, died in 413. and *Urbanus* ſucceeded him, and was deputed that very Year to go to *Rome*. St. *Auguſtin* proves in both thoſe Letters, That God cannot be ſeen with bodily Eyes. In the former, he explains, What it is to ſee God; How he is ſeen; Who they are that have ſeen him; and, Who ſhall ſee him hereafter.

The 149th. is an Anſwer of St. *Auguſtin*, to the Queſtions propoſed by St. *Paulinus*, in the 121ſt. Letter, about ſome Paſſages of Scripture; He critically examines the Difficulties that were raiſed about St. *Paul*'s Epiſtles, and gives a Rational Account of them. This Letter was written about the Year 414. after the Promotion of *Urbanus* to the Biſhoprick of *Sicca*.

The 150th. is written to *Proba*, and to her Daughter *Juliana*; He wiſhes them joy, That *Demetrias*, *Juliana*'s Daughter, had conſecrated her ſelf to God in vowing Virginity. It is full of noble Expreſſions, in Commendation of Virginity.

Count *Marcellinus*, who preſided at the Conference of *Carthage*, was Executed in the Year 413. at *Carthage*, with his Brother *Apringius*, by order of Count *Marinus*, being Accuſed of abetting

abetting *Heraclianus* his Rebellion: St. *Auguſtin* being his Friend, and knowing his Innocency, uſed all his Endeavours to hinder that Judgment; and was ſenſibly affected for the Death of thoſe innocent Perſons. A great Lord, one *Cæcilian*, St. *Auguſtin*'s Friend, and an Enemy to the two Brothers, being at *Carthage* the ſame time when this Judgment was given, was ſuſpected to have had a hand in it; and St. *Auguſtin* having forborn writing to him for ſome time, this Lord thought that he had alſo conceived the ſame Suſpicion; wherefore he wrote to St. *Auguſtin* about it. To this Letter St. *Auguſtin* returns an Anſwer in the 151ſt. wherein he repreſents, both the Cruelty and Injuſtice of *Marinus*'s Judgment, and what had made the World believe that *Cæcilian* had a hand in it. Yet he profeſſes not to believe it, conſidering what he had written to juſtifie himſelf; but he exhorts him to renounce all manner of Friendſhip with *Marinus*. Afterwards he makes a Panegyrick upon theſe two Brethren without naming them, and particularly of *Marcellinus*; giving an Account of the edifying Diſcourſes he made in the Priſon: This is a remarkable thing. St. *Auguſtin* declares, That having been to viſit him in the Priſon, he demanded of him, whether he had ever committed any Sin for which he ought to have done Penance; and that *Marcellinus* made him this Anſwer, *That he took to witneſs thoſe Sacraments which that hand brought him, that neither before nor after Marriage, he ever touch'd any Woman, but his own Wife.* This Paſſage teaches us, That Paſtors were careful to viſit Priſoners, to aſſiſt, and carry the Sacraments to them, and enjoyned them Penance when they found them guilty of great Sins; and there is no doubt, but that after Penance they alſo gave them Abſolution, when they feared that they ſhould be Condemned to Die; but upon condition, that if they eſcaped Death they ſhould fulfil their Penance. At laſt, St. *Auguſtin* ſets *Marcellinus* his Innocence againſt the Cruelty and unworthineſs of *Marinus*'s Action, whom he deſcribes as a very ill man, who had Sacrificed thoſe two innocent Perſons to pleaſe the *Donatiſts*. He again adviſes *Cæcilian* to abhorr that Action, and to conceive ſuch an Indignation againſt him that committed it, as might oblige him to a Penance proportionable to the greatneſs of his Crime. At laſt, he tells him, That being of ſuch an Age, and of ſuch Probity, he ought no longer to continue a *Catechumen*. *Marcellinus*, who had been ſo barbarouſly uſed by *Marinus*, was juſtified at Court. St. *Auguſtin* ſaith, That there was not ſo much as need of a Pardon from the Emperor, and had not *Marinus* haſtned the Judgment againſt *Marcellinus*, without waiting for the Biſhop's Anſwer, who was ſent to the Emperor to ſollicit his Pardon, he had been acquitted; and accordingly, *Marinus* was diſgraced, and the Memory of *Marcellinus* honoured by the Emperor *Honorius*, who by a Law of the Third of *Auguſt* 414. Regiſtred in the *Theodoſian* Code, *B.* 16. *Tit.* 5. *L.* 55. confirms all that he had done againſt the *Donatiſts*, and gives him the Title of *Marcellinus of Glorious Memory.*

St. *Auguſtin*. Tome II.

The 152d. Letter is from *Macedonius*, Lieutenant of *Africa*, who deſires to know of St. *Auguſtin*, whether Religion permits Biſhops to make Applications to Judges to obtain favour for Enemies, as they did at that time, and as St. *Auguſtin* often did of *Macedonius*. This Magiſtrate could hardly believe that Religion authorized that Practice; *Seeing that God doth ſo ſeverely forbid Sin, that a Man is not admitted to Penance after the firſt time; and that it ſeems to be a countenancing of Crimes when we ſhow an unwillingneſs to have them puniſhed.*

St. *Auguſtin* in the 153d. Letter, anſwereth, That Biſhops intercede for Criminals, becauſe they hope they may amend: They abhorr the Crime, but they pity the Criminals: That Repentance having no place but in this Life, there is reaſon to intercede for the Guilty, leſt by this finite Puniſhment which ends their life, they may fall into a Puniſhment that ſhall never end. So that none can doubt but that Religion approveth that Practice, ſince God himſelf, in whom is no Injuſtice; who ſeeth what every Man is, and what he ought to be, and cannot be miſtaken in his Judgments, cauſeth his Sun to riſe upon the bad as well as upon the good, and by his long forbearance invites Sinners to Repentance. That when Biſhops by their Interceſſions, have reſcued any from the ſeverity of the Judges, they put him to do Penance, that the Crime may not remain unpuniſhed. *For*, ſaith he, *a true Penitent hath no other proſpect, than that the Evil which he hath done may be puniſhed.* That if there be any Perſons whoſe Malice is ſo great, that after Penance, and being reconciled and admitted to the Holy Myſteries, they relapſe into their Diſorders, and ſometimes into greater; then indeed, the Church admits them no more to do Penance, leſt a Remedy, (which is ſo much the more profitable, that it is leaſt expoſed to the contempt of Sinners) ſhould loſe its Virtue, if it become more common: But yet, we deſpair not of their Salvation, which they may obtain through God's Mercy, by being converted and altering their Life. Afterwards, St. *Auguſtin* alledgeth ſeveral Reaſons in Equity, and ſeveral Examples, to ſhew, That we are not forbidden to intercede for Criminals; and that all Men ought to be inclined to Meekneſs and Pity. The principal Conſideration which he makes uſe of, is the State of Man in this Life, which cannot be without Sin. *For*, ſaith he, *Though the Sins which we commit, after the general aboliſhment in Baptiſm, are not of the ſame quality with thoſe for which Men are ſeparated from the Altar; yet they muſt be expiated, not by a barren Sorrow, but by a Sacrifice of the Works of Mercy.*

St. *Auguſtin* acknowledgeth, That the Soveraign Power of Princes; the Power of Life and Death, and the dread of Puniſhments, are all neceſſary to reſtrain Wicked Men, and the Terror which theſe things ſtrike into the Hearts of Men, is of great advantage, not only to the good, who by this means live ſecurely among the wicked, but even to the wicked themſelves; becauſe whil'ſt their Hands are tied by the fear of Puniſhment, their Hearts may call upon God, and turn

St. *Auguſtin.* Tome II.

from Evil to Good: *For* (ſaith he) *they are not good Men, becauſe they abſtain from Evil through fear of Suffering; for Fear does not make Men Good, but only the Love of Righteouſneſs.*

He tells us further, That upon ſome occaſions, it is *Mercy* to *Puniſh*; and in others, *Cruelty* to *Forgive*: *Sicut enim eſt aliquando miſericordia puniens, ita eſt crudelitas parcens.* He ſpeaketh at laſt, of Reſtoring Stoln Goods, or ſuch as are ill gotten: And concerning theſe, he ſaith, (1.) That it is a Mockery, not to do Penance; not to reſtore, when it is in our power, the Goods that are gotten by thoſe Crimes for which we pretend to do Penance. (2.) That though a Judge may, without Injuſtice, appoint Puniſhments to oblige a Thief to make Reſtitution; yet one may intercede for him, not to prevent reſtoring what is taken away, ſince we bind them to it by the dread of God's Judgments, and debarr them from the Communion till they have done it; but only by way of preventing unneceſſary Cruelty againſt a Man that is ſuppoſed not to be in a capacity of making Reſtitution, or not fully convicted of the Theft. (3.) That when we have not evident Proofs that ſuch a one is poſſeſſed of our Goods, it is better to hazard loſing them, though perhaps he is guilty, but denies it, than to torment and put him to Death, perhaps unjuſtly, if he hath them not. An excellent Caveat to teach Maſters not to be too forward to ſeize upon their Servants, merely upon Suſpicion. (4.) That Lawyers may take Money for their Advice in a juſt Cauſe, but not Judges to do Juſtice, nor Witneſſes to give Teſtimony to Truth: and that both are exceedingly guilty when they take Money; the one for an Unjuſt Sentence, and the other for a Falſe Witneſs. (5.) That Lawyers having taken Money to defend an ill Cauſe, or to blind the Judge, are obliged to make Reſtitution, as well as the Witneſſes or Officers, who exact Fees beyond what belong to their Places. (6.) That Eſtates gotten by Stealth, Falſe Accuſation, or Oppreſſion, ought to be reſtored; and that it is not enough, to beſtow them upon the Poor. (7.) That in ſome ſence it may be ſaid, That wicked Men have Nothing, but that All things belong to the Faithful. "For (ſaith St. *Auguſtin*) whatſoever we "have which we have no Right to, belongs to another, and we have Right to nothing but what "we juſtly poſſeſs; and we poſſeſs nothing juſtly, but what we poſſeſs as we ought: and all "that we poſſeſs not as we ought, is another's; and we poſſeſs nothing as we ought, if we "make not good uſe of it.... So that wicked Men never poſſeſs any thing as they ought; and "good Men enjoy it ſo much the more juſtly, becauſe they love it leſs." Strange Conſequences would follow from this Poſition, had not St. *Auguſtin* added this Reſtriction immediately; "But their Iniquity is tolerated, who poſſeſs not this World's Goods as they ought; "yea, Laws are eſtabliſhed to ſecure their Poſſeſſion; and are called *Civil Laws*, becauſe that "by them Civil Society is preſerved; not by obliging them to uſe thoſe Goods as they ought, "but by preventing their abuſing them for the Oppreſſion of others.... Yet we have reſpect "to theſe Humane and Temporal Laws; and our Interceſſions never go ſo far, as to hinder the "reſtoring of what is ill gotten, according to the Laws."

The 154th. Letter is from *Macedonius*; who ſendeth St. *Auguſtin* word, That he had done what he deſired; and, That he had read the Three Firſt Books of *The City of God*, which St. *Auguſtin* ſent him.

St. *Auguſtin* anſwers him in the 155th. wherein he diſcourſes of Happineſs; ſhewing, That God is the Spring of a happy Life, and that true Vertue conſiſts in the Love of God: "Vertue "(ſaith he) is nothing elſe but the love of what ought to be loved: To know how to make a "good Choice, is called *Prudence*; not to be turned away from it, for any Evil, by Pleaſure "or Pride, is called *Fortitude*, *Temperance* and *Juſtice*. Thus God is the chiefeſt Good: ſo "that to love any other thing more, or as much as him, is not to love our ſelves; for our "Condition is ſo much the more happy, as we approach with greater violence towards that "which is beſt.

Theſe four Letters were written immediately after St. *Auguſtin* had compoſed his three firſt Books of *The City of God*; which were compleated in 413. before the Fourth and the Fifth, which were publiſhed in 415.

The 156th. Letter was written from *Syracuſe*, by one *Hilary*; who deſireth St. *Auguſtin* to let him know what he ſhould think of certain Propoſitions, ſet forth by ſome at *Syracuſe*; That "it is in Man's power to keep himſelf pure from all Sin; That it is eaſie for him, if he pleaſe, "to keep the Commands of God; That Men are born without Sin, and by conſequence, that "it is inconſiſtent with the Juſtice of God, that Children dying before Baptiſm, ſhould periſh; "That rich Men cannot enter into the Kingdom of God, without renouncing their Riches, "and ſelling all they have, and giving it to the Poor; And that whil'ſt they keep them, all the "good Works they may do, according to God's Law, will profit them nothing: And laſtly, "That we ought to Swear in no caſe. He asketh further, Whether the Church without *ſpot* or *wrinkle*, ſpoken of by St. *Paul*, is that to which we now belong, or that which we hope to make up one day with the bleſſed in Heaven. This *Hilary*, of *Syracuſe*, is very like that *Hilary* who joined with St. *Proſper* to refute the *Semi-Pelagians*, and who writ to St. *Auguſtin* the 226th. Letter; both were Lay-men, ſince St. *Auguſtin* calleth them *Sons*: They were both great Enemies of the *Pelagians*, Diſciples and great Admirers of St. *Auguſtin*: The Style of both Letters ſeems to be the ſame, which makes it probable that they were both written by the ſame Perſon.

Be that as it will, in the next St. *Auguſtin* anſwereth the Queſtions propoſed in this Letter; which gave him opportunity to treat at large of Original Sin; Of the Corruption of our Nature;

ture; Of Juſtification, and of the Grace of Jeſus Chriſt: And to prove againſt the *Pelagians*, (1.) That no Man can be free from Sin in this Life. (2) That no Man can fulfil the Law without the Grace of Jeſus Chriſt, which is obtained by Labour and by Prayer. (3.) That Grace doth not take away Liberty; becauſe the Will of Man is by ſo much the more free, as it is the more ſubject to Chriſt's Grace, and delivered from the Dominion of Sin: We ſhould not think that Free-Will is deſtroy'd, becauſe it needeth ſuch Helps; on the contrary, it ſuppoſes that it ſubſiſts ſtill, when we ſay that it hath need of help. (4.) That we learn of St. *Paul*, That all the Children of *Adam* are *born in ſin*; and periſh eternally, if they are not ſanctified by the Grace of Baptiſm. Here he refuteth the *Pelagians* very fully; who anſwered, That Sin was not from *Adam*, but by Imitation: And he enlargeth upon the Oppoſition which St. *Paul* makes between *Adam* and *Jeſus Chriſt*; between the Condemnation cauſed by the Old Man becauſe of Sin, and the Juſtification which the New Man worketh in us by his Grace. Having handled theſe Points, he ſpeaks occaſionally againſt *Cœleſtius*, who had been both accuſed and convicted of thoſe Errors which St. *Auguſtin* had lately refuted. Afterwards this Saint diſcourſes againſt another *Pelagian* Error concerning Manners; and proveth, (1.) That to be ſaved, Men need not part with their whole Eſtate, and reduce themſelves to entire Poverty. And laſtly, he obſerves, That the Church here below conſiſts both of Good and Bad. He adds further, concerning Swearing, That Men ſhould avoid Swearing as much as poſſibly they can: That it is beſt, not to Swear at all; no, not in Truth; becauſe thoſe that are uſed to Swearing, are every moment upon the brink of Perjury: That it is a moſt dangerous thing to play with Oaths; but the ſureſt way, is, never to Swear, and uſe only *Yea* and *Nay*. St. *Jerom* mentions this Letter in his *Dialogue*, written in the Year 415. and ſpeaks of it as a Diſcourſe newly publiſhed. It was read in the Council of *Paleſtine*, aſſembled in *July*, 415. as St. *Auguſtin* obſerves in the Book of *The Acts of Pelagius*, chap. 11. which ſhews that it was written in the Year 414.

St. *Auguſtin* Tome II.

The Subject of the 158th. Letter is as followeth; *Evodius*, Biſhop of *Uzala*, having given an Account of a Young Man's happy Death, who had led a moſt holy Life, and had appear'd to ſome after his Death; propoſes ſome Queſtions to St. *Auguſtin* about ſuch Apparitions, and asks, Whether the Soul hath not a Body after Death? We ought not to forget that this Biſhop, ſpeaking of that Young Man's Death, obſerves, That in his Sickneſs he repeated Pſalms, and in his Agony he made the Sign of the Croſs upon his Forehead: That they buried him honourably, and for Three Days together Hymns were ſung upon his Grave, and on the Third Day they offer'd the Sacrifice of our Redemption. At the latter end of this Letter, *Evodius* asks St. *Auguſtin* ſome other Queſtions about the difference betwixt God's and Man's Wiſdom.

St. *Auguſtin* anſwers that Biſhop in the 159th. and tells him, That this Queſtion requireth much Labour and Study to reſolve all the Difficulties that may be in it. But to let him know his Opinion in one word, He did not believe that the Soul did go out of the Body with a Body: That as to Viſions and Apparitions, nothing can be ſaid, without deciding after what manner an infinite number of different Idea's are raiſed in our Souls: which is a thing very hard to be comprehended; though it is certain, that ſuch Repreſentations are neither Corporeal Motions, nor Corporeal Qualities. He referrs *Evodius* to what he had ſaid concerning that Matter, in his Book upon *Geneſis*; and contents himſelf to tell him what happened to *Gennadius*, a Phyſician at *Carthage*; who doubting whether there was another Life, was convinced of it by a Young Man that appeared to him in a Dream; and made him apprehend, that ſince he did both hear and ſee him, though his Eyes were ſhut, and had no uſe of his Ears, that even ſo after Death, though he ſhould have no bodily Eyes, yet he ſhould ſee, and feel, and live.

The 160th. and 161ſt. are both by *Evodius*. In the firſt, he asketh St. *Auguſtin* what *God* is? and what is *Reaſon?* And in the Second, he deſireth him to explain a Paſſage in his 137th. Letter to *Voluſianus*.

St. *Auguſtin* anſwereth both by the 162d. Wherein he tells *Evodius*, That he had not Time enough to anſwer thoſe Queſtions, but he had already reſolved ſeveral of them, in his Books of the *Trinity*; Of *Free-Will*; Of the *Quantity of the Soul*; and, Of *True Religion*. He confirms what he had ſaid in the 159th. Letter, touching a Soul ſeparated from the Body; and about Apparitions. And at laſt juſtifieth what he had ſaid of the Incarnation to *Voluſianus*; *If a Reaſon could be given of that Myſtery, then would it ceaſe to be Wonderful: Were there an Example of it, it would not be Singular.*

Though St. *Auguſtin* had ſignified to *Evodius*, That he was not at leiſure to anſwer ſuch ſort of Queſtions; yet this Man propoſes two more in his 163d. Letter: The former, concerning the Original of Chriſt's Soul; and the other, about a difficult Paſſage in St. *Peter*'s Epiſtle, where it is ſaid, *That Jeſus Chriſt preached in the Spirit to the Spirits in Priſon; which ſome time were diſobedient, when the long-ſuffering of God waited in the days of Noah.*

St. *Auguſtin* reſolveth both theſe Queſtions in the 164th. Letter: And beginning with the latter, he ſaith, (1.) That no Man can doubt of Chriſt's Deſcent into Hell. (2.) That he did not deliver all Men from thence, but only ſuch as he judged worthy to be delivered. (3) That almoſt the whole Church believes that Jeſus Chriſt delivered our Firſt Father; and ſome others think, That he brought out the other Patriarchs and the Prophets: But that it is more probable that theſe righteous Men were not in Hell, but in another Place, called *Abraham's Boſom*. (4.) That

thoſe

St. Auguſtin. Tome II.

theſe juſt Men who were raiſed again when Chriſt died, did take again their Bodies to die a ſecond time. (5.) In cannot be ſaid, That Jeſus Chriſt preached the Goſpel in the other World, to thoſe that were Incredulous in this Life. (6.) That that Paſſage of St. *Peter*, is not to be underſtood of the Spirits or Souls detained in Hell; but of the Spirits who lived in the days of *Noah*, whom the Word did then enlighten: So that St. *Peter*'s meaning, in St. *Auguſtin*'s Opinion, is not, that Chriſt deſcended into Hell, to preach the Goſpel to thoſe who believed not, in *Noah*'s time; but that Jeſus Chriſt dying for us, was raiſed again by the ſame Spirit by whom he formerly preached, or by which he formerly inſtructed Unbelievers, in the days when *Noah* prepared the Ark, whil'ſt God's Patience waited and invited them to Repentance. (7.) That Chriſt's Birth was not defiled with Sin; and though he took in the Womb of a Virgin true Humane Fleſh, yet was it not ſinful Fleſh, becauſe Luſt had no hand in forming of that Fleſh. This brings him inſenſibly to the other Queſtion, about the Original of the Soul. St. *Auguſtin* is ſtill to ſeek about that Subject, and dareth not declare for any of the four Opinions that divided the Chriſtians at that time, but clearly diſowns the Notion, That for the Puniſhment of ſome Sins committed in another Life, the Soul is caſt into the Body, as into a Priſon: But maintains, That it is certain that Chriſt's Soul was not ſubject either to the Death of Sin, or to Condemnation. All theſe Letters of *Evodius*, and theſe Anſwers of St. *Auguſtin*, were written not long after one another, after that to *Voluſianus*, in the Year 414.

The 165th. is a Letter of St. *Jerom* to *Marcellinus* and *Anapſychia*: Wherein this Father having related the ſeveral Opinions about the Origination of the Soul, adviſeth them to addreſs themſelves to St. *Auguſtin*, if they deſired to know more. It is viſible, that this was written before the former; becauſe it is directed to Count *Marcellinus*, who was executed in 413. but it is placed here, becauſe of its relation with the following Letter of St. *Auguſtin*, which is a Treatiſe upon the Soul's Original, dedicated to St. *Jerom*, and ſent to him by *Oroſius*, in the Year 415.

St. *Auguſtin* having obſerved, That the Soul cannot be called a Body, if by *Body* be underſtood an *extended Subſtance*; though it might be termed *Corporeal* in another ſence, if this Term be taken at large to ſignifie *Subſtance* in general: he propoſes then to St. *Jerom* the ſeveral Opinions concerning the Soul's Original; ſtarting ſome Difficulties upon that which St. *Jerom* ſeemed to approve beſt; yet it is that which we now hold, That Souls are created and put into our Bodies at the Birth of each Perſon. He inſiſts particularly upon this, That it is difficult to make that conſiſt with Original Sin, and with what the Church believes concerning Children that die without Baptiſm; and ſo he asketh of St. *Jerom* a Solution of theſe Objections, having anſwered the Reaſons alledged againſt that Opinion which ſeemed moſt probable to St. *Auguſtin*. He takes notice, That the Innocents were honoured in the Church, as Martyrs.

The next Letter to St. *Jerom*, upon theſe words of St. *James*, ch. 2. v. 10. *He that tranſgreſſes in one point, is guilty of all*, was written immediately after the fore-going, as St. *Auguſtin* obſerves in his *Retractations*. He deſireth St. *Jerom* to explain that Paſſage to him; and himſelf giveth an Explication of it, which he ſubmits to St. *Jerom*'s Judgment. He examineth the *Stoicks* Opinions, who taught, That all Sins were equal; and that of the Philoſophers, who affirmed, That it was impoſſible to have any one Vertue, without being endowed with all. Having bandied theſe Queſtions on both Sides, he concludes, That though it were true, That One Vertue could not be alone; yet it would not follow, That All Sins were equal: But however, it is not true, That all Vertues muſt neceſſarily be joined together: becauſe Vertue being no other thing than the love of what one ought to love, a Man may have more or leſs of this Love; for no Man can attain to perfect Charity in this Life. This being ſuppoſed, he ſaith, That whoſoever tranſgreſſeth the Law in One Point, is guilty of breaking the Whole; becauſe Sin is againſt Charity, and Charity is the fulfilling of the Law. But from hence it doth not follow that all Sins are equal; becauſe that though every Sin violates Charity, upon which the Law dependeth; yet that hinders not but that a Man is more or leſs guilty, according as the Sins he commits are greater or leſs. In a word, There is more or leſs Sin in us, according as there is more or leſs Charity; and we ſhall never be perfect in Charity, before we are delivered from the weakneſs of this mortal Fleſh. Laſtly, We ought not to deſpiſe ſmall Sins, or daily Faults; but ask God Pardon for them, and blot them out by conſtant Prayers, and good Works. Whoſoever ſhould neglect to expiate them; and who thinking himſelf over-righteous, ſhould ask of God to be judged without Mercy, would doubtleſs come to Chriſt's Judgment-Seat overwhelm'd with Sins that would weigh him down, and would find no Mercy.

The 168th. is a Letter of Thanks, which both *Timaſius* and *James* return to St. *Auguſtin*, for his Book of *Nature and Grace*, compoſed in 415. which was dedicated to them.

In the 169th. St. *Auguſtin* anſwereth *Evodius* about two Queſtions which that Biſhop had put to him; one concerning the Trinity; and the other about the Dove, under whoſe Shape the Holy Ghoſt appeared; and there he explains the Faith of the Church, concerning the Trinity and the Incarnation, very clearly and exactly. This Letter is of the ſame Year with the Book of *Nature and Grace*; that is, in 415.

The next Letter, in St. *Auguſtin*'s and *Alypius*'s Name, is upon the ſame Subject: There they inſtruct *Maximus* the Phyſician, who was newly converted from the *Arian* Hereſie; and exhort him to reduce thoſe to the Faith whom he had led into Error.

The

The next is a Note from St. *Augustin*, and *Alypius*, to *Peregrinus*, a Bishop; whereby they desire him to give them an Account of what Success their Letter to *Maximus* had; and not to be offended at the length of their Letter, because they used to write such to those Persons, whom they esteemed most. This *Peregrinus* not being made Bishop before the Year 413. it is likely both these Letters were not written before 415. St. *Augustin.* Tome II.

The 172d. is an Answer of St. *Jerom* to St. *Augustin*'s 166th. and 167th. Letters. There he commendeth what St. *Augustin* had writ, and excuseth himself from making any Answer. This Letter was brought by *Orosius*, in 416.

The 173d. is directed to *Donatus*, a *Donatist* Priest, of the Town of *Carthagena*, in the Dioceſs of *Hippo*, who having been informed, That there was an Order to Arrest, and to carry him to Church, had purposed to throw himself into a Well. St. *Augustin* shews him, in this Letter, the Excess of his Folly; proving, That it is just to force them to do Good that are bent to do Evil. This Letter was written after the Conference at *Carthage*.

The 174th. Letter of St. *Augustin* to *Aurelius*, Bishop of *Carthage*, was sent with his Book *of the Trinity*, completed in 410.

The 175th. to Pope *Innocent* I. is not a particular Letter of St. *Augustin*'s, but a Synodical Epistle of the Council assembled at *Carthage* in 416. whereby the Bishops of that Council, to the Number of 68. inform the Pope of what they had done in the Council against *Pelagius*, and *Cœlestius*: How *Orosius* having delivered them the Letters of *Heros*, and *Lazarus*, against *Pelagius*, and *Cœlestius*, after they had revised what they had done before at *Carthage*, Five Years since, against *Cœlestius*, they had again Anathematized their Errours, to reclaim those that started them, from that Extravagancy; or, at the least, to Cure such as were infected already, and to preserve such as might be infected, in process of time, from the Contagion. They make the Pope acquainted with it, that so the Authority of the See of *Rome*, being joined with the Judgment of the *African* Bishops, might secure the Salvation of many, and call back, into the right way, those that had gone astray. They refute afterwards, the Principal Errors of the *Pelagians*, against Grace, and Original Sin. They add, That though *Pelagius* had been justly acquitted in the Council of *Palæstine*, yet now the growing Errour, that over-spreads the Church, ought to be Anathematized. Lastly, That though both *Pelagius*, and *Cœlestius*, seem to disown their Errours, and have undertaken to deny that they ever owned them, and to affirm, that the Writings objected to them, are none of theirs; yet Anathema's ought to be pronounced against *any one who dares teach, and averr, That the natural Strength of Man, is sufficient to avoid Sin, and to accomplish God's Commandments -.....- And that dares affirm, That Children need not be delivered from Perdition, by the Baptism of Jesus Christ; or, that they can have a share, in eternal Life, without that Sacrament.*

The 176th. is likewise a Synodical Letter of the Council of *Milevis*, made up of 60 *Numidian* Bishops, and Assembled at the same time with the foregoing. They exhort Pope *Innocent* to use his Authority, to Condemn that new Heresie which was an Enemy of the Grace of Jesus Christ. They accuse *Cœlestius*, and *Pelagius*, as the Authors of it; yet hoping that they will renounce their Errours.

Besides these Two Letters, St. *Augustin* writ a particular one in the Name of the Bishops, *Aurelius*, *Alypius*, *Evodius*, and *Possidius*, his Collegues, and familiar Friends; wherein he represents to him, That *Pelagius* having lived long at *Rome*, it was a thing of great Consequence there, to Condemn plainly the Errour which he taught; and, that it were convenient to send for *Pelagius*, to examine him, and oblige him to make such a Confession of Faith, as might not be capable of an ill Explication; and to anathematize the Errours that were found in his Books. They refute likewise the *Pelagian* Doctrine, explaining the Difference betwixt the Law, and Grace; and shewing the Necessity of the Latter to fulfil the Commandments.

St. *Augustin* wrote again upon the same Subject, and about the same time, the 178th. Letter to *Hilary*, supposed to be Bishop of *Narbon*; and the 179th. to *John* of *Jerusalem*, to whom he sendeth his Book of *Nature, and Grace*, with that of *Pelagius*, desiring, in exchange, *The Ecclesiastical Acts*; whereby it appeared, That *Pelagius* had been Justified; he means, the Acts of the Council of *Diospolis*. All these Letters are written in 416. *Orosius* being come back again, who brought from *Palæstine*, into *Africa*, *Heros's*, and *Lazarus's* Letters against *Pelagius*.

The 180th. to *Oceanus* a Gentleman of *Rome*, is also of the same time. This Man had embraced St. *Jerom*'s Opinion about the Origination of Souls, and concerning an officious Lye. St. *Augustin* shews him, in few Words, the Difficulties that attend St. *Jerom*'s Opinion, about the Origination of Souls, with the difference betwixt Tropes, or Metaphors, and Lying. He observes, That St *Jerom*, with whom he had had a Dispute about that Subject, had altered his Mind in his Dialogue against *Pelagius*. He desireth *Oceanus* to send him a Treatise of that Father, whereof *Orosius* had spoken to him, and wherein he treated of the Resurrection of the Flesh.

The 181st. 182d. 183d. and 184th. Letters, are Pope *Innocent*'s Answers to those of the *African* Bishops; whereby he approves, and confirms all that was done in *Africa*, against *Pelagius*, and *Cœlestius*; they are of the Year 417.

St. *Auguſtin.* Tome II.

The 185th. Letter, is amongſt thoſe Diſcourſes that St. *Auguſtin* mentions in his Retractations, where he calls it the Book of *the Correction of the* Donatiſts, againſt thoſe who found fault, that the Imperial Laws were put in Execution to make them return into the Church. He directs it to *Bonifacius* a Tribune, and afterwards Count in *Africa*.

Having ſhewed there the difference betwixt the *Arian* Hereſie, and the *Donatiſts* Schiſm, he proves, That keeping within the Rules of Chriſtian Moderation, the terrour of the Laws may be uſed to reduce Hereticks to the Church. He ſpeaketh at large of the Cruelties which the *Donatiſts*, and particularly the *Circumcellians* exerciſed againſt the *Catholicks*. He refutes all the Reaſons then alledged at large; which Reaſons were now made uſe of, to perſwade Men, that Hereticks are not to be reclaimed from their Errors, by Force, or Puniſhments. He ſays ſome Things concerning Penance, and Remiſſion of Sins: That Baptiſm blots out all Sins; and that, by Penance, they may alſo be remitted; and, "That if the Church hath ordained, That none of thoſe, who have been under Penance, ſhall be admitted into the Clergy, or kept in it, this is only for the upholding of Diſcipline, leaſt ſome ſhould do Penance, out of Pride, with a Deſign to obtain Eccleſiaſtical Dignities; not that ſhe would caſt Criminals into Deſpair, how Guilty ſoever they be, ⁂ but that this Method is altered upon thoſe Occaſions, where the Buſineſs is not only to ſecure the Salvation of ſome particular Men, but to deliver whole Nations from Death. In which Circumſtances, the Church hath remitted much of the Severity of her Diſcipline, to find a Remedy for greater Evils and for this very Reaſon, ſhe dealeth thus with the *Donatiſts*: That ſhe is ſatisfied if they expiate their Sin of Separation by as bitter Grief as was that of St. *Peter*; and ſhe preferveth their Rank and Dignity among the Clergy. That the Church practiſed this, when whole Nations were to be reclaimed from Errour, or Hereſie: That *Lucifer Calaritanus* was looked upon as a *Schiſmatick*, for being of another Opinion: That the Sin of the Holy Ghoſt is not Errour, or Blaſphemy, ſince it would thence follow, that no *Heretick* ought to be admitted to Penance, or obtain Remiſſion of his Sin; and that, by this, no other thing can be underſtood but final Impenitency. St. *Auguſtin* obſerves, in his Retractations, that he wrote this Letter at the ſame time that he compoſed the Book of *The Acts of* Pelagius, in 417.

The 186th. Letter of St. *Auguſtin*, is written to *Paulinus*, Biſhop of *Nola*; not to *Boniface*, as it is entituled in ſome Manuſcripts; ſiince it is quoted as directed to *Paulinus*, in the Book *of the Gift of Perſeverance*, Ch. 21. and by St. *Proſper*, Ch. 43. againſt *Caſſianus* his Conferences. And indeed, St. *Auguſtin* quotes a Paſſage out of a Letter, from the Perſon to whom he wrote, which is found in the 8th. Letter of St. *Paulinus* to *Sulpitius Severus*. This whereof we now ſpeak, is written in the Names of St. *Auguſtin*, and *Alypius*, who was an intimate Friend of St. *Paulinus*, againſt *Pelagius*, whom this Saint had in great Eſteem. In this Letter St. *Auguſtin* layeth open all his Principles, concerning Grace, and Predeſtination, and refuteth *Pelagius* his Notions. He begins with the Relation of what had been done againſt him in *Africa*, and ſends Copies of it to St. *Paulinus*. Then he layeth down theſe Poſitions, That the Grace of Jeſus Chriſt, that is neceſſary to enable us to do Good, is altogether of Free Gift; That God ſheweth Mercy to whom he pleaſeth; That he takes whom he thinks fit, out of the Maſs of Corruption, into which Mankind is fallen, through *Adam*'s Sin. He inſiſteth, particularly, upon the Example of Infants, whereof ſome are ſaved through God's Mercy, and others damned, becauſe of Original Sin. He refutes *Pelagius*'s Opinion, touching the State of Infants, whom he ſuppoſes to be in a middle State between Heaven, and Hell, which he calleth Eternal Life. He proves, That Free-Will does not conſiſt in an Indifference, to Good or Evil; for it is enclined to Evil, and cannot do Good, without the aſſiſtance of the Grace of God. He tells St. *Paulinus*, that *Pelagius* maintained the contrary in his former Books, that afterwards he ſeems to have retracted his Errours in the Council of *Dioſpolis*, whereof he had received the Acts; and then he diſſembled again ſometimes, confeſſing the Neceſſity of Grace, and often affirming, That the Will had Power of it ſelf to abſtain from Sin: So that God's Aſſiſtance, in his Opinion, was afforded us over and above, to enable us to do that which is good with the greater Eaſe. Theſe are the Opinions refuted by St. *Auguſtin* in this Letter, where he urges a Paſſage from a Letter, written by St. *Paulinus*, to convince him, that he ought to reject them, and condemn *Pelagius*.

The next Letter to *Dardanus*, is a Didactical Treatiſe, mentioned by St *Auguſtin* in his *Retractations*. There he ſhews how God is ſaid to be Omnipreſent, upon occaſion of Two Queſtions, which *Dardanus* had propoſed to him: The one upon theſe Words of Jeſus Chriſt to the good Thief, *This Day thou ſhalt be with me in Paradiſe*; and the other, *Whether Children have any Notion of God in the Womb*. The former Difficulty is grounded upon this, That the humane Nature of Chriſt was not in Paradiſe immediately after his Death, becauſe his Soul deſcended into Hell, and his Body was laid in the Grave. St. *Auguſtin* ſaith, That the Soul of Jeſus Chriſt, may be ſaid to have been in the ſame Place where the Souls of the Righteous were, which may be called Paradiſe. But he thinks it more probable, That this is meant of Chriſt's Divinity, which never ceaſed to be in Paradiſe. This puts St. *Auguſtin* upon treating of God's Immenſity, whereof he ſpeaketh after a very high manner; ſhewing, That we ought not to conceive of it, as of a Corporeal Extention. He diſcourſeth, likewiſe, of the particular manner, how God dwelleth in the Saints, and in Baptized Infants that do not yet know him. And this leads him to the Second Queſtion, about the Knowledge of Children that are yet in their Mother's Womb. He affirms,

affirms, That they have no knowledge, no, not after their Birth, and that the Holy Ghoſt dwelleth in them, and they know it not; whereupon he enlargeth upon Juſtification that is wrought by Regeneration, and ſpeaketh of Birth in Sin, the Neceſſity of Baptiſmal Grace, and of Faith in Jeſus Chriſt. It is evident by St. *Auguſtin*'s *Retractations*, That this Letter was written in the Year 417. It is directed to the Prefect of *Gaul*, to whom St. *Jerom* wrote alſo a Letter. St. *Auguſtin.* Tome II.

The 188th. Letter to *Juliana*, the Mother of *Demetrias*, is a warning given to that holy Widow by St. *Auguſtin* and *Alypius*, not to ſuffer her ſelf to be ſurprized by the hidden Poiſon in the Letter to *Demetrias*, whereof they did not yet know *Pelagius* to be the Author. He ſhews her, That this Letter aſcribeth all to Free-Will; whereas the Principle of Chriſtian Piety is to attribute all to God.

In the 189th. St. *Auguſtin* lays down ſeveral very uſeful and edifying Rules to *Boniface*, to live Chriſtianly in the Profeſſion of Arms; recommending to him, above all things, Charity towards God, and towards his Neighbour; as the Foundation of all Vertues. He ſhows, That to be a Soldier is no unlawful Profeſſion, and that a Soldier may be a good Chriſtian, if he be deſirous of Peace, and goes to War with no other deſign but that of procuring it. And that Neceſſity alone ought to put him upon taking away his Enemy's Life, and that his own Will ought not to have any hand in it. That he ought to do no Injuſtice nor Violence, nor get Wealth by wicked means. At laſt, he adviſes him to remember, That *every good thing cometh from God*: It is not certainly known in what Year this Letter was written.

The 190th. to *Optatus* contains St. *Auguſtin*'s Opinions touching the Original of the Soul. Firſt of all he ſuppoſes Original Sin as an indubitable thing; Then he ſaith, That whereas he had written; that we may without danger be ignorant of the Soul's Extraction, it is with this Proviſo, that we certainly hold, 1. That it is not of God's Subſtance, but a Creature. 2. That it is a Spirit, and not a Body. 3. That it is not placed in the Body for a Puniſhment of Sins committed in another Life. He ſaith afterwards, That no Man can be juſtified but by Faith in Jeſus Chriſt, and that it was that Faith which juſtified the Patriarchs. He enlargeth alſo upon the free Predeſtination of God's Elect, which is the choice that God made of them to take them by his Grace out of the maſs of Perdition, and upon the eternal Death of Children dying before Baptiſm. Laſtly, He endeavours to prove, That if we reject *Tertullian*'s groſs Opinion, who ſuppoſed the Soul to be Corporeal, the Notion of the Propagation of Souls agreeth beſt with Original Sin, though it hath ſome Difficulties. He obſerves, That it was the moſt general Opinion in the Weſt, and he believes it more probable, than that of conſtant Creation; yet he dares not decide any thing upon this Matter, neither will he condemn the *Pelagians* for holding this latter Opinion; But becauſe they draw from it a Conſequence againſt Original Sin, he ſpeaks of the Condemnation of *Pelagius*'s Doctrine by the Popes, *Innocent* and *Zoſimus*, and quotes a Letter of the latter which is not extant: St. *Auguſtin* writ this Letter at *Cæſarea*, where he dwelt ſome time after the Council of *Carthage*, in the Year 418. There are theſe two curious Sentences: The firſt, *We make our ſelves unworthy of Knowledge, if we deſire that others ſhould believe that we know them, when we are ignorant of them.* The ſecond, *It is raſhneſs to decide by Conjecture what Reaſon doth not diſcover, and what the Holy Scripture doth not clearly teach.*

In the 191ſt. Letter, St. *Auguſtin* congratulates *Sixtus* the Prieſt, afterwards Biſhop of *Rome*, who was ſuſpected to have been a favourer of the *Pelagians*, becauſe he declared himſelf for Grace. He deſireth him to beware of thoſe, who not daring to ſet forth their Doctrine openly, did notwithſtanding ſow it ſecretly; praying him to reclaim thoſe with Meekneſs, whom Fear kept in deep ſilence, but preſerved ſtill the ſame Venom in their Hearts.

In the 192d. he entertaineth *Cœleſtinus* the Deacon, afterwards Biſhop of *Rome*, with the Duties of Chriſtian Charity. He ſaith, That this Vertue is not of the Nature of thoſe Things which ceaſe to be after performance; for the more a Man performs Actions of Charity, the more Charitable he is. That no Man ought to want this Duty towards his Friends, ſince all Men are obliged to exerciſe it towards their Enemies: That Charity towards Enemies, is the way to make them Friends: for it makes us deſire that they ſhould become vertuous, which they cannot be, unleſs they be in Charity with thoſe that wiſh them ſo much good, even the ſame Charity that others have for them. That it is not with Charity as it is with Money: for the leſs we think to be re-imburſed, the more we love thoſe that we give Money to; whereas the more deſirous we are that thoſe ſhould prove Charitable towards us, to whom we ſhew Charity, the more we love them. One may plainly ſee that this Letter is a Chriſtian Complement wittily written. It was ſent at the ſame time with the two next to *Albinus*, after St. *Auguſtin*'s return to *Hippo*, whither he did not come till the 20th of *September* of the Year 418. for it appeareth by the Acts of the Conference which he had with *Emeritus*, that he was then in *Mauritania*.

The 193d. Letter lately Publiſhed out of a Manuſcript, is directed to *Mercator*, who is thought to be the ſame that writ againſt *Pelagius* and the *Neſtorians*. St. *Auguſtin* having excuſed himſelf, that he had not given him an Anſwer ſooner, by reaſon of his Journey into *Mauritania*, ſhows him here, That ſince the *Pelagians* own that Children in Baptiſm believe through other Men's Faith, they may own likewiſe, That Original Sin is remitted to them, by reaſon of others believing. He addeth ſome proofs, of their being born in Sin; and that they cannot

enjoy

St. *Auguſtin.* Tome II.

enjoy Eternal Life without being Baptized. He holds Death to be a Puniſhment for Sin, and anſwereth the Objection of ſome *Pelagians*; who, to prove the contrary, alledged the Examples of *Enoch* and *Elias*, who died not. St. *Auguſtin* anſwereth, That it is probable that they ſhall die ſome time or other; but if they die not, it is by the ſpecial grace of God, who is able to remit the Puniſhment of Sin no leſs than Sin it ſelf. This Objection raiſes another that is better grounded: How can the Penalty of Sin remain, after the Sin is remitted? St. *Auguſtin* doth not reſolve it here, but referrs us to his Book of *Infant-Baptiſm*. What followeth concerning the Reſurrection, is taken out of St. *Auguſtin's Anſwers to* Dulcitius *his Objections*.

The next, which is the Second Letter to *Sixtus* Presbyter of *Rome*, was written ſome time after the former; He relates there the *Pelagian* Errors, which he refutes by confirming the contrary Doctrine. Theſe Errors are, 1. That Free-Will can do no Good without God's help. 2. That God were Unjuſt, if he ſhew'd Mercy to ſome and not to others. 3. That God doth indeed afford help, but that is only to Merit. 4. That Faith, which is the beginning of Juſtification, depends upon Mens Free-Will. St. *Auguſtin* oppoſes to theſe Opinions St. *Paul's* Doctrine in the Epiſtle to the *Romans*; from which he concludes, That all Men are in the State of Perdition, and that God gives his Grace, and ſheweth Mercy to whom he pleaſeth; He oweth it to none, and they that receive it not, cannot accuſe him of Injuſtice, ſince they are condemned either for Original Sin, or for thoſe which they have added beſides; That he grants not this Grace to Merit, ſince there are no Merits previous to Grace; That he hardneth the Heart, not by inſpiring Malice, but by withdrawing his Grace. Theſe are the Maxims laid down by St. *Auguſtin* in this Letter, and which he confirms by the Example of Children dying either before or after Baptiſm, as it pleaſeth God; and by what St. *Paul* ſaith in the Epiſtle to the *Romans*, of *Jacob's* Predeſtination, and *Eſau's* Reprobation.

The 195th. is a Note of S. *Jerom's* to St. *Auguſtin*, wherein he calls him Happy, becauſe he was hated by Hereticks for refuting them; and had in Veneration by Catholicks, for defending the Doctrine of the Church.

In the 196th. to *Aſellicus*, St. *Auguſtin* having proved, That it is not lawful for Chriſtians to obſerve the Jewiſh Laws and Ceremonies, treats of the Uſefulneſs and Effects of the Law, and of the Neceſſity of Grace againſt the *Pelagians*. *Donatus* was Primate of *Numidia* when this Letter was written; he was in that Station in the Council of *Carthage* in 418, and the *Pelagians* were Condemned already.

The 197th. Letter is directed to *Heſychius* Biſhop of *Salona*. St. *Auguſtin* endeavoureth to undeceive that Biſhop, who fanſied that the End of the World was at hand, ſhowing, That that time is unknown to Men. He doth not believe it to be very near, becauſe the Goſpel had not yet been Preached throughout the whole Earth. Towards the latter end, he diſapproves the fanciful Opinion of a certain Man, whom St. *Jerom* in his Commentary upon the Prophet *Daniel*, had accuſed of raſhneſs, for affirming, That *Daniel's* Weeks related to the laſt, and not to the firſt coming of Jeſus Chriſt.

Heſychius returns this Anſwer to St. *Auguſtin* in the 198th. Letter, That though none knoweth either the Day or the Hour of the laſt Judgment, yet we may know whether it be far off, by the Signs, which Jeſus Chriſt told us ſhould precede his appearing; but however, it is an act of Piety to look for it, as near at hand. He anſwereth what St. *Auguſtin* had ſaid, That the Goſpel not having been Preached all the Earth over, it was not likely that the Day of Judgment ſhould happen ſo ſoon. He anſwers it, I ſay, by ſhewing that the Apoſtle St. *Paul* had look'd upon that Prophecy as already fulfilled; and at laſt approveth of their Opinion, who believed that the Weeks ſpoken of by *Daniel*, were not yet fulfilled. One of the Reaſons this Biſhop grounded his Opinion upon, is that Jeſus Chriſt foretelleth the Deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*, and the End of the World at once: And he aſſures him, That the Son of Man will be at hand, when *Jeruſalem* is deſtroy'd.

St. *Auguſtin* having received this Letter, writes back to *Heſychius* the 199th. Letter; wherein, after a long Diſcourſe upon this Principle of Morality, That without enquiring when Chriſt ſhall come, we ought rather be ready to receive him when he cometh: He ſaith, That no place of Scripture doth mark the time of the Laſt Judgment, nor teaches whether it be near or far off. He refutes the Inferences which *Heſychius* had drawn from ſome Paſſages of Scripture; and ſhews, That *Daniel's* Weeks cannot be underſtood of Chriſt's laſt coming: And at laſt he diſtinguiſheth in the Prophecies in the 24th. *Ch.* of St. *Matthew's* Goſpel, and in the 13th. *Ch.* of St. *Mark*, what concerns the Deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*, from that which relates to the End of the World; and clears the Circumſtances of thoſe Predictions. Finally, he concludes, That we ſhould have a care not to be miſtaken upon that Queſtion. That none is miſtaken, but when he thinks he knows, and affirms what he knows not. He repreſents the Diſpoſition of three ſorts of Perſons who wait for the Appearance of Jeſus Chriſt; One believeth, That he will ſhortly come; The other thinks, That it will be a great while firſt; And the third confeſſes, That he doth not know whether he will come ſooner or later. He ſaith thereupon, That the Notion of his coming quickly, is more according to our Wiſhes; but it is moſt dangerous if we ſhould be deceived. He on the contrary, who believes, That Jeſus Chriſt will not come ſo ſoon, but yet believeth, hopeth, and deſireth his coming, cannot be deceived, but his Error will turn to his Comfort: As for the Third, who owneth that he knows nothing of it, he wiſhes for what the firſt promiſeth, and if ready to bear patiently what the other puts him in fear of, and aſſerts

Nothing,

Nothing, is out of danger of being deceived. Experience hath taught us, That the Condition of the last is best, and to be embraced of all Men, until the Day of Judgment comes. These three Letters in all probability belong to the Year 418. or 419. St. *Augustin.* Tome II.

St. *Augustin* wrote the 200dth. Letter to Count *Valerius*, about his Books *of Concupiscence* and *Matrimony*, which he sent unto him after he had finished them in 418.

The 201st. is an Order from the Emperors *Honorius* and *Theodosius*, directed to *Aurelius* Bishop of *Carthage*, whereby they enjoyn him, to let all the Bishops know, That they must subscribe the Condemnation of *Pelagius* and *Cœlestius*, whom they had expelled out of *Rome*; and that as many as through impious obstinacy should refuse to do it, should be deprived of their Dignities, Banished for ever out of their Cities, and Excluded from the Communion of the Church. This Letter is dated the 8th. of *June* 419. At the latter end it is observed, That another like this was directed to St. *Augustin*, which shows, That the respect which the Emperors paid to the Dignity of the Church of *Carthage*, they paid likewise to the Merit and high Reputation of St. *Augustin*.

The 202d. is a Letter of St. *Jerom*'s to *Alypius* and St. *Augustin*, expressing his joy for their Victory over *Pelagius* and *Cœlestius*; and excusing himself for not having yet refuted the Books of one *Anianus*, a *Pelagian*. It is the same *Anianus* who translated some of St. *Chrysostom*'s Homilies, and dedicated them to *Orontius*, a *Pelagian* Bishop, condemned in the Council of *Ephesus*. *Bede* mentions a Letter of this Author directed to *Evangelus*, where he gives to those of St. *Augustin*'s Party the name of *Traducians*.

By the 203d. Letter, St. *Augustin* exhorteth *Largus* to despise the Goods of this Life, whereof he knew the Vanity by his own Experience, and to profit by the Mischiefs that happened to him. This *Largus* was yet Proconsul in *Africa* in 419. This Letter seems to have been written in 420. after his being recalled.

In the 204th to *Dulcitius*, St. *Augustin* shews, That he had already fully answered the *Donatists*, and laments the fury of those Wretches that murthered themselves, when they could do the Catholicks no further harm. Upon this occasion he treateth of Murder, and shows, That it is not lawful for a Man to kill himself, nor any other that was desirous of Death; He Answers the Case of *Razias*, which is well told in the *Maccabees*, and was looked upon as a noble and generous Action, but not approved by him as Wise and Vertuous. This Letter was written in *Gaudentius*'s time, and composed in 420.

The 205th. Letter to *Consentius*, contains the Explication of some Difficulties about the Nature of glorified Bodies. *Consentius* had asked St. *Augustin*, whether our Saviour's Body, hath now Flesh and Bones, with the same parts and features which he had upon Earth. St. *Augustin* resolveth this question, saying, That Christ's Body is altogether such in Heaven as it was upon Earth, when he left it to ascend into Heaven, and that it appeareth by the Gospel, that he had Hands and Feet, Flesh and Bones, as well after as before the Resurrection: That no mention is made of his Blood, and it is not convenient to ingage too far in those Matters, for fear of entring upon other very hard Questions, such as these; If there is Blood, is not there also Phlegm, Choler, or Melancholy, since the mixture of these four Humours make up the Temper of Humane Bodies: Yet St. *Augustin* denieth not but that these Humours may be in glorified Bodies; but that we ought to have a care of believing them alterable and corruptible; whereupon he undertakes to show by the Testimony of St. *Paul*, that glorified Bodies shall be incorruptible and freed from all corporeal and earthly qualities. *Consentius* had asked likewise, whether those that had been baptized and died without Penance for Sins committed after Baptism, should obtain Remission of them in a certain time. St. *Augustin* remits him to his Treatise *of Faith* and *Good Works*, where he had handled that Question. Lastly, *Consentius* desired to know, Whether God's breathing upon *Adam* was his Soul. St. *Augustin* answers, That it was either his Soul, or that which produced it; but we must be sure not to believe that the Soul is any part of God. *Consentius* to whom this Letter is written, is the same to whom St. *Augustin* dedicated his Treatise *of Lying*, composed in 420. It is probable, that, if this Letter be of the same time, it was written after his Book *of Faith and Good Works*, which was made in 413.

The 206th. is a Letter of Recommendation to Count *Valerius* in the behalf of Bishop *Felix*.

The next, is that which St. *Augustin* writ to Bishop *Claudius*, when he sent him his Books against *Julianus*, published after St. *Jerom*'s Death in 421.

In the 208th. St. *Augustin* exhorts the Virgin *Felicia*, newly returned to the Church from the *Donatist*'s Party, and Scandalized by some Bishops disorders; to continue always in the bosom of the Catholick Church, notwithstanding all those Scandals where she was afflicted. And this gave occasion to his Discourse *of Good and Evil Pastors*. It is thought, that the occasion of this Letter, was the Scandal given by *Antonius* Bishop of *Fussala*, mentioned in the following Letter, supposed to have been written in the end of the Year 422. but that is uncertain.

It is equally uncertain that the next Letter to Pope *Cœlestine* is written by St. *Augustin*; some Criticks doubt it, 1. Because the Stile of this Letter is not, as they pretend, perfectly like that of the other Letters of St. *Augustin*. 2. Because it is found but in one only Manuscript of the *Vatican* Library, which is not above 200 Years old. 3. Because St. *Augustin* seems to speak there after a low manner, and unworthy of his wonted Courage. 4. Because it seemeth not to agree with the Opinions of St. *Augustin*, nor of the other *Africans*, about Appeals. 5. Because *Cœ-*

St. *Auguſtin.* Tome II.

leſtine could not threaten then to ſend Clerks into *Africa*, to ſee his Judgments executed, as he doth in this Letter; becauſe Affairs in *Africa* were then in great Diſorder, and the Emperors had not much Authority in thoſe Provinces that were Uſurp'd by a Tyrant. Yet it muſt be confeſſed, That this Letter agrees exceeding well to the Cuſtoms and Manners of the *African* Church in St. *Auguſtin*'s time, and has a Character of Sincerity. However, If this Letter be truly St. *Auguſtin*'s, he writ it in the beginning of *Cœleſtine*'s Pontificat, ſince he begins it with congratulating his Promotion, which was compaſſed without Intrigues or Diviſion. He ſpeaks afterwards of *Antonius* his Buſineſs, whom he had ordained Biſhop of *Fuſſala*, a Town in the Dioceſs of *Hippo*, where no Biſhop had been before. This Man was brought up in St. *Auguſtin*'s Monaſtery, and looked upon by him as a Man of great Probity: but ſeeing himſelf exalted to ſuch a Dignity, he gave way to his Paſſions, lived diſorderly, and greatly vexed the People that were under his Juriſdiction: Being accuſed before the Provincial Council, he could not be convicted of the Sin of Uncleanneſs that was laid to his Charge; but it appeared that he had oppreſſed and tyrannized over the People intolerably: Thus the Judges finding not ſufficient cauſe utterly to deprive him, and being withal unwilling his Fault ſhould paſs without Puniſhment, left him the quality of Biſhop, upon condition that he ſhould not perform the Functions thereof, nor have any Authority over a People whom he had uſed ſo unjuſtly.

To hinder the Execution of this Judgment, *Antonius* appealed to the Pope, who pretended a Right to receive Appeals from the Judgments of the *African* Biſhops, though theſe conteſted his Right. This happened at a time, when they had bound themſelves to ſee the Canons of the Council of *Sardica*, which the Pope had alledged, as the Canons of the Council of *Nice*, executed with this Proviſo, Till they were aſſured that they were actually made by the Council of *Nice*. *Antonius* therefore obtained of *Boniface* a Letter, enjoyning that he ſhould be reſtored, if he had truly ſtated his Caſe. He returned triumphing with that Letter. But the *African* Biſhops regarded it not: And being threatned, that the Civil Authority ſhould be made uſe of to make them obſerve the Pope's Orders, St. *Auguſtin* took upon himſelf to write this Letter to *Cœleſtine*, wherein he intreateth him by the Blood of Jeſus Chriſt, and by St. *Peter*'s Memory, who forbad the Paſtors of the Church to exerciſe Dominion; not to ſuffer things to go to that extremity: telling him, That his Heart was ſo ſet upon that Buſineſs, That he would renounce his Biſhoprick, if *Antonius* was reſtored at *Fuſſala*. He was not reſtored; and we learn by the 224th. Letter, That his Dioceſs was immediately dependant upon St. *Auguſtin*, though afterwards we meet with a Biſhop of that place.

Antonius flattered himſelf with theſe hopes, either that they would have degraded him from the Epiſcopal Dignity, or have left him in the Biſhoprick. St. *Auguſtin* affirms on the contrary, That there are Examples of Judgments given, or approved by the Holy Apoſtolick See, whereby Biſhops were Puniſhed, without being abſolutely degraded: He citeth three of the lateſt; That of *Priſcus* Biſhop of the Province of *Mauritania Cæſarienſis*, who was ſuffered to continue in his Biſhoprick, being only barr'd from the Metropolitan Dignity, to which his Seniority might have promoted him in his turn; That of *Victor*, Biſhop of the ſame Province, who was likewiſe excluded the right of Primacy, and with whom no other Biſhop did communicate in his Dioceſs; And that of Biſhop *Laurentius*, with whom they proceeded as they had done with *Antonius* of *Fuſſala*. St. *Auguſtin* might have alledged beſides, thoſe Canons which allow to Biſhops the Rank and Honour of their Dignity, and yet deprive them both of the Function and Juriſdiction.

In the 210th. Letter St. *Auguſtin* inſtructeth *Felicitas* and *Ruſticus* how the Evils of this Life are to be endured, and gives them Rules for brotherly Correction. It is probable, that the occaſion of Writing upon this Subject, was the Diſſention which happened among the Virgins conſecrated to God, ſpoken of in the following Letter, about their Superior, whom the Nuns deſigned to change. St. *Auguſtin* having reproved them for it, and exhorted them to Peace and Obedience, preſcribeth them a moſt wiſe and prudent Rule of Life. This Letter was written after the Death of St. *Auguſtin*'s Siſter, who governed that Monaſtery at the time when moſt of the *Donatiſts* were re-united, in 424.

The 212th. is a Letter of Recommendation to *Quintianus*, in the behalf of an holy Widow named *Galla*, and of her Daughter *Simpliciola*, who carried about with them the Reliques of the Martyr St. *Stephen*.

After this Letter, comes the Act made at *Hippo*, upon the 14th. of *September*, 426. in the Church of *Peace*: whereby St. *Auguſtin* chuſeth *Heraclius* the Prieſt to be his Succeſſor and Coadjutor, yet without admitting him into Biſhop's Orders; and the People approve his Choice with their Acclamations.

The Occaſion of the 214th. Letter is this: St. *Auguſtin* having been informed by two Brethren of the Monaſtery at *Adrumetum*, that there had been ſome Diſputes among the Monks of that Convent, about Grace and Free-Will; becauſe, ſome willing to eſtabliſh the Doctrine of Grace, went ſo far as to deny Free-Will: whereas the others acknowledging Free-Will, did confeſs notwithſtanding, that it was aſſiſted by the help of the Grace of Jeſus Chriſt; approves of the latter Opinion; affirming, That he taught no other Doctrine, in his Letter to Saint *Sixtus*.

He again handleth the ſame Matter in the next Letter, directed to *Valentinus*, Abbot of the Monaſtery at *Adrumetum*, and to the Brethren of the ſame Monaſtery. He joined

to

to this Letter his Book of *Grace and Free-Will*, which he ſent at the ſame time to inſtruct them.

St. *Auguſtin.* Tome II.

Valentinus anſwered St. *Auguſtin* in the 216th. Letter: wherein, after he had thank'd him for his Letters, he gives him an Account how that Diſturbance happened in his Monaſtery, by the Imprudence of five or ſix that were offended at thoſe Diſcourſes of St. *Auguſtin*, which *Florus* had brought from *Uzala* to their Convent. That *Evodius*, Biſhop of *Uzala*, not being able to ſatisfie them, they came to him: That this Viſit had produced a good Effect, ſeeing it brought to their Monaſtery ſuch holy Inſtructions as his were, and had confirmed them in their Belief touching *Grace* and *Free-Will*. Theſe Letters are of the Year 426.

The 217th. Letter of St. *Auguſtin* is written to *Vitalis*, to undeceive him of thoſe Notions which he had then taken up; namely, That the Beginning of Faith was not a Gift of God, but the mere Product of Man's Will. St. *Auguſtin* refutes this Opinion, by the Prayers of the Church; by St. *Cyprian*'s Teſtimony, in his Book of *The Lord's Prayer*; and by ſeveral other Paſſages of Scripture. Afterwards he explains the difference betwixt the *Law* and *Grace*; proving, That the True Grace of Jeſus Chriſt, doth not conſiſt in Natural Helps, or in External Graces. At laſt he propoſes Twelve Articles; wherein he comprehends whatſoever he thinks neceſſary to be believed concerning Grace. The Twelve Articles are theſe:

" I. We know, That before Men were born into this World, they had no other wherein they " did either Good or Evil.... But deſcending from *Adam* according to the Fleſh, they par- " take, by their Birth, of the Poyſon of that ancient Death which he became ſubject to by his " Sin; and that they are not delivered from Eternal Death, except they are regenerated in " Jeſus Chriſt through his Grace.

" II. We know, That the Grace of God is not given upon the account of any Merit, either " to Infants, or to Men that are come to the Age of Reaſon.

" III. We know, That Grace is an Aſſiſtance afforded for every Action, to thoſe that have " attained to the Age of Reaſon.

" IV. We know, That it is not given to all Men; and that thoſe to whom it is given, re- " ceive it, without having deſerved it by their Works, or by their Will; which appears parti- " cularly in Infants.

" V. We know, That it is out of God's mere Mercy, that it is given to thoſe to whom it is " given.

" VI. We know, That it is by a juſt Judgment of God, that it is not given to thoſe to whom it " is not given.

" VII. We know, That we ſhall all appear before the Judgment-Seat of Jeſus Chriſt, that " every one may receive either Reward or Puniſhment according to what he ſhall have done in " the Body, and not according to what he ſhould have done had he lived longer.

" VIII. We know, That Infants ſhall not receive Recompence or Puniſhment, but ac- " cording to what they ſhall have done in the Body; that is, whil'ſt they were in the Body; " that is, according as ſome have been regenerate, and others not.

" IX. We know, That Eternal Happineſs is enſured to all thoſe that die in Jeſus Chriſt; " and that nothing is imputed to them of what they might have done, had they been " alive.

" X. We know, That as many as Believe in God, Believe willingly, and by an Action " of their free Will.

" XI. We know, That we ought to pray unto God for thoſe that Believe not, that they " would Believe.

" XII. We know, That whenſoever any of theſe embraces the Faith, we are to give God " Thanks ſincerely, and from the bottom of our Hearts, as being an Effect of his Mercy, and " that when we do it as we are wont to do, we perform a Duty incumbent upon us.

Theſe are the Twelve fundamental Points of St. *Auguſtin*'s Doctrine of *Grace*; to the which he reſtrains the Faith of the Catholick Church about that Matter. He applieth them likewiſe to his particular Diſpute with *Vitalis*, to know whether Grace goes before, or only followeth the Will; that is, Whether Grace be given us, becauſe we will have it? as *Vitalis* affirms: Or, Whether the Will it ſelf is not a thing which God worketh in us by his Grace? as St. *Auguſtin* pretends that it followeth upon the Twelve Principles which he lays down. To ſhew this, the reſt of this Letter is taken up; wherein he concludes, That the Beginning of Faith, Converſion, and a good Mind, comes from God, and not from Free-Will. This Letter, in all probability, is one of the laſt of St. *Auguſtin*'s Works concerning *Grace*.

In the 218th. Letter St. *Auguſtin* exhorts one *Palatinus* to perſevere and to proceed in Piety, and not to truſt to his own Strength. This likewiſe is one of the laſt of St. *Auguſtin*'s Letters.

The 219th. is a Letter written in the Names of *Aurelius*, St. *Auguſtin*, and *Florentius*, Biſhops in *Africa*, to *Proculus* and *Cilinnius*, Biſhops in *Gaul*, concerning *Leporius* the Monk; who having been expelled out of the Dioceſs of *Marſeilles*, becauſe of his Errors about the Incarnation, made a Retractation of them in *Africa*; which was drawn up by St. *Auguſtin*, and ſent to the Gallican Biſhops with this Letter; whereby they entreat the Biſhops to whom they

St. *Auguſtin.* Tome II.

they write, to receive him, ſeeing he had condemned thoſe Errors for which they had expelled him. This Letter was written after the Books of *Correction* and *Grace*.

The 220th. is directed to Count *Boniface*; who being married again after the death of his former Wife, was engaged in worldly Buſineſſes, and had committed very conſiderable Faults. St. *Auguſtin* adviſeth him by this Letter, to Contain, if he could perſuade his Wife to conſent to it; and to make uſe of his Authority, only to do good. This Letter is full of excellent inſtructions for Men of the World.

Quodvultdeus, a Deacon of *Carthage*, deſireth St. *Auguſtin*, by the 221ſt. Letter, to draw up a Catalogue of Hereſies. St. *Auguſtin* excuſes himſelf from doing it, in the 222d. The Deacon having again urged it by the 223d. he promiſes him in the 224th. to do it when he is at leiſure. Theſe Letters were written after his Book of *Retractations*, in 428.

The 225th. Letter is St. *Proſper's*; whereby he gives St. *Auguſtin* notice, That ſeveral Chriſtians of *Marſeilles* having ſeen his Works againſt the *Pelagians*, had believed, That what he taught concerning the Vocation of the Elect, was contrary to the Doctrine of the Fathers; and that they were more averſe to his Notions, when they had read his Book of *Correction* and *Grace*. Then he relateth their Opinions, and ſaith, (1.) "That they indeed acknowledge "that all Men have ſinned in *Adam*; and that our Salvation is not the Product of our Works, "but of Grace, that works the ſame by the means of Regeneration: But they hold, That the "Propitiation made by the Blood of Jeſus Chriſt, is offered to all Men without Exception; ſo that as many as will embrace the Faith, and be Baptized, may obtain Salvation. "(2.) That before the Creation, God by his Fore-knowledge, did know thoſe that ſhould "Believe, and who with the ſuccour of that Grace enabling them to preſerve that Faith which "they had once embraced, ſhould maintain the ſame unto the end; and that he had predeſtinated them to his Eternal Kingdom, foreſeeing that after he had freely called them, they "would make themſelves worthy of his Election, and end their Life holily. (3.) That God "calls all Men to the Faith, and to good Works, by his Inſtructions; and that Salvation is "the Reward of thoſe that are willing to do good. (4.) That whatſoever is ſaid of the Decree "of God's Will, touching the Call of Men, whereby it is ſaid that the Elect have been ſeparated from the Reprobate, is fit for nothing but to inſpire Men with Deſpondency, Idleneſs, "Negligence and Lukewarmneſs; becauſe it ſeems to no purpoſe to work, if the Reprobate "cannot be ſaved, nor the Elect be damned. (5.) That thereby all Vertues are deſtroyed. "(6.) That this Doctrine doth eſtabliſh, under the Name of *Predeſtination*, a fatal and unavoidable Neceſſity, or forceth Men to ſay that Mankind were created of different Natures. "(7.) That what is alledged out of the Epiſtle to the *Romans*, to prove, That Grace doth "prevent the Merits of the Elect, was never underſtood in this ſence by any Eccleſiaſtical Author. (8.) That ſome reduce that Grace which prevents our Merits, to the natural Faculties of "Free-Will, and of Reaſon; by the good uſe whereof we arrive to that Grace which makes us to "be regenerated in Jeſus Chriſt. (9.) That God hath indeed reſolved to communicate his Grace "only to thoſe that are Regenerate; but that all are called to partake of that ſaving Gift, whether it be by the Natural Law, or by the Preaching of the Goſpel. (10.) That Men are as "much diſpoſed to Good as Evil: That the Spirit and the Will may equally turn to Evil; and, "That Obedience or Diſobedience to God's Command, wholly depends upon our Liberty. "(11.) That Infants dying before the Uſe of Reaſon, are either ſaved or damned, according to "what God foreſees that they would have been, had they come to the Age of Acting and "Deſerving. (12.) That the ſame is to be ſaid of the Nations which God hath not enlightned with the Light that is neceſſary to Salvation". Theſe are moſt of the Points of the *Semipelagians* Doctrine, and of the Objections which they made againſt that of St. *Auguſtin*. St. *Proſper* intreateth him by this Letter to refute theſe Perſons Opinions, and to clear the Difficulties propoſed by them, telling him, That *Hilary* Biſhop of *Arles*, a conſiderable Man, and much addicted to the Study of Spiritual and Eccleſiaſtical Matters; and who did much admire and approve St. *Auguſtin's* Doctrine in all other things, could not reliſh his Principles about the Decree of the Vocation of the Elect.

This is not that *Hilary*, who had been St. *Auguſtin's* Diſciple, who writ at the ſame time with *Proſper* to St. *Auguſtin* upon the ſame Subject.

This Letter is the 226th. therein he gives a more particular Account than St. *Proſper* had done, of thoſe Points of St. *Auguſtin's* Doctrine, that diſturbed the Prieſts of *Marſeilles*, of the Objections which they made, and of their Anſwers to thoſe Paſſages of Scripture that were quoted by St. *Auguſtin*; which may be all reduced to theſe four Propoſitions. 1. That Man may believe, and deſire to be healed, by the ſtrength of his own Free-Will. 2. That when he is gone ſo far, God never denieth him his Grace. 3. That Election and Reprobation are Conſequences of God's Preſcience, whereby he ſees the Good or the Evil which Men ſhall do, or ſhould have done if they had lived. 4. That Grace is not effectual of it ſelf, and what help ſoever God affords to thoſe that are Predeſtinated; it is ſtill in their own Power either to make uſe of, or to reject it. Both theſe Letters were written in 429. after *Hilary's* promotion to the Biſhoprick of *Arles*. St. *Auguſtin* anſwered them by his Books *of the Predeſtination of the Saints*, and *of the Gift of Perſeverance*.

The 227th. to the holy old Man *Alypius*, is written upon the Converſion of two Pagans who had been baptized at *Eaſter*; The Name of the one, was *Gabinianus*; the other was a Phyſician called

called *Dioscorus*, for whom God had wrought several Miracles, related by St. *Augustin* in this Letter. It is here placed among those that were written in 429. but the Date of it is uncertain. St. Augustin. Tome II.

The Date of the next to *Honoratus* is certain by *Possidius*'s Testimony, who quotes it in the Life of St. *Augustin*; and affirms, That he writ it about the latter end of his Life; when the *Vandals* were almost Masters of *Africa*. He examines the Question in this Letter, Whether Priests, Clerks, and Bishops, may fly and forsake their Flocks in time of Persecution? St. *Augustin* affirms, That there are but two Occasions upon which they are permitted so to do. 1. If the Persecutors designed Mischief to some particular Pastors by name, because then it is profitable, even for the Good of the Church, for them to flee, and leave the others quiet. 2. When the Ministers of Jesus Christ meet with none that have need of their Ministery. In all other Cases, Pastors are obliged to watch over the Flock which Christ hath committed to them; neither can they forsake it without a Crime. This St. *Augustin* excellently proves in this Letter, and in terms dictated by the Fire of his fervent Charity, and with Reasons supported by a Zeal altogether Divine. He represents the desolation of a Town which is like to be taken; and the Necessity of the presence of Christ's Ministers. " In such occasions, saith he, What flocking " is there to the Church of Persons of all Ages and Sexes; whereof, some require Baptism, others " Reconciliation, others to be put under Penance, and all crave comfort. If then no Ministers " are to be found. What misfortune is that for such as go out of this Life, being Unregenerate, " or not loosed? What Grief is it to their Kindred, if they be Faithful, that they cannot hope " to see them with them in everlasting rest? What Crys, what Lamentations, nay, what Im- " precations from some, to see themselves without Ministers, and without Sacraments? If on " the contrary, Ministers have proved Faithful, in not forsaking their People; they are help- " full to all the World, according to the Abilities which it hath pleased God to endue them with; " Some are baptized, others are reconciled; none is deprived of the Communion of the Lord's- " Body. All are conforted, fortified, and exhorted to implore by fervent Prayers the Assistance " of the Mercy of God. This Passage is very remarkable, since it shews what was the Church's Opinion at all times concerning the Necessity of Sacraments

St. *Augustin* handleth two other Questions upon the same Subject: The First, Whether it be lawful for Pastors to flee in such Calamities, that they may preserve themselves for the Service of the Church in more peaceable times. He saith, That they may do it if there be other Ministers, to supply their places, and who are necessary to the Church. The Second, if it happens that the Persecution were only against the Pastors, in this case they may flee; and whether is better, That the Church should want them by their going away, or be deprived of them by their Death? St. *Augustin* answers, That this Supposition is very extraordinary; That it seldom happens, that they aim only at Church-men; That in this case they might hide themselves. It is to be presumed, That as all the Laity shall not perish, so some of the Clergy may escape. That it were to be wished, that in such occasions some should fly, and others remain; Then it would be a fine thing, if among Ministers there should be a Dispute, who should stay behind, that the Church might not be forsaken. That to decide this Difference, it should be convenient to cast Lots, that none might go about to free himself from the necessity of staying, under pretence of being more necessary for the Church than others.

He concludes with these words, *We do what Jesus Christ, either Permits or Commands, if we withdraw when there are other Ministers to serve the Church. But when by our flight Christ's Sheep are deprived of the Food that is to sustain the life of their Souls, then we are hirelings.*

The 229th. Letter is directed to Count *Darius*, who was sent into *Africa* to treat of Peace. St. *Augustin* wishes him Joy of that Employ. The Count gives him Thanks by the 230th. Letter, and prayeth him to send him his Book *of Confessions*. This Saint satisfies him by the 231st. Letter, wherein he treateth occasionally of the love of Praise. He saith thereupon, 1. That Men ought not to desire Praises for that which is not praise-worthy in them. 2. That they should not propose to themselves as the end of their good Actions, to get Commendations from Men. 3. Yet they may desire the Praises of Men, for the sake of those very Men, because the Praises given to them, are profitable for others. 4. That such as find not in themselves those Vertues for which they are commended, ought to be ashamed that they are not what they are thought to be, and what they should be indeed; and this may make them desire to become such. 5. That on the contrary, if there be in them something of that which is commended, they are to give God thanks for it, and be glad to see that others have an esteem for Vertue. Towards the end of the Letter, he speaks of Prosperity and Adversity. *The Caresses, saith he, of this World are more dangerous than its Persecutions, unless we look upon the Rest which we may enjoy here, as a means to make us lead a quiet and a peaceable Life in all Godliness and Honesty. This the Apostle commands us to ask of God: for if the heart be not full of Charity and Piety, rest and ease from the troubles of Life is but Perdition: and serves only as an Instrument or Provocation to Lust. If therefore we desire to lead a quiet Life, let it be only upon this account, that we may the better practise both Piety and Charity.* These Letters are supposed to have been written about the latter end of St. *Augustin*'s Life.

St. *Auguſtin.* Tome II.

The Fourth Claſſe.

THE *Laſt Claſſe* of St. *Auguſtin*'s Epiſtles, containeth thoſe whoſe Date is not well known.

The Firſt of theſe is the 232d. Letter, in anſwer to the Inhabitants of *Madaura*, whereof the greater Part were yet Idolaters. He exhorts them to embrace the Chriſtian Religion; and to enduce them to it, he mentions the dreadfulneſs of the Laſt Judgment, which he proves ſhall infallibly come, becauſe the other Prophecies are fulfilled: He alſo ſaith ſomething concerning the Myſtery of the Trinity, and that of the Incarnation. This Letter was probably written ſome time after the Edict Publiſhed by *Honorius* in the Year 399. againſt the Temples.

The 233d. Letter, is a Challenge from St. *Auguſtin* to a Philoſopher, one *Longinianus*, to oblige him to give an Account in Writing after what manner he believed, that God was to be Worſhipped; and what he thought of Jeſus Chriſt.

Longinianus anſwers St. *Auguſtin* in the 234th. Letter; and ſaith, according to *Plato*'s Principles, That the way to come to God, is to live Well, and to get the Favour of the inferior Gods by Propitiatory Sacrifices, that we may come to the Supreme Creatour. As for Jeſus Chriſt, he anſwereth, That he can ſay nothing of him, becauſe he knew him not.

St. *Auguſtin* deſireth *Longinianus* to explain himſelf about what he had ſaid, That the Way to come to God was to live Well, and to purifie our Selves by Expiations and Sacrifices; he asketh him, Whether it be the ſame Thing, or Two different Things. This is in the 235th Letter.

By the 236th. he gives *Deuterius* notice, That he had degraded, and expelled a Deacon, one *Victorinus*, convicted of being a *Manichee*, though he was but a Hearer among them, and not one of thoſe they call Elect. He ſpeaks of the difference which they made betwixt thoſe Two ſorts of Perſons; and he ſpeaks of their principal Errours.

In the 237th. Letter, he oppoſes the Dreams of the *Manichees*, and *Priſcillianiſts*, concerning the Apocryphal Books; and ridicules the phantaſtical Interpretations, which they made of the Canonical Books.

The 238th. is a Relation of a Conference that St. *Auguſtin* had about the Myſtery of the Trinity, with an *Arian*, called *Paſcentius*. The Three following Letters directed to this *Arian*, carry on the ſame Diſpute.

The 242d. is alſo written to *Elpidius*, an *Arian*, to whom he ſhoweth, That the Son of God is equal to his Father.

In the 243d. St. *Auguſtin* exhorts *Latus*, who having quitted the World, was tempted to return to it: He exhorts him, I ſay, to perſevere in his former Reſolution; and not to ſuffer his tenderneſs for his Relations, to weaken his Courage. He ſhews, in this Letter, That the renouncing of all Things to follow Chriſt, ought to proceed ſo far, as to leave Father and Mother, to ſerve God.

The 244th. is a Letter of Conſolation to *Chryſinus*, for a Loſs which he had ſuſtained.

In the 245th. to *Poſſidius*, St. *Auguſtin* ſpeaks, with great moderation, of Women's Dreſſes: He thinks, That fine Cloaths ought not to be forbidden to Married Women, who are obliged to pleaſe their Husbands; but he would not have them Paint, or Waſh, to make them appear fairer, or freſher, becauſe it is not probable, that their Husbands ſhould deſire to be thus deceived; for the true Ornament of Chriſtians, of both Sexes, is neither deceitful Painting, nor Gold, nor precious Stuffs, but Purity of Manners. Laſtly, he prohibits thoſe Superſtitious Dreſſings, which they uſed to render a kind of Homage to *Dæmons*. He tells *Poſſidius*, That he would not adviſe him to ordain a Man that had been Baptized among the *Donatiſts*.

The 246th. Letter to *Lampadius*, is againſt thoſe who accuſe Fate for the Faults which they commit themſelves.

By the 247th. Letter, St. *Auguſtin* reproves one *Romulus*, a Rich Man, that would make his Debtors to pay twice; pretending, That they had pay'd his Receiver in his Wrong.

The 248th. to *Sebaſtianus*, is concerning that Sorrow which affects the Righteous, becauſe of the impiety of the Wicked.

In the 249th. St. *Auguſtin* Comforteth *Reſtitutus* the Deacon, who could hardly bear with the Diſorders of ill Chriſtians; and inſtructs him to keep Peace with the Wicked.

The 250th. Letter is very conſiderable. There St. *Auguſtin* reſolveth a very nice Queſtion: Whether a whole Family, or Community, may be Excommunicated for the Sin of one Member. It is directed to a young Biſhop, called *Auxilius*, who had Excommunicated one *Claſſicianus*, with his whole Family, becauſe he came to the Church to demand certain Perſons who had taken Sanctuary there, after he had, by a falſe Oath, profaned the Sanctity of the Goſpel. He asks that Biſhop, VVhat Reaſon he could have for ſo doing; and how the Son can be Excommunicated for the Father's Sin, the VVife for her Husband's, and the Servant for his

his Master's, yea the Children that are yet unborn: Excommunication being not a Punishment which falls upon the Body, but an Effect of the Power given to Christ's Ministers, to bind and to loose, which properly concerns the Soul. St. *Augustin* confesses, That this Bishop might ground his Proceeding upon the Example of some great Bishops, who had Anathematized whole Families for one particular Person's Sin. But he affirms, That they could hardly justifie their Action, and that he never durst do it himself. Yet he addeth, rather in Jest, than Earnest, that he is ready to hear his Reasons, "Your Youth (*saith he*) and the shortness of the "time that you have been Bishop, will not hinder me from hearing your Reasons. I am ready "to learn of you, how young soever you be; though the Grey Heirs that I wear, and all the "Experience I may have got by those many Years that I have been Bishop, give me some small "Authority over you. After that, he Aggravates the Injustice of that Pretence which might prove the Loss of a Soul for want of Baptism, through the Impossibility to which the Sentence of Excommunication reduced those that were Excommunicated, from having recourse to the Sacraments. Wherefore he exhorteth *Auxilius* to revoke a Sentence, wherein Anger had a greater share than Justice; and so much the rather, because he, against whom it was pronounced, had no ways deserved it. St. *Austin.* Tome II.

In the next Letter, St. *Augustin* sendeth Word to *Classicianus*, That he will propose that Question in a Council; that he was much concerned at *Auxilius* his Behaviour, especially because it might happen, that some might die without Baptism; that he will also cause to be examined there, if need be, this Question; Whether those ought not to be Excommunicated who deal unfaithfully with their Securities; and that, if it should be requisite, he would write to the See of *Rome* about it, that so what was to be done in such Occasions, might be settled with general Consent. But he sticks not to affirm, "That an unjust Excommunication is of great-"er Prejudice to him that pronounces it, than to him against whom it is pronounced; for-"asmuch as the Holy Ghost, who dwelleth in the Saints, never puts any to Pain who deserves "it not: For if Charity is neither rash, nor hasty, What shall we say of him that diffuseth it "into our Hearts?

The 251st. Letter was written by St. *Augustin* to *Pancarius*, concerning one *Secundinus* a Priest, that was accused before him. He tells *Pancarius*, That he will receive the Accusations of *Catholicks*, but not of *Hereticks*; and prays him not to suffer any Disorder to be committed in that Priest's House.

The Four following Letters were written about a Virgin that was an Orphan, who was committed to the Church's Trust. St. *Augustin* declares, in these Letters, That he takes all the Care of her that may be; and that he will not marry her, without her consent, to a *Catholick*; and that he was looking out for an advantageous Match for her.

The 256th. is an Answer of St. *Augustin's* to *Christinus*, who desired, That he would write to him, to exhort him to give himself to God.

The 257th. is a Letter of Complement to *Orontius*.

In the 258th. he Congratulates *Martianus* for being a *Catechumen*, exhorting him speedily to receive Baptism.

The 259th. was written to reclaim a very lewd Man, one *Cornelius*, from his evil Way; and adviseth him to imitate his Wife, who lately deceased; upon whom St. *Augustin* promiseth to write a Panegyrick, if he will follow her Vertue.

By the next, *Audax* desireth St. *Augustin* to write longer than he used to do, and concludes with Four Verses in his Commendation. St. *Augustin* excuseth himself for his great Business, advising him to read his Works, and to come and see him. That's the Subject of the 261st. Letter.

In the 262d. St. *Augustin* reproves one *Ecdicia*, a Lady, severely; who (unknown to her Husband, whom she had brought to consent to live in Continence with her) had distributed his whole Estate to the Poor, and put on a Widow's Habit. He enjoyns her to make her Husband Satisfaction; who, out of Anger for his Wife's Behaviour, lived disorderly. This Letter is full of excellent Instructions for married Wives, teaching them not to give their Husbands any occasion of Discontent, by indiscreet Devotion.

The 263d. is a Letter of Consolation to *Sapida*; who having wrought a Garment for her Brother *Timothy*, and he dying, desired, for her Comfort, that St. *Augustin* would wear it. St. *Augustin* thanks her; but wishes her to seek in the Scripture some more solid Consolations.

In the 264th. he comforteth a Lady called *Maxima*, who beheld with Grief, and Disturbance, her Country infected with Errors.

The 265th. to *Seleuciana*, is a Refutation of the Enthusiastical Notions of a certain *Novatian*, concerning Baptism, and St. *Peter's* Repentance. He affirmeth, in the First place, That St. *Peter* was Baptized as well as the other Apostles: That it is an Errour to say, That he had not received the Baptism of Water before his Sin, though he had not yet received the Baptism of the Holy Ghost; yea, he thinks it probable, That the Apostles were Baptized by Christ himself. He saith, Secondly, That when it is said, that St. *Peter* did Penance, we are not to think that he did as they do in the Church, who are properly called Penitents. Thirdly, he distinguishes Two sorts of Penance, that which goeth before Baptism, and that which cometh after; when after Baptism Men have committed any of those Sins, for which they ought to be Excommunicated

St. *Auguſtin.* Tome II.

municated, and cut off from the Altar, after which they are reconciled if they deſerve it: And this ſort is the Penance of thoſe to whom is properly given in the Church the Name of Penitents. Beſides theſe two ſorts, They admit alſo a daily Penance of thoſe very Faithful, that live in Piety and Humility; whereby they Petition, and obtain the forgiveneſs of light, but Cuſtomary Sins, which Humane Frailty makes us fall into; and which, ſaith he, we ought to expiate continually, leſt we be over-whelmed with their Number.

In the 266th. Letter, St. *Auguſtin* offers to *Florentina*, a Virgin, to explain all the Difficulties which ſhe ſhould deſire to have cleared.

The 267th. is a Pious Letter to *Fabiola*; wherein he rejoyceth, becauſe ſhe bore the Exile of this Life with difficulty.

St. *Auguſtin* having borrowed a Sum of Money to pay the Debt of one *Faſcius*, who retired into the Church, being purſued by his Creditors; intreateth his People in the 268th. Letter, to make a Gathering, that he might repay that Summ.

By the 269th. St. *Auguſtin* intreateth Biſhop *Nobilius* to excuſe him, becauſe he could not be preſent at the Conſecration of a new Church, to which that Biſhop had invited him.

The laſt, is a Letter directed to St. *Auguſtin*, but the Author of it is not known. By it, he that wrote it, complaineth to St. *Auguſtin*, That he had not met him with Biſhop *Severus* in the City of *Leges*, where he hoped to find him.

To theſe Letters, we ought to add the Fragment of a Letter of St. *Auguſtin* to *Maximus*, which the *Benedictines* have taken out of *Primaſius* his Commentary upon the *Revelations*, and placed at the latter end of the Second Tome in their Edition. This Fragment contains ſeveral Rules concerning the degrees of Chriſtian Perfection.

It is manifeſt by theſe Extracts from St. *Auguſtin*'s Letters, That they are an inexhauſtible Spring of Principles, Rules, Precepts and Maxims upon the Articles of our Faith, and the Diſcipline of the Church upon Chriſtian Morals, and the Government of Life: For which Reaſon, I inſiſted the longer upon them, and drew the Extracts at large, there being hardly one that deſerves not particular Attention, and where there is not ſome fine ſtroke to be taken notice of. I intend to diſcourſe more briefly of the reſt of this Father's Works.

The Addition of Spurious Pieces annexed to this Volume, is not very large.

There are at firſt Thirteen Letters or Notes under the Names of St. *Auguſtin* to *Boniface*, and of *Boniface* to St. *Auguſtin*; containing ſeveral Paſſages taken out of St. *Auguſtin*'s Genuine Letters, and ſeveral things may be obſerved, which do not agree with the Hiſtory of that time: They are compoſed by one who had a mind to exerciſe his Pen with that Fiction.

We need not ſpeak here of *Pelagius* his Letter to *Demetrias*, which is after theſe to *Boniface*.

The two next, whereof the one is entituled, *St.* Cyril of *Jeruſalem*'s *Letter to St.* Auguſtin *concerning the Vertues of St.* Jerom: And the other, *St.* Auguſtin's *Anſwer to St.* Cyril *about St. Jerom*'s *Miracles*; diſcover their Impoſture by their very Title; as is obſerved, in another place; ſince St. *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem* died long before St. *Jerom*.

Laſtly, St. *Auguſtin*'s Diſpute with *Paſcentius*, that was formerly placed among the Letters, Number 178. is very rightly placed by the *Benedictines* among the Spurious Books. It is certain by the 238th. Letter, That St. *Auguſtin* had a Conference with *Paſcentius*; but nothing like that which is mentioned in this Letter. For he obſerves, 1. That he could not obtain, that what was ſaid on both ſides, ſhould be committed to Writing, but every thing is written in this Conference and inſerted into the Publick Acts. In the former, no body Preſided; in this, there is a Judge called *Laurentius*. That whereof St. *Auguſtin* ſpeaks, was held at *Carthage*; This is ſuppoſed to have been at *Hippo*. Both *Poſſidius* and St. *Auguſtin* mention one Conference with *Paſcentius*; but this ſuppoſeth that they had had a Diſpute before. The Character of both the Perſons introduced ſpeaking in this, is nothing like either St. *Auguſtin*'s or *Paſcentius*'s. This is but a cold Diſpute, and there is little ſaid to the purpoſe. The Anſwers made for St. *Auguſtin* are weak, and the Objections attributed to *Paſcentius*, have nothing of that Fire and Rage which *Poſſidius* taxeth him with. The Stile of thoſe Anſwers, ſuppoſed to be St. *Auguſtin*'s, comes not near that of this Saint, either in his Letters or in his Conferences. There are terms and manners of Expreſſion, which he never uſed, and which do not belong to that time. In a word, This Treatiſe is found in no Manuſcripts annexed to St. *Auguſtin*'s Works or Letters. Theſe Reaſons ſufficiently prove, That this Work is not a Conference which St. *Auguſtin* really had with *Paſcentius*, but a Dialogue compoſed by ſome other Author. Now we know none to whom it may be more properly aſcribed, than to *Vigilius Tapſenſis*, who compoſed ſeveral Dialogues of that ſort under the Names of ſeveral great Men.

The

The THIRD TOME.

THE Third Tome of the New Edition of St. *Auguſtin*, containeth his Treatiſes upon the Holy Scripture, which in the former Editions were diſperſed in other Volumes. St. *Auguſtin* Tome III.

The *Benedictines* have placed the Books *of Chriſtian Doctrine* firſt, which may ſerve in ſtead of a Preface to St. *Auguſtin*'s Commentaries upon the Holy Scripture; becauſe they contain ſuch Precepts and Rules as he thought were to be obſerved, both for the underſtanding and the explaining of the Scriptures: He began this Work ſoon after he was Conſecrated, about the Year 397. but he ſtop'd at the 36th. Chapter of the Third Book; and afterwards added the reſt of this Book with the Fourth in 426. as he ſays himſelf in his *Retractations*; where he makes two Remarks upon that Work. 1. That it is not certain, as he affirmed, That *the Wiſdom of Solomon* was written by *Jeſus* the Son of *Syrach*, the Author of *Eccleſiaſticus*. 2. That when he ſaith, That the Old Teſtament containeth 44 Books, he uſed that word in the ſence of the Church; though St. *Paul* ſeems to underſtand by the Old Teſtament no more than the Law given upon Mount *Sinai*; He confeſſeth likewiſe, That he committed a Fault of memory, in quoting one of St. *Ambroſe*'s Books for another.

In the Preface to this Work, he anſwereth three ſorts of Perſons who might find fault with it; Some, becauſe they did not underſtand it; Others, becauſe they could not make uſe of the Precepts and Rules which he gives to underſtand, and to expound the Scripture; and the laſt, becauſe they underſtand and expound the Holy Scripture without making uſe of his Rules, only by the light of the Holy Ghoſt. He tells the Firſt and Second, That it is not his fault if they want Underſtanding or Light. And the Third, That they ought not to judge of others by themſelves, ſince God hath not granted the ſame Gifts to all Men: and that we ſhould tempt him, if we neglected thoſe Humane means which God affords us to underſtand the Holy Scripture, under pretence that he can give us that knowledge, without either Study or Labour.

The deſign of this Book is, as we have obſerved, to give Rules and Precepts, both to Underſtand and to Explain the Holy Scripture. Theſe two divide the whole Work. He treateth in the Three firſt Books of the Underſtanding of the Scripture; and in the laſt, of the way to Expound it, and make it intelligible to others.

The Firſt Book contains looſe Reflections and general Principles. He obſerves at firſt, That all Knowledge is either of Signs or of Things; and that Things are expreſſed by Signs. He diſtinguiſheth two ſorts of Things; ſome which we may enjoy, and others which we are only to uſe. The three Perſons of the Divinity, are the only Thing we are to enjoy. They are that ineffable God, whom we look upon as the Supreme Being, as the immutable Wiſdom to be preferred before all Things; to know him, we muſt Purifie our Minds: And to teach us this, the Wiſdom of God was incarnate; it is that which Cures Man of his Diſtempers, Weakneſſes, and Blindneſs. He confirmed our Faith by his Reſurrection and Aſcenſion; and he increaſes and upholdeth it by the Hope of Reward, the Fear of Puniſhment, and by the Expectation of the Laſt Judgment. He hath eſtabliſhed a Church, to which he hath granted neceſſary Gifts and Graces to lead Men to their Heavenly Country. He gave it Keys to bind Sinners, and to looſe them that are Penitent. As for created Beings, we are not permitted to enjoy them; that is to ſay, to eſteem them as our Ultimate End; but we may uſe them, and they ought to be loved with reſpect to God. Thus we are to love both our Selves and our Neighbour. The Scripture commands us not to love our Selves; we are but too prone to this naturally, but it enjoyns us to love our Neighbour. The whole Law centers in this twofold Charity, which makes us love God above all things, and our Neighbour as our ſelves. Our Charity towards our Neighbour ought to be regulated: We muſt not love Sinners as Sinners, but as Men; and though we are more ſtrictly obliged to ſuccour thoſe that are near to us, whether by Kindred or Friendſhip, yet we ought to love all Men alike, becauſe they are our Neighbours; even Angels are to be comprehended under this general Name. St. *Auguſtin* having laid down theſe Principles, ſaith, That the double Precept of Charity, is to be a Rule for the underſtanding of the Holy Scriptures. That any ſence that hath no relation to Charity, is not certainly the true ſence; but on the contrary, every ſence which hath reſpect to it, is uſeful; though not always conformable to the Writer's intention; and yet we ſhould endeavour not to depart from their particular meaning. He ſaith, in the laſt place, That the underſtanding of the Scripture is compriſed in Faith, Hope, and Charity; So that a Chriſtian who is endued with theſe three Vertues, hath no abſolute need of the Scripture for himſelf; but only for the Inſtruction of others: Yea, That ſeveral Perſons live very Chriſtian Lives in their Solitude without the help of the Sacred Books. He concludes from all that he hath ſaid in this Book, That whoſoever is throughly perſwaded, that the Scripture is that Charity which proceedeth out of a pure Heart, of a good Conſcience and Faith unfeigned, may without fear betake himſelf to the reading of the Holy Scripture.

In the Second Book, he comes to the Knowledge of Signs; and having given the Definition, and Diviſions of them, he obſerves, That Words hold the Firſt place among Signs. He ſhows how the Sound of VVords is formed, and how the variety of Tongues was introduced into the VVorld. He ſuppoſes that the Scripture is not plain every where; and that there is need of

St. *Auguſtin.* Tome III.

Application to underſtand it; that the moſt Skilful meet with Difficulties; that the Allegories and Figures, there to be met with, ſometimes render it dark; but commonly what is obſcure in one place, is cleared in another; and ſo the Holy Ghoſt feeds the Hungry with what is clear, and prevents their being nauſeated by exerciſing them with what is obſcure. He ſheweth, at laſt, by what Degrees we may attain to the perfect Knowledge of the VViſdom, contained in the Holy Scripture. Theſe Degrees are, The Fear of God, Piety, Knowledge, Courage, Counſel, and Purity of Heart. Afterwards followeth a Catalogue of the Canonical Books, * the very ſame with ours. The Rule he makes uſe of to diſtinguiſh them, is this. *I deſire* (ſaith he) *that to know the Canonical Books, the Authority of the greateſt part of the Catholick Church may be obſerved, and particularly of thoſe that have Apoſtolical Sees, or which have had the Happineſs of receiving the Epiſtles of the Apoſtles. But among the Canonical Books, thoſe that are received by all Churches, muſt be preferred before thoſe which are rejected by ſome. Again, among theſe we ſhould pay a greater regard to thoſe which are acknowledged by a great number of Churches, and by the moſt conſiderable, than to ſuch as are admitted only by few Churches, and thoſe of no great Authority. And if ſome have been received by the greater Number of Churches, and rejected by thoſe that have greater Authority; though it is hard to meet with ſuch, yet they ought to be put in the ſame Rank, and to obtain the ſame Authority.* He adviſeth all Pious Perſons, that fear God, and ſeek to know his VVill, to read all the Canonical Books, to draw from them Precepts for Manners, and Rules of Faith, and at laſt, he furniſheth them with the means to arrive to the underſtanding of hard and obſcure Paſſages. The Firſt is the Knowledge of that Language, wherein thoſe Books were written. The Second is to conſult and compare the ſeveral Tranſlations, whereof ſome ſerve to explain the reſt. Among the Tranſlations, he preferrs the Vulgar Latin, as being more literal, and clearer: And among the Greek Verſions, he adheres to the *Septuagint*, to which he aſcribes much Authority. He doth not decide, Whether the Seventy compoſed it ſeparately, every one in his Cell by God's Inſpiration, or by conferring together. But he affirms, That however it was compoſed, it ought to be followed, and preferred even before the Hebrew Text, becauſe it is not credible, that they made this alteration, without a ſecret Aſſiſtance of the Holy Spirit, for the good of the Church. As to the Books of the New Teſtament, he ſaith, That, without doubt, the Latin Tranſlation is to be Corrected by the Greek Copies.

[* By theſe Words our Author means, That St. *Auguſtin*'s Canon of S. S. was the ſame with that now received in the Church of *Rome*: But that does not appear from St. *Auguſtin*'s Words; for of thoſe Books which the Church of *England* condemns as Apocryphal, he names none but *Tobith*, *Judith*, *Wiſdom of Solomon*, *Eccleſiaſticus*, and the *Maccabees*. By the Book of *Esdras*, he does not mean thoſe which we call by that name, but the Books of *Ezrah*, and *Nehemiah*, which he mentions no where elſe, and which were never diſputed in the Church; and it is uncertain, whether he owned thoſe Additions to the Book of *Eſther*, that are now received in the Church of *Rome*.]

The Third Thing which St. *Auguſtin* looks upon as neceſſary for the underſtanding of the Scripture, is the Knowledge of Things ſignified; as the Nature of Animals, Plants, Herbs, and of other Things which are made uſe of in Compariſons and Figures in Holy Scripture. He lays great weight upon the Knowledge of Numbers, and Muſick, which he pretends to be of great uſe: And he would not have Profane Sciences neglected; provided, that ſuch as are Falſe, and Superſtitious, be laid aſide; and particularly, judicial Aſtrology, and Magick. He reckoneth Painting, and Mythology, among thoſe Things whoſe Knowledge is Superfluous; but he ſhews the uſefulneſs of Hiſtory, Mechanicks, Logick, Rhetorick, and other Sciences, provided that a good Uſe be made of them, that Men depend not too much upon them, nor be lifted up becauſe of them, but that both Charity, and Humility, be preſerved as the Two Keys, without which the Holy Scripture cannot be underſtood.

The Third Book lays down Rules to clear thoſe Difficulties that ariſe from the different Senſes, in which a Diſcourſe may be taken; as for inſtance, when the Parts of a Diſcourſe are diſtinguiſhed by Points, and Comma's, which variouſly placed, alter the Sence. St. *Auguſtin* would have Men referr themſelves, in ſuch caſes, to the Rule of Faith, and reject that Diſtinction which makes an Heretical Sence: That if both Senſes be Catholick, that is to be followed, which agreeth beſt with the connexion of the Diſcourſe; and laſt of all, if both agree with the Text, then we may follow that which ſeems moſt probable. He applies the ſame Rules to determine the pronunciation, and ſignification of undetermin'd Terms: At laſt he deſireth, that Men ſhould conſult the original Text.

There is much more difficulty, when the Words are taken in a Metaphorical, and Figurative Sence; then we muſt have a care how we underſtand them in a Proper, and Natural Sence. The Jews were for a long time, Slaves to this literal Meaning. The Gentiles likewiſe were Slaves to unprofitable Ceremonies. But Chriſtians deliver the Jews, by diſcovering to them the Truths that were hid under the Letter, and they ſet the Gentiles at Liberty, by utterly rejecting their profane Ceremonies. Themſelves are charged but with a ſmall Number of Signs eaſily practiſed, whoſe Signification is very Majeſtical, and their Obſervation very Pure. Chriſt himſelf inſtituted them, and the Apoſtles taught the Church the Knowledge of them: Such are the Sacrament of Baptiſm, and the Celebration of the Body and Blood of Jeſus Chriſt.

After this, St. *Auguſtin* goes to the neceſſary Rules, whereby we may diſtinguiſh the proper Sence from the Figurative. The Firſt, and moſt general is, That whatſoever cannot be made to agree, either with Purity of Manners, or with the Truth of Faith, when 'tis underſtood according

cording to the Letter, muſt neceſſarily have a Figurative Sence. But we are not to judge of what may be Pure, or True, according to the Prejudices, either of Cuſtom, or Opinion, but only by the Rules of Faith, and Charity, becauſe the Holy Scripture teacheth nothing but Charity, and condemns nothing but Luſt. St. *Auguſtin.* Tome III.

Neither muſt thoſe Opinions, and Actions, be taken in a Figurative Sence, which ſeem to imply a kind of Cruelty, which in Scripture, is aſcribed either to God, or to Righteous Men, when they are made uſe of againſt the Luſts of carnal Men. But a Word, or an Action which is abſolutely unjuſt, and that cannot be excuſed by any Circumſtance, when it is attributed to God, or to thoſe whoſe Sanctity is commended in Scripture, muſt neceſſarily be expounded by a Figure. This Rule takes place in Things that are expreſſed in the Form of a Command. If the Letter forbids a Crime, and enjoins a good Thing, there is no Figure; but, on the contrary, if it ſeems to command a Crime, and forbid a Vertue, it is a Figure. It often happeneth, that ſuch as are in a more perfect State, do underſtand Figuratively, what is ſaid of a State leſs Perfect; but let thoſe Men conſider, that there are Precepts for all Men in general, and ſome that relate to each State in particular. He adds, That we ſhould not believe, that ſince the Coming of Jeſus Chriſt, thoſe Things can be obſerved, which were either permitted, or preſcribed only for the time of the Old Law, though at that time, they were to be taken in their proper Sence. He inſtanceth in the Polygamy of the Patriarchs, becauſe they lived Holily in Marriage, with a proſpect of having Children; and he confidently preferreth that State, before that of ſuch Men, who having but one VVife, abuſe Matrimony to ſatisfie their brutiſh Luſt.

Finally, it muſt be confeſſed, That when the Scripture mentions great Men's Faults, we may not only ſeek there for a Figurative Sence, but alſo for Inſtruction in the Hiſtorical Sence, becauſe their Fall teaches the Holyeſt Men, not to be lifted up through Preſumption.

St. *Auguſtin* addeth, beſides the following Obſervations, that the ſame Figurative Expreſſion ſometimes ſignifies Two different Things, and ſometimes contrary Things. That a dark Place of Scripture ought to be explained by thoſe that are clearer; and that Reaſonings may likewiſe be uſed to clear it: But it is ſafer to have recourſe to other Paſſages of Scripture; and that the ſame Paſſage may have ſeveral Significations equally good. He concludes with the Seven Rules of *Tychonius*, the *Donatiſt*; but they are very far from the good Sence, and the Uſefulneſs of St. *Auguſtin*'s: They diſcover great Subtilty; but it is very difficult to apply them.

In the laſt Book *of Chriſtian Doctrine*, St. *Auguſtin* ſhows how to Expound the Holy Scripture for the benefit of others. He ſays at firſt, That they were not to expect Rhetorical Rules upon that Subject from him; which though they are not uſeleſs, yet ſince they may be found in other places, they ought not to be introduced into this Work; He enlargeth however upon the Qualifications of a Chriſtian Orator. He ſhews, That it were an Errour to think, that Truth cannot make uſe of Rhetorical Ornaments to refute Errour; ſo that he would have Chriſtians ſtudy to ſpeak Eloquently. He adviſeth young Men to learn the Precepts and Rules of Art; but as for Men in Years, his Opinion is, That they ſhould only read Books that are well written, and frame their Diſcourſes after their Pattern, without regarding the Precepts of Art, which are of little uſe. The Deſign of a Preacher who expounds the Holy Scripture, who ſets forth God's VVord, who defends the Faith, and oppoſes Errours, ſhould be to teach that which is Good, and to perſwade others to depart from that which is Evil; to bring over thoſe of contrary Opinions, to quicken the Sloathful, to inſtruct the Ignorant, to ſoften, and convert hardned Sinners.

VVhen the Queſtion is only how to inſtruct the Ignorant, it is enough to declare the Doctrine of the Church; but if Gain-ſayers are to be perſwaded, it muſt be eſtabliſhed by ſolid Arguments: And Laſtly, If Men's Hearts are to be moved, there is need of Prayers, Reproaches, Threatnings, Exhortations, and other Figures proper to affect them. Such as want Eloquence to excel in theſe Things, ought to make up their Diſcourſes with Paſſages, and Expreſſions out of Holy Scripture. He proves by ſeveral Examples, That there is much Eloquence in the Holy VVritings; yet he would not have a Preacher imitate that Obſcureneſs which is to be met with in ſome Paſſages of the Holy Scripture, but charges him, above all things, to be clear; not to content himſelf to pleaſe with agreeable Notions, but to inform by ſolid Inſtructions. As the Matter which a Preacher treateth of is high, ſo he ought never to loſe his Gravity, though he may alter his Stile according to the variety of Subjects. St. *Auguſtin* produces Examples, both out of the Holy Scripture, and out of the Fathers, of Three kinds of Eloquence; ſhewing, at the ſame time, upon what Occaſions, and to what Subjects they are to be apply'd. Laſtly, Having laid down ſeveral uſeful Rules to compleat a Preacher, he adviſes him, above all, to prepare himſelf by Prayer, and to be ſure that his Life be anſwerable to his Sermons. He blames not thoſe who Preach Sermons compoſed by others, when they cannot make Sermons themſelves.

After this Treatiſe of *Chriſtian Doctrine*, follows St. *Auguſtin*'s Writings upon the Holy Scripture.

The Firſt is his imperfect Book upon *Geneſis*. It is the Firſt, not only according to the Order of the Books of the Holy Scripture, but alſo according to that of its Compoſition. St. *Auguſtin* wrote

St. *Auguſtin.* Tome III.

wrote it in *Africa*, in the Year 393. before he was Biſhop. He deſigned to prove againſt the *Manichees*, That the Hiſtory of *Geneſis*, taken literally, was no ridiculous thing, as they pretended: But he confeſſes, That being not well inſtructed in thoſe Matters, he found this Undertaking to be above his ſtrength; which obliged him to ſtop in the way, even before he had finiſhed the Firſt Book, which remained imperfect. He was once reſolved utterly to ſuppreſs it; but he thought it more convenient to leave it as a monument of his Firſt Enquiries upon the Holy Scripture, and he added ſome Periods to it. He begins this Book with an Account of the Doctrine of the Church, concerning the Trinity, and the Incarnation. He adds againſt the *Manichees*, That Sin is none of God's Creatures, but that it conſiſts in the Abuſe of Free-Will. Afterwards he diſtinguiſhes Four Sences of the Scripture: The Hiſtorical, which takes place when a Relation is made of Matters of Fact, as they happen'd: The Allegorical, which explaineth what is ſpoken by Figures: The Analogical, when the Old and New Teſtament are compared together, and their Agreement is juſtified: And the Ætiological, whereby Reaſons are given of the Actions and Diſcourſes that are related in the Holy Scripture.

This being ſuppoſed, he undertakes to Explain the Hiſtory of the Creation, ſet forth in the beginning of *Geneſis*. He frames Difficulties upon every Word, and makes ſeveral Objections to himſelf, but often anſwers them not; or if he doth, his Anſwers are not commonly very juſt, nor ſufficient to ſatisfie the leaſt ſcrupulous. This Work endeth at Man's Creation.

He purſues very near the ſame Method in the Twelve following Books upon *Geneſis*, which he writ when he was Biſhop: They were begun in 401. and compleated in 415. He explains the Text of *Geneſis* from the beginning, to that place where it is ſaid that *Adam* was driven out of Paradiſe. He examines the Words, and ſtarts an infinite number of Queſtions: ſome he anſwers, but moſt are left unreſolved. He often gives Myſtical and Moral Solutions, which are not very literal. He diſcourſes likewiſe by the bye, of ſeveral common places, concerning the Nature both of Angels, and of the Soul; the Fall of Angels, and that of Man; concerning the Myſteries of the Number Six; concerning Hell and Paradiſe, Viſions, and ſeveral other Subjects which he meets with in his way.

The Seven Books of the Ways of Speaking, in the ſeven firſt Books of the Bible, which follow this Work we have now ſpoken of, is a Critical Treatiſe; wherein St. *Auguſtin* explaineth ſeveral VVays of Speaking that are peculiar to theſe Books, and which ordinarily are not met with in others. This VVork is of the Year 419.

In making theſe Remarks upon the VVays of Speech, in theſe Seven Firſt Books of the Bible, he finds ſeveral Difficulties about the things themſelves, which he collecteth in the Form of Queſtions, which he propoſeth to himſelf; whereof he gives a Solution in few words, though without going to the depth. This is both the Subject and the Method of the Seven following Books: where he takes a ſhort view of the principal Difficulties that he met with in the *Pentateuch*, in the Book of *Joſhua*, and in that of *Judges*. This is a very curious and uſeful VVork. There he does not recede from the literal Sence, as in his other Treatiſes, but makes very learned and judicious Remarks, which ſerve very much to clear the Text of the Bible.

The Notes upon *Job* are a very imperfect VVork. St. *Auguſtin* had writ them in the Margin of a Copy of the Book of *Job*; from which ſome body took them, and compiled them into a Book by themſelves: which makes him ſay, That he knew not whether it was to be called his VVork or theirs who had thus collected and reduced them. He findeth there much Obſcurity, proceeding from their great Brevity, and becauſe they added ſome Notes to thoſe words of the Text to which they do not referr. In one word: He found ſo many Faults in that VVork, that he had ſuppreſſed it, had he not known that there were ſeveral Copies of it abroad. This is the Account which he gives of it in the 13th. Chapter of the Second Book of his *Retractations*. Yet this Treatiſe is not ſo contemptible; it is a kind of Paraphraſe, or literal Explication of the Book of *Job*, which explains it, and diſcovers ſuch Notions as may be further improved.

The *Looking-glaſs taken out of the Scripture*, is neither a Commentary, nor a particular VVork upon the Scripture, but barely a Collection of Paſſages out of the Old and New Teſtament, containing Precepts and Inſtructions for Manners. *Poſſidius* affirms, That St. *Auguſtin* wrote a Book of this Nature, and *Caſſiodorus* recommends the reading of it. It is not certain whether this is that which St. *Auguſtin* wrote. The Preface is in his Style, but in the Body of the Book the Scriptures are cited according to St. *Jerom*'s Tranſlation. Perhaps the Text uſed by St. *Auguſtin* was changed, and the more common Verſion was put in the room of it: For I can hardly believe that St. *Auguſtin* would quit his Old Tranſlation, to make a conſtant uſe of St. *Jerom*'s. Father *Vignier* hath alſo publiſhed *A Looking-glaſs taken out of Scripture*, attributed to St. *Auguſtin*: But this relates to Doctrine, more than to Manners; which doth not agree with what *Poſſidius* ſaith of St. *Auguſtin*'s.

Theſe are all St. *Auguſtin*'s Treatiſes upon the Old Teſtament, which make up the Firſt Part of the *Third Tome*. The *Second* contains Treatiſes upon the New Teſtament, and begins with a Harmony betwixt the Four Goſpels divided into Four Books.

In the *Firſt*, having ſpoken of the Number, Authority, and of the Style of the Goſpels, he refuteth thoſe who refuſe to give Credit to the Goſpel, becauſe it was not written by Jeſus Chriſt himſelf, but by his Diſciples, whom they ſuppoſe to have receded from their Maſter's Doctrine,

Doctrine, that ſo they might perſuade the VVorld that he was God, and thereby deſtroy the VVorſhip of the Gods. He obſerves, That Two of the Four Evangeliſts were Apoſtles, St. *Matthew* and St. *John*; and Two were not, St. *Mark* and St. *Luke*; that ſo none might ſay, that there was a difference betwixt thoſe who had ſeen with their Eyes Chriſt's Actions, and thoſe who wrote them upon the Relation of thoſe who had ſeen them. He addeth, That other Men's VVorks, who undertook to write the Hiſtory of Chriſt, were not received by the Church as Canonical; becauſe the Authors of theſe Hiſtories were not to be believed, having ſtufft their Works with falſe Relations, and Errors, contrary to the Rule of the Catholick and Apoſtolick Faith, and to ſound Doctrine. He believes, That the Four Goſpels were compoſed in the ſame Order as we ſee them in at preſent: That St. *Matthew*'s Goſpel was written in Hebrew, and the others in Greek: That each Evangeliſt hath obſerved a particular Order, yet without obliging himſelf not to ſpeak any thing that had been ſpoken by another: That St. *Matthew* deſigned particularly to give an Account of Chriſt's Royal Deſcent, and to repreſent him according to that Humane Life which he led among Men: That St. *Mark* did little elſe but abridge St. *Matthew*: That St. *Luke* apply'd himſelf to ſet forth Chriſt's Prieſthood; which is the reaſon why he doth not reckon his Genealogy from King *David*, by *Solomon*, as St. *Matthew* doth, but by *Nathan*: and for the ſame reaſon, he takes notice, That the Virgin *Mary* was a-Kin to *Elizabeth*, who was of the Sacerdotal Race, and Wife to *Zacharias* the Prieſt. Laſtly, That St. *John* taketh his Subject above Chriſt's Humane Actions, to ſpeak of his Divinity, and to diſcover the Equality of the Word with his Father: So that it may be ſaid, that the Three Firſt Evangeliſts are more for the Active Life, and St. *John* for Contemplation. After this, St. *Auguſtin* makes Application of the Four Beaſts in the *Revelations* to the Four Evangeliſts; and having made theſe Remarks, he anſwereth thoſe who found fault that Chriſt had written nothing. He propoſes to them the Examples of *Socrates*, *Pythagoras*, and of the wiſeſt Heathen, who left to their Diſciples the care of committing to Writing both their Doctrine and their Inſtructions. He ſhews, That Chriſt cannot be ſaid to have written Magical Books, or that he approved the Worſhip of Falſe Deities. He particularly enlargeth upon this laſt Head, ſhewing, That the Apoſtle's Doctrine, touching the Worſhipping of One only God, is conformable to that of the Prophets, who fore-told, That the *Meſſiah* ſhould preach the ſame upon Earth, and that it ſhould be publiſhed and received throughout the VVorld. The Three other Books, are a Harmony of the Evangeliſts. In the Second and Third, he followeth the Text of St. *Matthew*'s Goſpel, and compareth the three other Goſpels with that. In the laſt, he takes notice of what the three other Evangeliſts have peculiar to themſelves. He doth not only compare the Text of the Evangeliſts, but makes them agree together, and reſolves the ſeeming Difficulties and Contrarieties that are betwixt them, as to the Order and Manner of their relating both of the Words and Actions of Jeſus Chriſt. This Work was very difficult and laborious, and it was finiſhed by St. *Auguſtin* with great exactneſs. It was compoſed about the Year 400.

St. *Auguſtin.* Tome III.

After this Treatiſe, we find in this Volume the two Books of St. *Auguſtin*, upon the Sermon of Chriſt in the Mount, written about the Year 393. They contain Moral Reflections, with Inſtructions and Precepts contained in Chriſt's Sermon, recorded by St. *Matthew* in the 5th. 6th. and 7th. Chapters of his Goſpel. St. *Auguſtin* likewiſe clears the Difficulties that he meets with in the Letter of the Text. Among the Paſſages of this Treatiſe which he reviſeth in his *Retractations*, there are Two of Conſequence: The former, is, about the Divorce allow'd by Jeſus Chriſt, in caſe of Fornication. He had extended what is ſaid of Fornication, to all thoſe Crimes that ſet us at a diſtance from God. Here he retracteth this Opinion, and confeſſeth, That this Notion is not very certain. He ſaith alſo, That it is a very hard Queſtion, VVhether a Man may Marry another VVife, having been Divorced from a former? The Second Point of any importance, taken notice of in his *Retractations*, is, touching an Expreſſion he had uſed when he ſpake of Jeſus Chriſt: He had called him *Homo Dominicus*: He diſapproves that Term, though he had read it in Eccleſiaſtical VVriters. He retracts likewiſe what he had ſaid, That the Sin unto Death, was Envy againſt our Brother: with ſome other Explications that were not very juſt. However, the Treatiſe it ſelf is very inſtructive, and very uſeful: It contains ſeveral Moral Precepts, which may be of very great Uſe. In the Second Book, he explains the Lord's Prayer.

Both the Books of Queſtions upon ſome Paſſages of St. *Matthew*'s and St. *Luke*'s Goſpels, were compoſed by St. *Auguſtin* with great precipitation, to ſatisfie the Requeſts of a Perſon that read the Goſpel. Moſt of his Anſwers are either Myſtical or Moral Explications. He places this Book in his *Retractations*, among thoſe which he writ about the Year 400. and takes notice of ſome Faults of Inadvertency. The Firſt Book is upon St. *Matthew*'s Goſpel. The Second, upon that of St. *Luke*. He makes no mention of the Seventeen following Queſtions upon St. *Matthew*'s Goſpel, neither are they mentioned in the beſt Editions of the Catalogue of St. *Auguſtin*'s VVorks, made by *Poſſidius*: which gives us reaſon to doubt whether they are St. *Auguſtin*'s, though *Rhabanus* hath quoted them under his Name, and though they are written in a Style very much like his.

The 124 Treatiſes upon St. *John*'s Goſpel are of a very different Nature from the former; they are Homilies preached by St. *Auguſtin* to his People, wherein he followeth the Text of St. *John*, and draws important Inſtructions from it upon the principal Points both of Doctrine and Morality. He attacks three ſorts of Hereticks principally; the *Arians*, the *Donatiſts*, and the

St. *Auguſtin.* Tome III.

Pelagians. He maintains againſt the Firſt, the Divinity and Conſubſtantiality of the VVord. He oftens refutes the Reaſons alledged by the Second to juſtifie their Separation, and earneſtly exhorts them to re-unite themſelves with the Church; and proves againſt the laſt, the neceſſity of Chriſt's Grace, and the free Predeſtination of the Elect. Theſe are the principal Subjects treated of in theſe Homilies, which he preached after the *Pelagian* Hereſie broke out, before the Deſtruction of the *Donatiſts* Schiſm, ſome time after they had found St. *Steven*'s Body, as he affirms in the 120th. Sermon; which makes us conjecture that they are the Sermons which he preached to his People in the Years 416. and 417. For he began with them about the end of VVinter, towards *February*, in the Year 416. as appears by the beginning of the Sixth: He continued them in *Lent*, as it is obſerved in the 10th. and 11th. They were interrupted during *Eaſter* Holy-days. After the Holy-days he undertook the Expoſition of St. *John*'s Epiſtle, and then proſecuted his Goſpel. He had got but to the 27th. Homily, about the Feaſt of St. *Lawrence*, and ſo could not finiſh theſe Sermons before the next Year.

St. *Auguſtin*'s Ten Homilies upon St. *John*'s Epiſtle, interrupted, as we ſaid juſt now, the courſe of thoſe which he compoſed upon the Goſpel. He gives notice of it himſelf in his Preface; where he obſerves, That having been obliged by the Solemnity of thoſe Feſtivals, wherein particular Leſſons are yearly recited, to interrupt the courſe of his Explications upon St. *John*'s Goſpel; before he returned to it, he thought it convenient to Expound, during thoſe ſeven or eight Days, the Epiſtle of the ſame Evangeliſt, that was moſt agreeable to that joyful Time, becauſe it ſpeaks of nothing but Charity. St. *Auguſtin*, in his *Homilies*, makes excellent Reflections upon this Vertue. He obſerves, That Fear brings in Charity, but that Charity drives away Fear. He diſtinguiſheth two ſorts of Fear; that which is conceived by a dread of Puniſhment, which goes before Charity; and that which he calleth a Chaſte Fear, which conſiſts in the Fear of Loſing Charity. He explaineth theſe two ſorts of Fear, by the different Diſpoſitions of two VVomen, whereof the one loveth her Husband, and the other hateth him, though both Fear him. There are other excellent Inſtructions in theſe *Homilies* of St. *Auguſtin*, concerning the Love of God and our Neighbour. He ſpeaks alſo occaſionally, concerning Grace and the Church: "And expounds theſe words of Chriſt to St. *Peter*, *Thou art Peter, and upon this rock* "*I will build my church*, of the Faith whereof St. *Peter* had immediately before made Profeſſion."

St. *Auguſtin* compoſed at *Carthage*, in 394. his Expoſition of ſeveral Paſſages of the Epiſtle to the *Romans*, in Anſwer to the Difficulties that were propoſed to him. He had not then perfectly found his Syſtem of Grace, which made him let ſlip ſome Explications different from ſome which he hath given ſince: And this very thing gave Occaſion for his Remarks upon this Book, in his *Retractations*, where he corrects what he had ſaid, whereby ſome might be made to believe, That the Beginning of Faith cometh from Man, and not from the Grace of Jeſus Chriſt.

He undertook alſo at the ſame time a larger Commentary upon this whole Epiſtle; which would have been prodigiouſly large, ſince the ſingle Expoſition of the Salutation with which St. *Paul* begins the Epiſtle, makes up a whole Book. True it is, that he makes there a Digreſſion of ſeveral Pages, upon an incidental Queſtion concerning the Sin againſt the Holy Ghoſt, which he thinks to be final Impenitency; but both the Extent and the Difficulty of that Work made him give it over: however, he left that Book, and entituled it, *The Beginning of an Expoſition upon the Epiſtle to the Romans.*

At the ſame time likewiſe he made a continued Commentary upon the Epiſtle to the *Galatians*, wherein he contents himſelf with clearing the whole Text, with Explications and Reflections, without departing from his Subject by long Digreſſions.

The Addition at the latter end of this Volume, containeth ſeveral Diſcourſes upon the Scripture, which are none of St. *Auguſtin*'s.

The Firſt is intituled, *Of the Miracles of the Holy Scripture, contained in the Old and New Teſtament.* One needs only read one or two Periods of this VVork, to be convinced that it is not St. *Auguſtin*'s; ſo different is the Style thereof from that of this Father: The Author thereof ſeems to have been either an Engliſhman or an Iriſhman. He ſpeaks of the Flowing and Ebbing of the Sea upon the Coaſts of the Britiſh Iſlands; and to expreſs the ſame, he makes uſe of Terms that were uſual in *Bede*'s time, he fixes the time where he lived in the 4th. Chapter of the 2d. Book; and ſpeaking of thoſe Iſlands, he ſhews, That he wrote after the Year 660. This VVork is divided into Three Books: The Firſt contains the Miracles related in the Hiſtorical Books of the Old Teſtament. The Second, Thoſe that are contained in the Books of the Prophets. And the Laſt, Thoſe that are mentioned in the New Teſtament. It is ill written, and of very little uſe.

The ſmall Diſcourſe of the Benedictions of the Patriarch *Jacob*, belongs not to St. *Auguſtin* but is a Fragment of *Alcuinus*'s Queſtions upon *Geneſis*; who took part of it from the Queſtions upon *Geneſis*, and part from the Morals of St. *Gregory*. This very Book is found in the 3d. Book of the Commentary upon *Geneſis*, attributed to St. *Eucherius*, Biſhop of *Lyons*.

VVe have obſerved already, ſpeaking of the VVorks of *Hilary* the Deacon, in the *Second Volume* of this *Bibliotheca*, that the Queſtions upon the Old and the New Teſtament, are not St. *Auguſtin*'s; and the Conjectures, for which they were aſcribed to *Hilary* the Deacon, were there ſet down: He that deſires more Arguments to prove, That they are not St. *Auguſtin*'s, ſhould read the Firſt Part of the *Benedictines* Preface to this Treatiſe. It remains only, That

we

we take notice with them, That in all probability theſe Queſtions are not at all written by the ſame Author. In ſome Manuſcripts there are only the 127 Queſtions, which were publiſhed at firſt; others have 151. but in theſe, there are not all thoſe that are in the firſt Manuſcript; and among the reſt the 44th. and the 115th. which afforded Conjectures concerning the Age and the Country of their Author. This makes it difficult to affirm any thing certainly concerning the Author of theſe Queſtions. St. *Auguſtin.* Tome III.

The Explication of the *Apocalypſe*, which is the laſt Book that is added to this Volume of St. *Auguſtin*, is a Collection of Notes upon the *Revelations*, taken out of the Commentaries of *Victorinus*, *Primaſius*, and *Bede*, and diſpoſed into the Form of Homilies. Thoſe that thought that this was the Commentary of *Tychonius* the *Donatiſt*, upon the *Revelations*, did not take notice that it was ſo far from containing things favourable to the *Donatiſts* Sect; That on the contrary, it refutes their Errors, and particularly that of Rebaptization, in the Sixth Homily upon the *Revelations*, Verſ. 11. Neither do we find here, thoſe Expoſitions which *Bede* mentions as written by *Tychonius*; nor the long Diſſertation, to prove, That the Angels ſpoken of in the *Revelations*, are thoſe Churches which *Tychonius* had inſerted into his Commentary; as St. *Auguſtin* obſerves in the Thirtieth Chapter of the Third Book *of Chriſtian Doctrine.*

The FOURTH TOME.

THE Fourth Tome of St. *Auguſtin*'s Works contains This Father's Explications upon the *Pſalms*; which make too large a Book, to be compriſed in one Volume with his other Commentaries upon the Holy Scripture. He compoſed them not in that order wherein we find them, but ſome at one time, and others at another; and not all after the ſame manner. Some are Commentaries written in his Study, and the others, which make by far the greater number, are Diſcourſes made to his People. *Caſſiodore* obſerves, That in his time they were divided into Fifteen Decads; this diviſion is not obſerved at preſent, and it is not likely that St. *Auguſtin* made it. St. *Auguſtin* underſtanding no Hebrew, followed the Latin Tranſlations made from the Greek Verſion of the *Septuagint*, to the Text whereof he often referrs. In ſome of theſe Explications, and particularly, in thoſe that were not written to the People, as the Thirteen firſt, he only makes Allegorical Notes upon the Text of the *Pſalms*; but in the reſt, he is either very diffuſe, and enlargeth much upon Reflections that are not very ſolid, or elſe he goeth from his Subject by long Digreſſions. He profeſſes to explain the Letter, but his literal ſence is almoſt always Spiritual or Moral. If he clears any term, or inſiſts upon the Signification of any word, it is always to extract an Allegory, or ſomething Moral from it. He brings all to Jeſus Chriſt, to the Myſteries of our Religion, and to the Church. The Recompences and Bleſſings mentioned in the *Pſalms*, are always in his opinion, Spiritual Recompences and Eternal Bleſſings. He often gives ſeveral ſences of the ſame place, and very frequently makes a digreſſion againſt the Schiſm, or the Hereſies of his own time; He is full of uſeleſs Alluſions, ill-grounded Subtilties, and improbable Allegories. His very Moral Thoughts are ſeldom ſuch as might have been naturally inferred from the Scripture Text; but ordinarily ſuch far-fetch'd Notions as could never fall into the Mind of any Man that ſhould read the Text. Tome IV.

Yet here and there one may meet with lively and fervent Exhortations, which raiſed his People; and profitable Inſtructions upon the moſt important Truths of Religion. So that though this Work cannot paſs for a good Commentary upon the *Pſalms*, yet it may be looked upon as a wonderful Collection of Chriſtian and Moral Notions; and if it be of no great uſe for thoſe that enquire after the literal ſence of the Scripture; yet it will prove very Profitable to Preachers, who deſire to fit their Minds with neceſſary Thoughts and Rules to help them to diſcharge well that part of their Miniſtery.

The FIFTH TOME.

MOſt of St. *Auguſtin*'s Sermons being Homilies upon the Scripture, they are with a great deal of Reaſon brought in to make up this Volume, which follows immediately after St. *Auguſtin*'s Commentaries upon the Holy Scripture. They had hitherto been in great confuſion, becauſe new Collections of them were ſtill Printed, as new Sermons were diſcovered. There was a great number of Suppoſititious or Doubtful ones among the True; moſt Editions were full of Faults, ſo that it was neceſſary, that Perſons ſo exact, learned, and verſed in ſuch Matters as theſe *Benedictines* are, ſhould undertake to ſet them in order, to diſtinguiſh St. *Auguſtin*'s from thoſe that are Suppoſititious, and to Correct the Text from the beſt and ancienteſt Manuſcripts. This they have performed moſt happily in the Fifth Tome, which containeth all St. *Auguſtin*'s Sermons, placed in very good order, and divided into five Claſſes. Tome V.

The Firſt containeth 183 Sermons upon ſeveral Paſſages both of the Old and New Teſtament.

The Second is made up of 88 Sermons upon the great Feſtivals of the Year.

In the Third are 69 upon the Feſtivals of the Saints.

The

St. *Auguſtin.* Tome V.

The Fourth comprehendeth 23 upon various Subjects, as, The Love of God, Fear, Penance, Contempt of the World, Behaviour of the Clergy, Peace and Concord, Reſurrection from the Dead, *&c.*

The laſt Claſſis is compoſed of ſuch Sermons, as cannot be certainly affirm'd to be St. *Auguſtin's*, though there is no certainty that they are none of his; among theſe, there are ſome of which we have more reaſon to doubt, which are Printed in a ſmaller Character; there are not above 31 of them.

They have alſo added at the latter end, Fragments of ſome other Sermons of St. *Auguſtin's*, which are taken out of the Collections of *Eugyppius*, *Bede*, *Florus*, and *John* a Deacon of the Church of *Rome*: Another Fragment, of the Sermon upon the Aſcenſion, and a Sermon of *Heraclius*, a Diſciple of St. *Auguſtin's*.

The Addition contains 317 Spurious Sermons, divided into four Claſſes, according to the order obſerved in the true ones; At the Head of each, is a very exact Critick; Several of them are reſtored to *Cæſarius* their true Author; Some are found to belong to *Rhabanus*, and ſome others are taken out of *Origen's* Homilies, or out of the Works of St. *Cyprian*, St. *Ambroſe*, St. *Maximus*, St. *Leo*, *Fauſtus*, St. *Gregory*, *Alcuinus*, and *Ivo Carnutenſis*.

St. *Auguſtin's* Sermons are written neither Artificially nor Methodically, They are not regular Orations compoſed of all their Parts; They are familiar Diſcourſes, ſpoken without much Preparation; Moſt of them are very ſhort, and made up of conciſe Sentences and Phraſes; He doth not go to the depth of Points either of Doctrine or Morality, as the Greek Fathers do, but contents himſelf to ſpeak of them ſuccinctly, and in few words. Interrogations, Antitheſes, and Quibbles, are almoſt all the Figures that he beautifies his Diſcourſe withal; He doth not aſſert the Truth ſtrongly, nor inculcate it Pathetically; but barely propoſes it with agreeable Expreſſions, and impreſſes it with ſome pleaſant Thoughts. This kind of Eloquence is much inferior to that of the Greek Orators, but it may be that it reliſhed beſt with the Men of St. *Auguſtin's* Age, and agreed with the Genius of the *Africans*; who not only admired his Sermons, but were moved by them. It would not be ſo now, and I queſtion whether a Sermon of St. *Auguſtin's* preached in our Pulpits would draw many Auditors: Yet it muſt be confeſſed, That few Latin Preachers are to be compared with him, and that if he be much inferior to the St. *Baſils*, or the St. *Chryſoſtomes*, he is much above the St. *Maximus's*, the St. *Chryſologus's*, and ſeveral other Latins that came after him. I ſhall not enter into particulars upon his Sermons, which were both a tedious and an endleſs Work.

The SIXTH TOME.

ome VI.

THE Sixth Tome of St. *Auguſtin's* Works contains his Dogmatical Books, upon ſeveral Points both of Morality, and Diſcipline: He begins with ſome ſmall Treatiſes, containing Anſwers to ſeveral Queſtions upon various Subjects.

The Firſt, Is a Collection of Anſwers to 83 Queſtions, which he reſolved, after his return into *Africa*, about the Year 388. and which he Collected after he was a Biſhop. Theſe are the Reſolutions contained in thoſe 83 Queſtions, with moſt of the Principles from whence they are taken:

I. The Soul is not of its ſelf, nor by its ſelf; ſince it is not eſſentially the Truth.

II. God did not make Man like himſelf. He is not good by Nature, but by Will; therefore he muſt be free.

III. If a Wiſe Man's Advice never makes another man worſe than he was before, Is it credible, That God ſhould make Men more wicked?

IV. What then may be the Cauſe of Man's Wickedneſs? We muſt ſeek for it, either in himſelf, or in others, or in nothing: Conſider it well, and you will find, That the Will of Man is the Cauſe of his Depravation.

V. Animals have no Knowledge, and therefore cannot be Happy.

VI. All Corporeal and Spiritual Beings, have a Perfection which makes their Eſſence: Evil hath none; therefore it is no Being.

VII. Sometimes we confound the Soul with the Spirit, and ſometimes we diſtinguiſh them: when the Actions of Man that are common to him with Beaſts, are attributed to his Soul, the Spirit cannot be meant by that term; for Beaſts have no Reaſon: and Reaſon is a neceſſary Adjunct of a Spirit.

VIII. The Soul hath no other Motion beſides its Will and its Actions; It makes the Body change its place, but changes not her ſelf.

IX. Our Senſes only acquaint us with thoſe Things that are in a perpetual change; Therefore they cannot give us the Knowledge of Eternal and Immoveable Truth.

X. Whatſoever hath any Perfection cometh from God: Bodies have; Therefore God is the Author of them.

XI. Jeſus Chriſt was Man; but he is Born of a Virgin: Who can doubt then of his being come to ſave both Sexes?

XII. God

XII. God may be preſent, indeed; yet a defiled Soul cannot ſee him: This Notion is not St. *Auguſtin*'s, but an Heathen's called *Fonteius*; who was afterwards Baptized, and died a Chriſtian; as St. *Auguſtin* aſſures us in his *Retractations*. St. *Auguſtin.* Tome VI.

XIII. Man can tame and dreſs a Beaſt; but do we find that Beaſts can do the ſame to Man?

XIV. If Chriſt's Body had been but a Phantome, Chriſt had deceived us; but he is not capable of ſo doing.

XV. The Spirit of Man comprehends it ſelf; and knows no infinite Perfection in it ſelf: wherefore it is finite.

XVI. The Time paſt, is no more; The Future is not yet: Every thing is preſent with God.

XVII. There ſhould be three Cauſes of a Creature; That which gives it a Being; That which gives it ſuch a ſort of Being; and that which gives it a Love to its Being: Therefore the Cauſe of it is a Trinity. This Argument is not the moſt convincing.

XVIII. In Eternity, there is neither time paſt nor to come, all is preſent.

XIX. God is no where, and comprehends all things, without being the place of any thing; for he could not be in a place, nor be a place, without being Corporeal.

XX. Since God is the Author of Being, he cannot be the Author of what tends to nothing. Evil tends to nothing; therefore God is not the Author of Evil.

XXI. The only reaſon why we need any thing, is a defect in our ſelves; God therefore needs nothing.

XXII. Man is wiſe, becauſe he partaketh of wiſdom; but God is wiſe through Wiſdom it ſelf. It is the ſame in all other Perfections.

XXIII. If any thing ſhould happen in the World by chance, then there would be no longer Prudence; but there is a neceſſity of Prudence: for all Beings are perfect, but can no further be ſo, than as they participate of the Goodneſs and Perfection of God. God and Man are the Authors of all that is done in the VVorld. Good and Evil depend upon our own VVills.

XXIV. It was the part of VViſdom to ſhow that the moſt ſhameful Death is not to be feared: And that's one of the Reaſons for which Chriſt endured ſuch a one.

XXV. There are Sins of Weakneſs, Ignorance and Malice; Weakneſs is contrary to the Strength of God, Ignorance to his VViſdom, and Malice to his Goodneſs: Thus whoſoever knows what God's Strength and VViſdom are, may know which are Venial Sins: And whoſoever knows God's Goodneſs, knoweth alſo what thoſe Sins are which deſerve to be puniſhed both in this VVorld and in the next. This well underſtood, ought to be a Rule whereby to judge what ſort of Sinners ſhould be obliged to do Publick Penance, though they confeſs their Sins. Yet this Rule is very general and very equivocal.

XXVI. God makes uſe of the VVicked both to puniſh and to help. Afflictions are an Exerciſe to the Righteous, and a Puniſhment to the VVicked. Reſt and Peace corrupt the VVicked, and ſanctifie the Righteous. God makes uſe of Men to accompliſh the deſigns of his Providence, though they know it not. VVe act our ſelves when we follow God's Commandments; but in all other things God guides us by the Springs of his Providence; and we have no ſhare in the Events.

XXVII. VVe ſhould not ask why God would create the VVorld, that were to ſeek after a Cauſe of that which is the Cauſe of all things.

XXVIII. VVhen it is ſaid, *Seek thoſe things that are above*; the meaning is, thoſe things that are great and ſublime by their excellency.

XXIX. Man may make uſe of all things, but he ought only to enjoy God; and the uſe which he makes of all things, ought to have a Relation to God. Whoſoever uſes the Creatures otherwiſe, abuſes them.

XXX. This Queſtion is not St. *Auguſtin*'s; it is a definition of Vertue out of *Tully*.

XXXI. Whoſoever conceiveth a thing, conceives it as it is; and he who conceives it not as it is, doth not conceive it at all: There are no different degrees of Conception.

XXXII. We are afraid of loſing what we love: and we are afraid that we ſhall not obtain what we deſire: If we deſire to be without fear, How can we fear that we ſhall not be freed from fear?

XXXIII. Men ſhould not deſire preciſely to be free from fear, becauſe raſh and ſtupid Men are without fear: we ſhould have a reaſon why we are not afraid.

XXXIV. VVe ought to love what we poſſeſs, No man can know and love Happineſs, without being happy: Happineſs therefore is an eternal love and knowledge of a good thing which cannot be taken away from us.

XXXV. To preſerve and increaſe Charity, we muſt oppoſe and leſſen Luſt. This is to be begun by impreſſing a Dread of God's Judgments, to deſtroy the habit of Sin: After that, we ought to diſcover both the Beauty and Excellency of Vertue, to manifeſt the difference betwixt the Old and the New Man; to propoſe Chriſt's Life as an Example; to make uſe of his Exhortations, Inſtructions, and Promiſes; to conſider the vaſt number of thoſe that followed and imitated him; to ſet forth the Vertues both of Saints and of Martyrs, as Patterns; and at laſt, to oppoſe Pride and Ambition, and to inſpire the fear and the love of God.

I omit the following Queſtions, becauſe they are obſcure, and contain nothing remarkable.

The XLVth. Is againſt Judicial Aſtrology.

The XLVIth. Is concerning *Plato*'s *Idea's*.

St. *Auguſtin.* Tome VI.

The XLVIIIth. Is expreſſed in theſe terms. We believe Three ſorts of Things. The Firſt, Are ſuch Things as are believed, and not conceived, as Hiſtory. The Second, Are both believed and conceived at the ſame time; as the reaſonings of Men. The Third, Are Things believed but not conceived at that time, though they are conceived afterwards; Such are Divine Inſtructions, which are conceived by none but thoſe that have Pure Hearts.

In the LI. Queſtion, He explains in what ſence it is ſaid, That Man was created after God's Image and Similitude: And in the LII. he proves, That what is ſaid in *Geneſis*, That it repented God to have made Man, is not to be underſtood literally.

In the LIII. He juſtifies the Command which God gave the *Jews* to borrow of the *Egyptians* rich Veſſels to carry them away; by ſaying, That God made uſe of them to Puniſh the *Egyptians*: But that from thence it cannot be inferred, That Men may deceive, becauſe the People of *Iſrael* was not capable of Evangelical Perfection.

The Reſolutions of the following Queſtions, are Myſtical and Moral Explications of ſeveral Paſſages both of the Old and of the New Teſtament.

The LXXX. Is againſt the Error of the *Apollinariſts*.

The two Books of Queſtions directed to *Simplicianus* Biſhop of *Milan*, who ſucceeded St. *Ambroſe* in the Year 397. are the firſt which St. *Auguſtin* writ, after he was made a Biſhop. In the firſt, he diſcourſeth upon two Paſſages of the Epiſtle to the *Romans*, upon what is ſaid, *Ch.* 7. of the man, who being under the Law, doth not what the Law requireth: And upon what is written in the 9th. Chapter, of *Jacob*'s being call'd, and *Eſau*'s being rejected. He proves in this Firſt Book with great ſtrength, the Neceſſity of Grace to every Good Work, even for the beginning of Faith, and a Free Call. He ſaith himſelf, both in his Book *of Predeſtination*, and in that *of the Gift of Perſeverance*, That he began then to ſee clearly into thoſe Matters which he had not taken right in his former Books. Yet he underſtands the firſt Paſſage in the *Romans*, of a man under the Law, who is yet without Grace; whereas he believed afterwards, that it was rather to be underſtood of that man, who being Spiritual in his Superior part, finds himſelf carnal, by the deſires and motions of the Inferior.

The Second Book contains the Reſolution of Five Queſtions, about particular Paſſages in the Old Teſtament. The Firſt is, of what Spirit that which is ſaid in the Firſt Book of *Kings*, *That the Spirit of God entred into* Saul, is to be underſtood. Whether it was the Holy Ghoſt, or the Evil Spirit, wherewith he was poſſeſſed afterwards? After ſeveral Reflections and Digreſſions, St. *Auguſtin* concludes, That it muſt be underſtood of the Spirit of God; and that *Saul* was filled at firſt with the Spirit of God for a time, and afterwards was poſſeſſed with an evil Spirit. Yea, he thinks, That *Saul* had a Spirit of Prophecy at the time when he perſecuted *David*, and he proves, That this Gift of the Holy Ghoſt may be found in Wicked Men.

The Second Queſtion is upon thoſe words attributed to God in the Firſt Book of *Kings*, Ch. 15. *It repenteth me that I have ſet up* Saul. How God's Repenting can agree with his Preſcience? St. *Auguſtin* anſwers, That the Repentance aſcribed to God, is not accompanied with regret, as that of Men is; it is only an Alteration of Will. This Queſtion puts him upon diſcourſing of God's Knowledge.

The Third Queſtion is about the Story of the Witch of *Endor*. St. *Auguſtin* does not decide whether it was the Soul of *Samuel*, or a Phantome that appeared to *Saul*; he thinks the latter to be more probable.

Both the other Queſtions are about two Paſſages in the Books of *Kings*, which have not much difficulty.

The laſt is concerning the Spirit of Error, whereby God permitted King *Ahab* to be deceived.

Dulcitius, a Tribune in *Africa*, having propoſed Eight Queſtions to St. *Auguſtin*, about ſome Matters which he had already treated of, he Collected in this Book, which he ſent in Anſwer to his Queſtions, what he had ſaid in his other Works.

The Firſt Queſtion was, Whether the Baptized that die in Sin, ſhall at any time be delivered from Damnation? St. *Auguſtin* anſwereth, No; and expounds a Paſſage of St. *Paul*, 1 *Cor. Ch.* 3. *v.* 11. where he ſpeaks of the Fire which is to Purifie the Faithful, by conſuming the Evil which they ſhall have built upon the ſound Foundation of Faith. He underſtandeth by Fire, that Affliction in this Life which Purifies the Faithful from light Sins. He adds, That we may believe, that ſome ſuch thing is done alſo in the other Life, towards thoſe who die before they are cleanſed from thoſe light Sins: But he affirms, That none can believe without Impiety, that this can be apply'd to ſuch as die with the guilt of thoſe Sins that exclude Men from the Kingdom of God. This Anſwer is taken out of his Book *of Faith*.

The Second Queſtion of Works, hath great relation to the former. It was demanded, Whether the Oblations and Prayers that are made for the Dead avail them any thing? St. *Auguſtin* Anſwers what he had ſaid already in his Book concerning the Care that ought to be taken of the Dead, That the Oblations and Prayers are profitable to thoſe who deſerved in their Life-time, that Prayers ſhould avail them. He addeth what he had ſaid in his *Enchiridion* to *Laurentius*, "That in all that time, between Death and the laſt Reſurrection, the Souls ſhall be detained "in ſecret and hidden places, where they ſhall either enjoy Reſt, or ſuffer Pain, according as "they have deſerved, when they were in the World: That Souls in that Condition, are refreſhed "by the Piety of the Living: when the Sacrifice of the Mediator is offered for them, or Alms

"are

" are given in the Church in their behalf. But, ſaith he, That availeth only them, who in their
" Life-time deſerved by their Actions, that theſe things ſhould be available to them, when they
" are out of the World..... Thus when the Sacrifices of the Altar are offered, or Alms given
" for all the Dead that were baptized, they become Thankſgivings for them that were extremely
" Good; They are Interceſſions for thoſe that were not great Sinners: And if theſe things do
" not eaſe thoſe that were very wicked, yet they Adminiſter Comfort to the Living.

St. *Auguſtin.* Tome VI.

The Third Queſtion is, Whether all Men ſhall Die before the Day of Judgment? St. *Auguſtin* anſwereth, no; according to what he had ſaid before in the 193d. Letter to *Mercator*; He confeſſes, That this is a difficult Queſtion.

The other Five Queſtions are upon ſome hard Paſſages of Scripture; He repeats thoſe Explications which he had given in his other Books. This Book was Compoſed after the *Enchiridion* that was written in 421. and before the Book of *Retractations* written in 427. Which ſhews, That it muſt neceſſarily belong to the Years between; yet the Date of *Eaſter* of the Year wherein this Book was written, which is at the beginning, ſhould regularly fall in the Year 430, or 419. wherefore there muſt have been a Miſtake in the Cypher.

The ſmall Treatiſe *concerning the belief of thoſe things which are not conceived*, is placed again in this Volume, among the Treatiſes that are really St. *Auguſtin*'s; though the *Louvain* Doctors after *Eraſmus*, had put it among the Spurious Books. St. *Auguſtin* does not mention it in his *Retractations*; but he doth in the 231ſt. Letter to Count *Darius*; and it is written in his Stile, and is very worthy of him. He ſhews there, That many things are believed, though they are not ſeen. He particularly urges the Example of Friendſhip, and good Wiſhes which are believed without being ſeen. Whence he concludes, That if that Faith is taken away, which makes us believe things that we ſee not, Society would be utterly overthrown. He confeſſeth, That to believe a thing, we ought to have ſome Marks that ſuch thing is: But he affirms, That we believe not in Jeſus Chriſt, without ſufficient Proofs of his Authority; That the Church alone is a conſtant and viſible Proof of the Truth of his Doctrine; ſince we ſee that accompliſhed which Chriſt and the Prophets foretold. That none can doubt of the Truth of the Prophetical Books, ſince the Jews, who were the Chriſtians great Enemies, preſerved them; who alſo are unqueſtionable Witneſſes of their Antiquity. He concludes this Diſcourſe with a ſhort Exhortation to the New Chriſtians, to keep the Faith of the Church inviolable. What is ſaid in the 10th. Chapter concerning the demoliſhing of the Temples, ſhews, That this Treatiſe was Written, and Compoſed after *Honorius* his Law, that was dated in 399.

It has been obſerved already, That St. *Auguſtin* being yet but a Prieſt, expounded the Creed in a Council of *African* Biſhops aſſembled at *Hippo*. This Diſcourſe which he afterwards put in Writing, as he declares in his *Retractations*, contains an exact Expoſition of the Articles of the Creed. We have it here entituled, *Of Faith and the Creed.*

In the Book *of Faith and Good Works*, St. *Auguſtin* refutes ſeveral Errors which he had read in ſome Books that had been ſent to him. There it was affirmed, 1. That all were to be admitted to Baptiſm who deſired to be baptized, without any Examination. 2. That it was ſufficient to inſtruct them in the Articles of Faith, though they were not taught the Rules of Manners till after they had received the Sacrament. 3. That what Crime ſoever a baptized Chriſtian might commit, and in what Condition ſoever he might die, yet he ſhould be infallibly ſaved, after he had paſſed through the Fire. St. *Auguſtin* declares againſt the firſt Propoſition, That though the Wicked are to be tolerated in the Church, yet Correction was not to be neglected, nor the Diſcipline of the Church ſuffered to relax. He confeſſes however, That Sinners ought to be reproved with Meekneſs and Charity. Againſt the Second Propoſition, he teacheth, That Sinners who perſevered in their Wickedneſs, were by no means to be admitted to Baptiſm: Showing, That the Holy Scripture requireth Repentance before Baptiſm; That St. *John* gave Precepts concerning Manners to thoſe which he baptized; and that this is the Temper of the Church, which appointed the Times and Ceremonies obſerved by the *Catechumens*, for no other end, but to be ſure, that they are well-diſpoſed to receive the Sacrament of Baptiſm. Laſtly of all, St. *Auguſtin* proves againſt the Third Error, That whoſoever dieth in the State of Mortal Sin, without Repentance, is eternally Damned: And he Anſwers the place of St. *Paul*, that was alledged to prove the contrary. This Treatiſe was Compoſed in 413. after the Book *of the Spirit and the Letter*. *Garnerius* ſuppoſeth, That St. *Jerom* is the Perſon whom St. *Auguſtin* diſputes with in this Book. But he cannot ſuſpect that Father as guilty of either the firſt or the ſecond Error: And it is altogether unlikely that it ſhould be St. *Jerom* whom St. *Auguſtin* refuteth concerning the third.

The *Enchiridion*, or Treatiſe of *Faith, Hope, and Charity*, was written at the Requeſt of *Laurentius*, a great Lord of *Rome*, and Brother to *Dulcitius*; who had deſired St. *Auguſtin*, to ſend him a ſmall Book, containing an Abridgment of the Chriſtian Religion. To ſatisfie him, St. *Auguſtin* dedicated to him this Book; wherein he reduceth all Religion to the Vertues of Faith, Hope, and Charity, becauſe a Man knoweth all that is compriſed in Religion, when he knows what is to be Believed, what is to be Hoped for, and what is to be Loved. He explains what is to be Believed, by keeping to the Method of the Creed, refuting the Errours, and Hereſies that are contrary to the Doctrine of the Church, without naming their Authors. He layeth down alſo moſt excellent Maxims, ſuch as theſe: That Faith does not ſtop at a curious Inquiry after Natural Things; That Errours of Right are more dangerous than Errours of Fact;

St. *Auguſtin.* Tome VI.

Fact; That all Errours are not Sins; and that there are ſome Things, which it ſignifies little whether they are known, or not. He enlargeth much upon Original Sin; upon the Fall of Man, and Angels; upon the Neceſſity of a Mediator; of Baptiſm, and Grace; upon the Diſtinction of Venial and Mortal Sins; upon the Eternity, and the Inequality of the Pains of the Damned, upon the Extent of the VVill of God to ſave Men; upon Free-Will; and upon the State of Souls till the Day of Judgment. Having thus explained what concerns Faith, he comes to Hope; and he ſaith, That Chriſtians ought to Hope in God alone; and that whatſoever we Hope for, is comprehended in the Lord's Prayer, upon which he makes ſome Reflections. Laſtly, he treateth of Charity; without which he pretends, That no Man can be Righteous. To which he referrs all the Commandments of God, and Advices of the Goſpel. This Book was written after St. *Jerom*'s Death, who dyed in 420. as is plain by the 87th. Chapter, where St. *Auguſtin* ſpeaks of him as one dead.

The Book, intituled, *The Combat of a Chriſtian*, has much the ſame Deſign with the foregoing. St. *Auguſtin* compoſed it ſoon after he was a Biſhop, in a plain Stile, that it might be the more proper to inſtill the Doctrine, and Precepts of Chriſtian Religion into thoſe Chriſtians who were not Skilfull in the Latin Tongue. He exhorts them, at firſt, to fight againſt the Devil: Then he ſhews, That Men get the Victory over him, when they overcome their Paſſions, and bring their Bodies under Subjection; which is only done by ſubmitting to God, to whom every Creature ought to be ſubject, either Willingly, or out of Neceſſity. He adds, That in this Combat, Man is armed with Faith, and with the Aſſiſtances which Chriſt merited for us by his Death. At laſt, he runs through the Articles of the Creed, and refutes the contrary Hereſies.

The Book *of Inſtruction for thoſe that have no Knowledge of our Religion*, was written at the Requeſt of a Deacon of *Carthage*, who deſired of St. *Auguſtin*, Rules, and a Method to Catechize his People acceptably, and uſefully. The Father comforts him at the beginning, upon his being, very often, not pleaſed with his own Diſcourſes, ſince it ſometimes happens, that a Diſcourſe which diſpleaſes the Speaker, is very acceptable to the Hearers. He adviſeth him to teach them cheerfully, and not to be tired with it; and then furniſhes him with Rules how to inſtruct them right in their Religion. He ſaith, in the firſt place, That perfect Inſtruction ſhould begin at the Creation of the World, and end with the preſent Age of the Church: But for this, there is no need of learning by heart, or reciting all the Books of the Bible; one needs only chuſe the beſt, the moſt admirable, and moſt diverting Paſſages. He layeth down, in the ſecond place, his uſual Rule, That every thing ought to be referred to Charity: That Care muſt be taken, that the Auditor may believe what is ſpoken; Hope what he Believes, and Love what he Hopes for. And he would have him inſpired with a wholſome Fear of God's Judgments, and kept from all proſpects of temporal Intereſt, and Advantage that he might have by being a Chriſtian. He obſerves, That the ſame Method is not to be followed with the Learned, as with the Ignorant; and he lays down very prudent Rules how they are to be dealt withal. He ſhews what Things commonly tire the Hearers; and he gives excellent Remedies how they may be avoided; and at laſt, makes Two inſtructive Speeches, one pretty long, the other ſhorter, but compoſed with a great deal of Art, to ſerve for an Example, or Pattern of ſuch Inſtructions, as ought to be given. This Treatiſe ſhews, That to inſtruct Men well in Religion, is an harder Task than moſt Men imagine; and that the Method, formerly uſed, was nobler, and larger, than that which is now obſerved. This Book is of the Year 400, or thereabouts.

Though St. *Auguſtin* does not mention his Treatiſe *of Continency* in the Review of his Works, yet he owns it in the 262d. Epiſtle; and *Poſſidius* reckons it among his VVorks. This Book is a Diſcourſe upon theſe VVords of the 140th. *Pſalm. Set a Watch, O Lord, before my Mouth, and keep the Doors of my Lips. O let not my Heart be enclined to any evil Thing; let me not be occupied in ungodly Works, with the Men that work Wickedneſs.* He ſhews, That true Continency conſiſts in ſuppreſſing ones Paſſions; and he recommends the Neceſſity of Grace to overcome them. He ſpeaks againſt the Proud who excuſe their Sins, and particularly againſt the *Manichees*, who charged their Sins upon an evil Nature that was in them. This Sermon is thought to be of the Year 395. or thereabouts.

Both the following Treatiſes are written againſt the Errour of *Jovinian*. This Enemy of Virginity had drawn aſide ſeveral *Roman* Virgins from their Deſign of continuing ſo, and perſwaded them to marry; ſaying to them, *Are you better than* Suſanna, *or* Anna, *or ſo many other Holy Women?* Though *Jovinian*'s Opinion was rejected at *Rome*, yet this *Heretick*'s Diſciples gave out, That none could refute him without condemning Marriage. To undeceive thoſe that were of this Opinion, St. *Auguſtin* writ a Book, intituled, *Of the Advantage of Matrimony*, before he undertook to ſpeak of the Excellency of Virginity. Wherein he ſaith firſt, That the Union betwixt the Husband and the Wife, is the moſt Ancient, and the moſt Natural. After that, he examineth a Queſtion, rather Curious, than Uſeful, namely, How Men could have had Children, had they perſiſted in the State of Innocence. He obſerves a Four-fold Advantage in Marriage: The Society of both Sexes, the Procreation of Children, the good Uſe of Luſt, which is regulated by a Proſpect of having Children, and the Fidelity which Husband and Wife preſerve towards each other. He ſaith, That every Union between a Woman and a Man, is not Marriage. He doth not think, That this Name is to be given to that Union,

whoſe

whose aim was only to satisfie their brutish Passion, if they endeavoured to prevent their having Children. He declares, That Man guilty of Adultery, who should abuse a Virgin, when he has a Design of Marrying another: As for the Young Woman, he judgeth her guilty of Sin, but not of Adultery, if she is true to that Man, and Designs not to marry when he leaveth her: Nay, he preferrs her before several married Women, who abuse Matrimony by their Intemperance. He doth not excuse from venial Sin, either the Man, or the Woman, who have another Prospect in Marriage, than the begetting of Children. In a word, he distinguishes Three Things in Marriage: The Fidelity which married Persons owe one to the other, which is of natural Right; the Procreation of Children, which ought to be the end of Marriage; and the Sacrament, or mysterious Signification, which makes it indissoluble: For which Reason he determines, That though humane Laws permit a Man to marry again, when he is divorced from a former Wife, yet it is not Lawful for Christians, to whom St. *Paul* forbids it. He concludes, That Marriage is of it self a good Thing, but one of those good Things which we should not look after, but in order to a greater Good, or to avoid a great Evil. That before Christ, the most Continent might marry to multiply that People from whom the *Messiah*, was to be born; but now, as many as are able to contain, do well not to marry. That for this Reason, Men were permitted formerly to have several Wives, and never Women to have several Husbands, but now no Man is to have more than one Wife. That the Gospel-Purity is so great in this Point, That a Deacon was not to be ordained, who had ever had more than one Wife. He approves their Opinion, who understand this Maxim in its whole Extent, and without Restriction, as St. *Jerom* doth by excepting those who contracted a former Marriage before Baptism: For, saith he, Baptism doth indeed remit Sins; but here the Question is not concerning a Sin. And as a young Woman that hath been defiled when she was a *Catechumen*, cannot be consecrated as a Virgin after Baptism, even so it hath been thought reasonable, that the Man who hath had more than one Wife, whether before, or after Baptism, should be looked upon as wanting one necessary Qualification for Orders. St. *Augustin.* Tome VI.

In answer to *Jovinian*'s Objection, he distinguishes the Habit from the Action of Vertue: This being Premised, he saith, That the old Patriarchs had an Habit of Continency, but did not practise it, because it was not convenient to do it in their time; and so, when the Question is put to a Man that is not married, Are you more perfect than *Abraham?* he ought to answer, No; but Virginity is more perfect than conjugal Chastity: Now *Abraham* was endu'd with both these Vertues; for he had the Habit of Continency, and exercised conjugal Chastity. He adds, That Persons are to be distinguished from Vertues: One Person may have one Vertue in a higher Degree than another, and yet be less Holy, because he hath not other Vertues in the same Degree. Thus a disobedient Virgin is less to be esteemed than a married Woman, with the Vertue of Obedience. Last of all, he exhorts Virgins not to be lifted up, because of the Excellency of their Condition, but to be constant in Humility.

The Book *Of Holy Virginity*, came out presently after that *Of the Advantage of Matrimony.* St. *Augustin* shews there, That Virginity is one of the most excellent Gifts of God, and that Humility is necessary to preserve it. He exalteth the Excellency of Virgins consecrated to God, by the Example of the Virginity of the Mother of God, who, according to him, had made a Vow of Continency before the Angel appeared to her. He refutes those that condemn Matrimony, and those that compare it with Celibacy. He does not think that Virginity is of Command, but of Advice: It should not be chosen as a thing necessary to Salvation, but as a state of greater Perfection. And this he proves by several Passages of Scripture, and explains a Passage of St. *Paul*, from which some concluded, that he recommended Virginity merely upon account of the Advantage of this present Life. He asserts also, That Virgins shall have a particular Reward in Heaven. At last, he exhorts them to Humility; proposing several convincing Reasons, and powerful Motives, to inspire them with it. Then he recommends to them, above all things, the Love of their Divine Spouse, and speaks of him in a very moving manner: "Behold (saith he to them) the Beauty of your Spouse! Think that he is Equal with "his Father, and yet he was willing to submit himself to his Mother: He is a King in Heaven, "and a Slave upon Earth: He is the Creator of all things, and yet he ranked himself among "the Creatures. Consider both the Greatness and the Beauty of that which the Proud look "upon with Contempt: Behold with the Eyes of Faith the Wounds which he received upon "the Cross, the Blood of the dying God, who is the Price of our Redemption, and the Cause "of our Salvation... He seeketh only the inward Beauty of your Soul: He gave you the power "to become his Daughters: He desires not the Handsomness of the Body, but Purity of Man-"ners. None can deceive him, nor make him be jealous of you; and you may love him with-"out fear of ever displeasing him upon account of false Suspicions." Both this and the foregoing Books were written in the Year 401.

They did well to joyn unto this the Book that treats *Of the Advantages of Widowhood*, which *Erasmus* and others had inconsiderately rejected, as a Work that was none of St. *Augustin*'s. St. *Augustin*, indeed, takes no notice of it in his *Retractations*; but that's not to be wonder'd at, because it is only a Letter to *Juliana*, which *Possidius* put into his Catalogue. * *Philo* and *Bede* quote it as St. *Augustin*'s; and in the 15th Chapter some other Pieces of St. *Augustin*'s

* [Who this *Philo* is, I don't know; it seems to be a Fault of the Press: *Philo Carpathius*, mention'd in the last Volume, dy'd several Years before St. *Augustin* wrote this Letter to *Juliana*.]

St. *Auguſtin.* Tome VI.

guſtin's are quoted. This Book is an Inſtruction for Widows. He aſſerts there, That Widowhood is to be preferr'd before Marriage: Yet he doth not condemn SecondMarriages, nor Third and Fourth; but only ſays, That it is a great Crime to Marry after the Vow of Virginity; though he judges thoſe Marriages to be good and valid, and blames thoſe who look upon them as adulterous. The Practice of the Church at that time was, To put them under Penance who Married after vowing Virginity; but their Marriages were not yet declared void, as is plain by the Sixteenth Canon of the Council of *Chalcedon*, and by ſeveral other Teſtimonies of the Ancients. The reſt of this Letter is full of Inſtructions to *Juliana*, and her Daughter *Demetrias*, who had already made Profeſſion of Virginity, as it is obſerved in the 19th. Chapter: And ſo this ſmall Treatiſe is of the Year 414. He bids them beware of the *Pelagian* Errors.

In both the Books *Of Marriages which cannot be excuſed from Adultery*, St. *Auguſtin* handleth this nice and Difficult Queſtion, Whether it be lawful either for the Man or the Woman to Marry after Divorce on the Account of Fornication? *Pollentius*, to whom theſe Books are directed, believed, That the Exception of the Caſe of Adultery, which we find in St. *Matthew*'s Goſpel, was no leſs to be underſtood of a Permiſſion to Marry again, than of a Separation of Bodies: ſo that a Husband might not only leave his adulterous Wife, but alſo take another when he was divorced from the firſt. St. *Auguſtin* affirms on the contrary, That a Woman thus divorced, ought never to Marry again, no more than the Husband who cauſed her to be divorced. This whole Diſpute depends upon the Sence of that Paſſage in St. *Matthew*, which excepteth the cauſe of Fornication; and upon that of St. *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 7. which ſaith, That the Bond of Matrimony is indiſſoluble but by the Husband's Death; and that if the Wife is married to another while he liveth, ſhe committeth Adultery. St. *Auguſtin* enlarges much upon the Sence of theſe two Paſſages. He endeavours to make the firſt to agree with his Opinion, which he groundeth eſpecially upon the ſecond. He anſwereth *Pollentius*'s Arguments, and uſes ſeveral Reaſonings, upon the Matter. He confeſſes in his *Retractations*, That he had not yet cleared that Point, but that there are ſome conſiderable Difficulties beſides, though he had given Light enough to reſolve them.

He further explaineth in the 1ſt. Book, another Paſſage in the ſame Epiſtle of St. *Paul*, concerning the Diſſolution of Marriage between Infidels. *Pollentius* held, That St. *Paul* abſolutely forbids Believing Husbands to put away their Unbelieving Wives: Whereas St. *Auguſtin* affirms, That it is only an Advice that he gives them, Not to uſe the liberty they have to Separate. He concludes this Book with another Queſtion concerning the Catechumens, who fall into ſuch Diſeaſes as take away their Speech and Knowledge, VVhether they ſhould be Baptized or no? He ſaith, That they ought to be Baptized; though he doth not condemn thoſe that dare not hazard the Sacrament: And he goes ſo far, as to declare, That in ſuch Caſes thoſe very Catechumens may be Baptized, who are known to be in a habit of Sin, and who ought not to be admitted to Baptiſm at another time. He adds, That Penitents are to be dealt withal after the ſame manner, and they ſhould not be ſuffered to Die before they are Reconciled. In the 2d. Book, he treateth more at large than in the Firſt, *Of the Indiſſolubility of Marriages*, and examines ſeveral Queſtions upon that Subject. He concludes with an Exhortation to Husbands that have left their VVives, to live in Continency; alledging the Example of Church-men, who abſtain ſo religiouſly, though they often were forced to take that Profeſſion upon them againſt their VVills. The rank which St. *Auguſtin* ſets theſe two Books in, in his *Retractations*, ſhews that he compoſed them in the Year 419.

The two next Books are concerning *Lying*. There St. *Auguſtin* handleth this Queſtion, which was very famous in his time, *Whether a Lye may be uſed upon ſome Occaſions?* He confeſſeth in the 1ſt. Book, entituled, *Of Lying*, and written in 395. That this is a perplexing Queſtion, often diſturbing Conſciences; and that there ſeem to be ſome Occaſions, when in Civility; and ſometimes, out of Charity, officious Lyes may be lawful. He ſays that he will forthwith examine the Queſtion, that he may find out ſome Light in ſo obſcure a Matter; and that at laſt he will declare for the Truth; being perſuaded, That though he were miſtaken in ſo doing, yet his Miſtake would prove leſs dangerous; becauſe Error can never do leſs miſchief, than when Men are deceived by a great Love of the Truth, and by oppoſing Falſhood with too much Zeal.

After this Preface, he defines what *Lying* is. He confeſſes, That Ironies are not Lyes; That every Untruth which a Man may ſpeak, is not a Lye, if Men believe that what they ſay is True: and, That to Lye, is to ſpeak what we do not think, with a deſign to deceive. VVhereupon he examines this ſubtle Queſtion, VVhether a Man ſpeaking what he knoweth to be falſe, becauſe he is ſure that he to whom he ſpeaks will not believe it, tells a Lye? And on the other ſide, VVhether a Man that ſpeaketh a Truth, with a deſign to deceive him whom he ſpeaks to, becauſe he knows that he will not believe him, is free from Lying? St. *Auguſtin* ſaith, That neither of theſe can be taxed with Lying; becauſe the one deſign'd to perſuade the Truth, by telling an Untruth; and the other ſpake the Truth, to perſuade a Falſity: but neither can be excuſed from Imprudence and Raſhneſs. Then he comes to the Queſtion which he propoſed to himſelf, VVhether a Man might Lye upon ſome Occaſions? Thoſe that held the Affirmative, alledged ſeveral Examples of Lyes, which ſeem to be both approved and commended in the Old Teſtament, and added a Reaſon from Common Sence. Should any one (ſaid they) flee to your Houſe for ſhelter, and it is in your power to ſave him from Death, by telling a Lye, would

would you ſee him unjuſtly murthered, rather than tell a Lye? If a ſick Man asketh you a Queſtion about ſomething that he muſt not know; yea, ſuppoſing that he will be the worſe if you give him no Anſwer; would you then utter a Truth that might occaſion Death? or will you keep ſilence, when you may eaſe him by telling a charitable Lye? St. *Auguſtin* oppoſes to theſe Reaſons thoſe Paſſages of Holy Scripture which forbid Lying without reſtriction, and then anſwereth the Examples out of the Old Teſtament; That the Righteous who ſeem to have Lyed, did not intend that what they ſaid ſhould be underſtood in the uſual ſence, but that by a Prophetical Spirit they meant to diſcover thoſe things that were ſignified by thoſe Figures; as for other Perſons which are not in the number of the Righteous, the Holy Scripture never approves their Actions, but by comparing it with a greater Evil. He affirms, That there is no Example of Lying in the New Teſtament, and endeavours to anſwer the Inferences which they pretend to draw from the Inſtances of the Diſpute betwixt St. *Peter* and St. *Barnabas*, and betwixt St. *Peter* and St. *Paul*, as well as from the Circumciſing of *Timothy*. Laſtly, That he might put an End to all the Reaſons alledged from Neceſſity or Advantage, he maintains, That we muſt never do Evil, what Advantage ſoever we may get by it: That ſo the whole Queſtion is, Whether Lying be Evil or no? And not, Whether it is ſometimes Profitable? VVhence he concludes, That no Lye is to be told, either to preſerve our Chaſtity or our Life, or for the Good of others, or for any other reaſon whatſoever; no, not for the Eternal Salvation of our Neighbour, becauſe that Sin cannot be imputed to a Man, which he cannot prevent but by committing himſelf another Sin. To explain what he had ſaid more at large, he reckons up Eight ſorts of Lyes; and having laid this down for a Rule, That we muſt depend altogether upon Goſpel-Precepts, he enlargeth upon thoſe that make againſt Lying.

St. *Auguſtin* Tome VI.

The Second Book *againſt Lying*, is written upon the ſame Principles, but long after the Firſt; for St. *Auguſtin* wrote it in 420, at the Requeſt of *Conſentius*, who asked him, Whether it was not lawful to make uſe of Lyes, to diſcover the *Priſcillianiſts*, who concealed their Error by Lying, and horrid Execrations? St. *Auguſtin* condemns not only the Practice of the *Priſcillianiſts*, but alſo the Zeal of the *Catholicks*, who made uſe of Lyes to diſcover the Men of that Sect. He poſitively condemns the *Catholicks* Action, who feigned themſelves *Priſcillianiſts*, more than that of the *Priſcillianiſts*, who feigned themſelves *Catholicks*. From hence he takes an opportunity to enter upon the general Queſtion concerning Lying; and he affirms, That it is never allow'd upon any Pretence whatſoever; becauſe whatſoever is Sin in its own Nature, can never be rectified by any good Intention. He ſhews, by the Examples of *David*, and *Lot*, that we are not always to imitate the Actions of Righteous Men. He excuſeth *Abraham*, and *Iſaac* from Lying. As for *Jacob*'s Action, he ſaith, it was no Lye, but a Myſtery: That there is no Example of any Lye in the New Teſtament, becauſe Tropes, Parables, and Figures, cannot be called Lyes, no more than what is ſaid of Jeſus Chriſt; that in his Diſcourſe with the Pilgrims, who went to *Emmaus*, he made as though he would have gone further; that we are no more to imitate *Thamar*'s Lye, than *Juda*'s Fornication; that God rewarded not the Lye of the Egyptian Midwives, but their Compaſſion towards the Iſraelites Children. The ſame muſt be ſaid of *Rahab*'s Action. In one word; Theſe Examples of Lyes taken out of the Old Teſtament, are no Lyes, or if they be, they cannot be excuſed. Laſtly, Whatſoever Pretence they may have, Men are never permitted to betray the Truth for any Advantage, how great ſoever it may be, becauſe they are never allowed to ſin. And indeed, as St. *Auguſtin* obſerves once again, It is a very dangerous thing to allow Lying upon ſome occaſions, becauſe this Maxim may be ſtretched too far, and upon the ſame Principles, Perjury, and Blaſphemy may in time be allowed.

St. *Auguſtin* confeſſes, in his *Retractations*, that both theſe Treatiſes are very intricate; and that he had a Deſign himſelf to ſuppreſs them.

The Book *Of the Buſineſs of Monks*, is an excellent Satyr againſt ſome Monks, who thought themſelves exempted from working with their Hands, becauſe Chriſt hath ſaid, That we ſhould take no care for the Morrow, and ſo contented themſelves with Praying, Reading, and Singing. St. *Auguſtin* oppoſes to them both the Example, and the Authority of St. *Paul*, who plainly ſays, *That whoſoever will not Work, ought not to Eat.* He refutes the falſe Diſtinctions which they made to ſhift it of. He proves, That the true Sence of that Paſſage of the Goſpel which they quoted, did not exempt Men from Working, but only baniſhed the Ingratitude of worldly Men; that to labour with ones Hands is not inconſiſtent with Prayer; that it is ſo far from being unworthy of the Monaſtical State, that it is part of it: For, ſaith he, if a Rich Man makes himſelf a Monk, what can there be more perfect, than having quitted great Eſtates, to be obliged to Labour to get Neceſſaries. And if this new Convert be Poor, and of mean Condition, would not that be a criminal Nicety, to deſire to live more at Eaſe in a Monaſtery, than he did before in the World? Afterwards he draws the Picture of thoſe idle Monks, whom he calls Hypocrites in Monaſtical Habits, with whom the Devil hath overſpread the World. *They travel* (ſaith he) *from Province to Province, without any Miſſion; they have no fix'd Habitation, and abide in no place; they continually alter their Station: Some carry Relicks about, (if they be Relicks,) and make an Advantage of them: Others take much upon them, by reaſon of their Habit and Profeſſion: Some ſay they are going to ſee their Kindred, who, as they have heard, dwell in ſuch a Countrey: But they all beg, and take it ill if you give them not, either*

to

St. *Auguſtin.* Tome VI.

to ſupply the Wants of ſuch a Poverty as enricheth them, or to Recompence a ſeeming and counterfeit Honeſty. EXIGUNT AUT SUMPTUS LUCROSÆ EGESTATIS AUT SIMULATÆ PRETIUM SANCTITATIS. Laſtly, St. *Auguſtin* compares his own Condition with that of the Monks; affirming, That he would chuſe the Life of a Regular Monaſtery, to work at certain hours with his Hands, and to have others for Prayer and pious Reading, rather than to be ſubject to the Fatigues of Office, and to be continually entangled with the ſecular Buſineſſes of other Men. Towards the latter end, he laughs at the fancy of thoſe Monks who would never cut their Hair. Nothing is more pleaſant than the Anſwer which they made to that Paſſage of the Apoſtle, where he forbids Men to let their Hair grow. This (ſaid they) is ſpoken for Ordinary Men, but not for thoſe that have made themſelves Eunuchs for the Kingdom of Heaven. St. *Auguſtin* makes Sport with that ridiculous Notion of the Monks; ſhewing them, That they are Men as well as others. This Book is in the *Retractations*, among thoſe that were written about the Year 400.

The next Book is concerning the *Predictions of Dæmons*; wherein St. *Auguſtin* explains how they may Imagine and Foretell things, and how they often Miſtake: ſhewing at the ſame time, That Religion permits us not to Conſult with them. He ſuppoſes that *Dæmons* have very ſubtile Bodies. This ſmall Treatiſe was compoſed in an *Eaſter-Week*, of ſome of the Years betwixt 406, and 411.

The Book of the *Care which they ought to have of the Dead*, was written to anſwer that Queſtion which St. *Paulinus*, Biſhop of *Nola*, had propoſed to St. *Auguſtin* in the Year 421. namely, Whether a dead Man was any thing the better for being buried in the Church of ſome holy Martyr. To this Queſtion is added another, *To what purpoſe are the Church's Prayers for the Dead, ſeeing that according to the Apoſtle's Maxim, All Men ſhall be judged according to what they have done in this Life?* St. *Auguſtin* anſwereth, That the Book of *Maccabees* eſtabliſhes the Cuſtom of Praying for the Dead; and, That though nothing of it were found in the Old Teſtament, yet the Cuſtom of the Church is ſufficient to authorize that Practice, which is done in the Adminiſtration of the Euchariſt. He is perſuaded, That the Honour of Burial doth neither Good nor Hurt to the Soul of the dead Perſon; but yet that this Duty is to be pay'd to the Dead, as a Teſtimony of the Reſpect which is due to the Memory of pious Perſons: That to be buried in a Martyrs Church, doth nothing of it ſelf; but it ſerves to put the Faithful in mind of Praying for the Dead, becauſe the Devotion for the Martyr encreaſeth the Fervency of Prayer. But that commonly the Care of decent Burial proceeds from the Reſpect which Men have for the Body: That Martyrs had Reaſon to lay aſide that Care: That the Scripture commends thoſe that are careful to bury the Dead, becauſe it is a Token o their Tenderneſs and Affection towards their Brethren. St. *Auguſtin* ſpea s afterwards concerning Apparitions of the Dead, by Dreams or otherwiſe; and having mention'd ſeveral Examples, he examineth how they come to paſs. He thinks it more rational, to attribute them to the working of Angels, who form thoſe Idea's in the Imagination, than to the Souls of the Dead. He does not believe that they are preſent, or that they take any notice at that time of the things that are done, but that they are acquainted with them afterwards, either by Angels, or by the Souls of thoſe that are dead; or laſt of all, by the Inſpiration of God. And by this laſt means, he believes that the Martyrs come to know the Neceſſities of the Faithful, and to hear their Prayers. He does not queſtion but Martyrs help the Living; but he knows not whether they do it by themſelves, or whether God doth it by Angels, at their Requeſt. He confeſſeth, That we cannot know by which of theſe means, or whether by both, the Martyrs work Miracles.

He concludes, That of all that is done for the Dead, nothing availeth them where they are but the Offering of the Euchariſt, Prayers and Almſdeeds: That theſe things are not uſeful to all, but only to ſuch as deſerved in their life-time, to reap Benefit by them after their death: That however, theſe things are performed for all Chriſtians that were Baptized, becauſe we cannot diſtinguiſh who ſhall be the better for it or not: That it is better that they ſhould be ſuperfluous to ſome, than that they ſhould be wanting to others: That theſe Duties are with Reaſon more exactly performed for our Friends and Kindred, that we may receive the ſame Aſſiſtance from our other Relations: That the Decency of Burial availeth nothing to the Salvation of the Dead, but it is a Duty of Humanity which is not to be neglected.

The *Diſcourſe of Patience*, is one of thoſe that St. *Auguſtin* mentions in the 231ſt. Letter. He treateth there of that Vertue rather Dogmatically than Pathetically. He takes notice at firſt, That God's Patience is of another nature from that of Men, becauſe he cannot ſuffer. Then he diſtinguiſhes True Patience, which is a Vertue, from the Counterfeit, which is a Vice. Ambitious Men, Covetous, Luxurious Men, and Robbers, endure patiently extremity of Pain and Miſery; yet want the Vertue of Patience, becauſe they ſuffer upon an ill account. None but ſuch as Suffer for a good Cauſe, can be ſaid to be truly Patient. But if wicked Men endure all things for the Goods of this World, What ought not the Righteous to ſuffer for Eternal Life? Then he propoſes the Examples both of *Job* and of the Martyrs; to the which he oppoſes the Impatience of the *Donatiſts*, who killed themſelves, that they might be accounted Martyrs; ſhewing, That Self-Murther is a greater Sin than Murthering of another; "For (ſaith he) a Parricide "is more guilty than a Man-ſlayer, becauſe he kills a Perſon that is nearer to him than other "Men: By the ſame reaſon, he muſt be thought the greater Sinner who kills himſelf, be-"cauſe none are ſo near to us as our ſelves." Laſtly, He maintains, That True Patience is not

from

from our own ſtrength, but from God's help; becauſe true Patience is grounded upon Charity, which is the Gift of God. This puts St. *Auguſtin* upon diſcourſing of Grace, and proving that it is not given to our Merits; but that it prevents them, and goeth before Faith it ſelf, which is the beginning of all good Works. This ſhort Diſcourſe was written about the Year 418. St. *Auguſtin.* Tome VI.

Of the Four following Sermons *upon the Creed*, there is none but the firſt which comes near St. *Auguſtin*'s Stile, as it is obſerved in the Preface. It contains a clear and ſuccinct Explication of the Articles of the Creed. He ſaith, upon the Article *of the Church*, That there is but one only true Catholick Church, which oppoſes all Hereſies, and can never be overcome. Upon the Article *of the Forgiveneſs of Sins*, he diſtinguiſheth two ſorts of Sins, Light and Great Sins; Baptiſm remitteth both. After Baptiſm, Light Sins, from which no man can be abſolutely free, are remitted by the Lord's Prayer: But great Sins, as Adultery, and other Enormous Crimes, cannot be remitted but by an humbling Penance. In this Creed we find the Article *of Everlaſting Life*, which gives Grounds of Suſpicion, that this Diſcourſe is none of St. *Auguſtin*'s; becauſe this Article is not in the Book *of Faith, and the Creed*, which is certainly his.

The *Benedictines* have Reaſon to Print the Three other Sermons upon the ſame Subject, in a ſmall Character, and to obſerve as they do, that they are written in a very different Stile from St. *Auguſtin*'s; yet they believe them to be ancient, and written by ſome Diſciple of St. *Auguſtin*, during the *Vandals* Perſecution againſt the Catholicks, which is mentioned in the Second Sermon.

They likewiſe put into the ſame rank Three other Sermons, which they believe to belong to the ſame Author; The Sermon *of the Fourth Day of the Week*, Or, *Of the Dreſſing of the Lord's Vineyard*; A Diſcourſe *concerning the Flood*, and the Sermon *of the Time of the Barbarian's Perſecution*; which they have alſo Printed in a ſmall Character.

They have left the Sermon *of the New Song* under St. *Auguſtin*'s Name; but they ſay in the Preface, That they doubted whether it was his. They might have paſſed the ſame Cenſure of the Sermon *of Diſcipline*, and that *of the Uſefulneſs of Faſting*; which I cannot find to be any more than the others of S. *Auguſtin*'s Stile: Nay, I ſcarce believe, That the Sermon *of the taking of the City of* Rome, which is the laſt in this Volume, is truly St. *Auguſtin*'s; yet every man is left to judge as he pleaſes, that ſhall read it.

The Treatiſes which you find in the *Supplement*, are certainly none of St. *Auguſtin*'s: The *Benedictines* have made an exact Critick of them in their Prefaces, and have Collected all that could be ſaid or gueſs'd at concerning their Authors.

The firſt is a Collection *of One and twenty Queſtions*, gather'd without any Order by a very Ignorant Author. Moſt of them are about Philoſophical Matters, and compoſed of Extracts out of ſeveral of St. *Auguſtin*'s Books.

The *Sixty five* following *Queſtions and Anſwers*, which are found in ſome Manuſcripts under *Oroſius*'s and St. *Auguſtin*'s Names, are in a better order than the former, and concerning more Theological Matters; but they are Extracts out of ſeveral Paſſages: The firſt Twelve are taken out of a Treatiſe falſly attributed to St. *Auguſtin, Concerning the Trinity and Unity of God.* Moſt of them that follow, are Extracts out of St. *Eucherius.* Some are out of St. *Auguſtin*'s Treatiſe upon *Geneſis.* They end with a Citation of a Paſſage of St. *Auguſtin* againſt thoſe who deſire to be Biſhops, that they might Command, taken out of the 19th Chapter of the 19th. Book *of the City of God*; which is quoted as of a Father ancienter than himſelf: *One of the Fathers*, ſaith he, *hath ſaid very elegantly, againſt thoſe that deſire to Command: Let thoſe*, ſaith he, *who would Command rather than Serve others, know, that they are not Biſhops.*

The Book *of Faith* to *Peter*, belongs to St. *Fulgentius*, to whom it is aſcribed in a Manuſcript of *Corby*, above One thouſand Years old, as well as in another later. It is cited under his Name by *Ratramnus*, in his Treatiſe *of the Body and Blood of Chriſt.* Both *Iſidore*, and *Honorius* of *Autun*, do likewiſe mention a Treatiſe of St. *Fulgentius*, containing the Rule of Faith; which is not different from this.

The Book *of the Spirit and Soul*, which is a Collection of Paſſages from ſeveral Authors, is attributed to *Hugo de S. Victore* by *Trithemius*, and by *Vincentius Bellovacenſis*, and Printed among this Author's Works. Yet the great number of Extracts taken out of the very Works of *Hugo de S. Victore* makes it queſtionable, whether it be his. St. *Thomas* aſcribes it to a *Ciſtercian* Monk. The *Benedictines* believe that it was written by *Alcherus*, a Friend of *Iſaac*'s, Abbot of *Stella*, to whom this Man directed a Letter *of the Soul.* In the *Bibliotheca Ciſterciana*, it is attributed to *Iſaac*, and it is obſerved that he publiſh'd it under *Alcherus*'s Name; but it is not likely that Abbot *Iſaac* would inſert a part of his own Letter into this Treatiſe.

The Treatiſe *of Friendſhip* is an Epitome, or rather an Extract out of the Treatiſe of *Aelredus Rievallenſis*, which is found among that Author's Works.

The Book *of the Subſtance of Love*, is made up of two ſmall Treatiſes among the Works of *Hugo de S. Victore.* That *of the Love of God*, is a Collection of Paſſages of this ſame Author's, out of St. *Bernard*, and St. *Anſelm. Vincentius Bellovacenſis* cites it under *Peter Comeſtor*'s Name.

The Soliloquies that are here, are not thoſe of St. *Auguſtin*, which are in the firſt Volume of his Works: Theſe are made up out of Paſſages of the Soliloquies and Confeſſions of St. *Auguſtin*, and the Books of *Hugo de S. Victore.* There is the firſt Chapter of the Fourth *Lateran* Council held in the Year 1198.

St. *Auguſtin.* Tome VI.

It is proved in the Preface to the Book of Meditations, that they cannot be St. *Auguſtin's*. Many of them are attributed to St. *Anſelm*; but the *Benedictines* have prov'd, That they are rather written by *John* Abbot of *Feſcamp*, who lived in the time of the Emperor *Henry* III. to whoſe Widow he directs a Letter, publiſhed by Father *Mabillon* in the firſt Volume of his *Analecta*, from another Manuſcript of the Abby of St. *Arnoul* of *Metz*, where this Treatiſe of Meditations is mentioned, part whereof is found in the ſame Manuſcript.

The following Treatiſe *of the Contrition of the Heart*, is taken out of the Meditations attributed to St. *Anſelm*.

The Manual is Compoſed likewiſe of Extracts out of St. *Anſelm's* Works, and St. *Bernard's*, *Hugo's de S. Victore*, and *Alcuinus*; there are alſo ſome Paſſages of St. *Auguſtin*, St. *Cyprian*, St. *Gregory*, and of *Iſidore* of *Seville*. Part of this Book is in the next Book, entituled *the Looking-Glaſs*: Another part of it is the Extract of a Prayer which is in the Manuſcript of *Corby*, which containeth the Works of Abbot *John*.

The *Looking-Glaſs* makes a part of the Confeſſion of Faith, which *Chiffletius* publiſhed under *Alcuinus's* Name; yet it is Compoſed of Paſſages out of *Alcuinus's* own Works.

The next Book is entituled, *The Looking-Glaſs of a Sinner*. The Author citeth a Sentence of *Odo Cluniacenſis*, in Commendation of St. *Martin*. He uſeth the term of Prebend, and he hath taken ſome places out of the Prayer of *Hugo de S. Victore*, out of the Book *of the Spirit and Soul* already mentioned, and out of the Book *of Conſcience*, aſcribed to St. *Bernard*. The Book *of the threefold Habitation* is of the ſame nature; and there are the ſame Notions. It is very likely that all theſe Treatiſes of Piety belong to the ſame Author.

The Book intituled, *The Ladder of Paradiſe*, attributed to St. *Bernard*, and intituled in his VVorks, *the Ladder of the Cloiſter*; or, a Treatiſe *how to Pray*; is written by *Guigo* [or *Guido*] *Carthuſianus*, as appears by the Letter that ſerves for a Preface, taken out of the Manuſcript of the *Carthuſian Houſe* in *Colen*.

Honorius of *Autun*, in his Book *of Luminaries*, mentions a Book which he had written, intituled, *Of the Knowledge of Life*; or, *Of the true Life*. This here bears the ſame Title, and has the Stile and Genius of this Author; as is proved in the Preface.

The Book *of a Chriſtian Life*, was formerly reſtored by *Holſtenius*, to one *Faſtidius*, a *Britain*, who is the true Author of it; as we learn not only by the ancient Manuſcript belonging to the Monaſtery of *Mount-Caſſin*, by which *Holſtenius* Printed it at *Rome*, in 1633. but alſo by the Authority of *Gennadius*, who aſcribes it to him, and who obſerves that this Author was a *Britain*.

In this Book there are ſeveral Footſteps of *Pelagius's* Errors; he lived much about the ſame time.

The Book *of Wholſome Inſtructions*, is here reſtored upon the Credit of an ancient Manuſcript, in the Library of M. *Colbert*, to *Paulinus* Patriarch of *Aquileia*; who lived about the latter end of the * Ninth Century.

The Author of the Book, *Of the Twelve Abuſes of the Age*, is not known; it is as wrongfully attributed to St. *Auguſtin* as to St. *Cyprian*: only it is obſerved in the Preface, That this Book is quoted by *Jonas* Biſhop of *Orleans*, who was ancienter than *Hincmar*, who writ a Book bearing the ſame Title, different from that mentioned by *Flodoardus*: *Pamelius* found a Manuſcript, having in the Margin the Name of *Evrard*, inſtead of St. *Auguſtin*; but this *Evrard* is not known.

They did not Print the two Treatiſes *of the Seven deadly Sins*, and *of the Seven Gifts of the Holy Spirit*, which F. *Vignier* publiſhed under St. *Auguſtin's* Name, in the Firſt Part of his Supplement, becauſe they are amongſt the VVorks of *Hugo de S. Victore*.

The Treatiſe *of the Conflict betwixt Vertues and Vices* was firſt aſcribed to St. *Auguſtin*, then to St. *Leo*, then to St. *Ambroſe*, and at laſt to *Iſidore* of *Seville*: but here it is reſtored to its true Author *Ambroſius Autpertus*, a *Benedictine* Monk [of the Monaſtery of St. *Vincent*] upon the *Vulturnus* near *Benevento*. This Treatiſe is mentioned in his Life, which is in the *Acts of the Benedictines*, *Age* III. at the Year 778. The Stile of this Treatiſe is very like that of this Author's Commentary upon the *Revelations*.

Of the ſame Nature is the Book *of Sobriety and Charity*, and the Author of it is unknown. There Drunkenneſs is particularly reproved. This Book is well enough written, and ſeemeth to me to be ancient.

The *Benedictines* prove in their Preface to the Book *of true and falſe Repentance*, That this Book has not St. *Auguſtin's* Stile, though it hath been cited under his Name by *Gratian*, by the Maſter of the Sentences, *Petrus Bleſenſis*, and ſeveral others.

The Treatiſe *of Antichriſt*, is likewiſe among the VVorks of *Alcuinus* and *Rabanus*. *Rupertus* cites it without naming the Author. The Manuſcripts attribute it to *Alcuinus*, and it agrees well enough with his other Writings. It contains ſeveral Circumſtances relating to Anti-Chriſt, and the End of the World, which he deſcribeth with as much Confidence as if he had learned it by Revelation.

After this Treatiſe comes *a Prayer*, or rather *an Imprecation* out of ſeveral Verſes of the *Pſalms*. It is intituled in a Manuſcript of the King's Library, *The Pſalter of Pope* John, *made at* Vienna. *John* the XXIId. is thought to be the Man meant by that Title.

* [This ſeems to be a miſtake of the Preſs: this *Paulinus*, or as it is in the French *Paulus*, was Contemporary with *Charles* the Great, aſſiſted at the Council of *Franefort*, and dy'd, according to Dr. *Cave*, in the Year 804.]

The

The following Treatiſe upon the *Magnificat*, is a Fragment of the Treatiſe of *Hugo de S. Victore*, upon this Hymn.

That *of the Virgin's Aſſumption*, is a Sermon of ſome Author of the Twelfth Century, or thereabouts; which teacheth that the Bleſſed Virgin is in Heaven, both Soul and Body.

Both the Diſcourſes *concerning Viſiting the Sick*, contain uſeful Rules to teach Prieſts how they ſhould behave themſelves towards Sick Perſons; but they are very late. Both the Diſcourſes of the Comfort for the Dead, are of the ſame Nature, and it may be of the ſame Author.

The Treatiſe *of Chriſtian Behaviour* is a Collection of Notions taken out of St. *Eloi* or *Eligius* Biſhop of *Noyon*, and *Cæſarius*. The Diſcourſe *upon the Creed*, is likewiſe a Collection of Remarks drawn out of *Rufinus*, *Cæſarius*, St. *Gregory*, *Ivo Carnutenſis*, and others. The Sermon upon *Eaſter*-Eve, about the Paſchal-Lamb, and that upon the * 41ſt. Sermon, are among the Books falſly attributed to St. *Jerom*.

The three Sermons to the Novices, *concerning Unction*, *Baptiſm*, *and waſhing of the Feet*, are not like St. *Auguſtin*'s Writings, though they are attributed to him in very ancient Manuſcripts.

The Treatiſe *of the Creation of the firſt Man*, is inſerted entire into the Book *of the Spirit and the Soul*. It is among St. *Ambroſe*'s VVorks, entituled a Treatiſe *of the Dignity of the firſt Man*; and among *Alcuinus*'s it is intituled, *Thoughts of the Bleſſed* Albinus *a Levite*, *upon theſe words of* Geneſis, *Let us make Man after our own Image*.

The Sermon *of the Vanity of this preſent Age*, is inſerted into the Treatiſe *of Chriſtian Behaviour*. The Author of the Sermon *upon the contempt of the World* is not known. That about the Advantage of Diſcipline belongs to *Valerianus Cemelienſis*: It is not known who was the Author of the Sermons *of Obedience*, *Humility*, *Prayer*, *Alms*, and that *of the Generality of Alms-deeds*. The ſmall Diſcourſe of the Twelve Prayers ſpoken of in the 21ſt. Chapter of the *Revelations*, belongs perhaps to *Amatus* a Monk, of *Mount-Caſſin*, or rather an Extract of *Bede*'s Commentary upon that Paſſage in the *Revelations*.

Finally, The Sermons *to the Brethren that live in the Wilderneſs*, are the Work of ſome Modern Monk, who was ſo imprudent as to publiſh them under St. *Auguſtin*'s Name, though it be as clear as the day, that they are not of this Father. *Baronius* obſerves, That they were Compos'd by an Impoſtor, and that they are full of Fables, Falſities, and Lyes. *Bellarmin* ſaith, That the Stile of them is Childiſh, Courſe, and Barbarous. There are ſeveral Paſſages out of St. *Auguſtin*, *Cæſarius* and St. *Gregory*. It is probable, that the Author was a *Flemming*.

St. *Auguſtin.* Tome VI.

* [What this Book *upon the* 41ſt. *Sermon* ſhou'd be, I cannot tell; it is falſe Printed in all probability, but not having this *Benedictine* Edition of St. *Auguſtin* by me, I could not alter it.]

The SEVENTH TOME.

Tom. VII.

THE Seventh Volume contains St. *Auguſtin*'s great Work *of the City of God*. He undertook it about the Year 413. after the taking of *Rome* by *Alaric* King of the *Goths*, to refute the Heathens who attributed that Misfortune to the Chriſtian Religion. This VVork held him ſeveral Years, by reaſon of many intervening Buſineſſes which he could not put off; ſo that he did not finiſh it before the Year 426. It is divided into Two and twenty Books, whereof the firſt Five refute thoſe who believe that the worſhip of the Gods is neceſſary for the good of the VVorld; and affirmed, That all the Miſchiefs lately happened, proceeded from no other cauſe, but the aboliſhing of that Religion. The next Five are againſt thoſe who confeſſing that the ſame Calamities have been in all Ages; yet pretend that the worſhip of the Heathen Divinities was profitable to a future Life. Thus the Ten firſt Books are to Anſwer both thoſe Chimerical Opinions, which are contrary to the Chriſtian Religion. But leſt they ſhould reproach him with having refuted the Opinions of others, without eſtabliſhing the Chriſtian Religion, the other part of this VVork is allotted to that purpoſe, and it conſiſts of Twelve Books, though he ſometimes eſtabliſheth our belief in the former Ten, and ſo in the Twelve others he ſometimes correcteth the Errors of our Adverſaries. In the Four firſt of theſe Twelve, he deſcribes, The Original of the two Cities; the one of God, and the other of the VVorld. In the Four next, their Progreſs; And in the Four laſt, their Ends: And ſo, though all the 22. Books do equally treat of both Cities, yet this VVork has its Name from the better, and they are commonly called, *The Books of the City of God*. This is the Account which St. *Auguſtin* gives, both of the Subject and of the Occaſion of theſe Books in his *Retractations*. Let us now examine more particularly what is moſt remarkable in each Book; for it is a VVork made up of a great variety of very learned and very curious things.

In the Firſt Book, he ſhews, That inſtead of imputing to the Chriſtians, the Deſolation and the taking of *Rome*, the Heathen ought rather to aſcribe to the ſpecial favour of Jeſus Chriſt, That the *Barbarians*, only out of reverence to his Name, ſpared all thoſe that had retired into the Churches. He pretends, That there are no Examples in the VVars of the Heathen, to ſhew That the Enemies who ſpoiled a Town taken by Storm, ſpared thoſe who took Sanctuary in the Temples of their Gods. This puts St. *Auguſtin* upon asking, why this Favour of God was extended to thoſe Ungodly Men that fled into the Churches, who feigned themſelves to be Chriſtians; and why the good were involved in the ſame Miſchief with the wicked. He confeſſes, That both the Good and the Evil Things of this VVorld are common both to Good and Evil Men;

St. *Auguſtin.* Tome VII.

Men; but the difference conſiſts in the Uſe which they make of them. He obſerves, That perhaps good Men probably are puniſhed with the wicked, becauſe they took no care to reprove and to correct them; and that however, good Men loſe nothing by loſing the good things of this World; That a Chriſtian ought to be eaſily conforted for want of Burial, ſeeing that this doth him neither good nor hurt: And he comforteth the Virgins that had been raviſhed in that diſorder; ſhewing, That they loſt neither the Chaſtity of the Soul, nor the Purity of the Body: He excuſeth thoſe that killed themſelves, rather than endure that diſhonour. But he ſhews at the ſame time, That this Action ſo much admired by the Heathen, is contrary both to Reaſon, and to the Laws of Nature; and that it is never lawful to kill our ſelves upon any account whatſoever. He anſwers the Examples of ſome holy Women who threw themſelves into the River, to eſcape the Violence of thoſe that would have raviſh'd them. He ſaith, That they might have been induced to that, by the Spirit of God, as *Sampſon* was. He concludes with a Deſcription of the Depravation of the *Romans*, and the Diſorders of their Manners, at that time.

In the Second Book he affirms, That the corruption of Manners, which is the greateſt of Miſchiefs, was always reigning in *Rome*; and that the Gods they Worſhipped, were ſo far from preſcribing them Laws, for the Reformation of their Manners, that on the contrary, they encouraged them to Vice, by their Examples, and by the Ceremonies that were uſed in their Worſhip.

In the Third Book he goes back as far as the Siege of *Troy*, and then takes a view of the principal Events which happened to the People of *Rome*, to convince the moſt Stubborn, That their Gods preſerved them not from the ſame Diſaſters and Calamities, which the Heathen now imputed to the Chriſtian Religion.

In the Fourth Book he ſhews, That the encreaſe of the Roman Empire can be attributed neither to all the Divinities which they adored, nor to any one in particular: That however, no Empire is to be called Happy, which is encreaſed only by War, as the Roman Empire was: That great Empires, without Juſtice, were but great Robberies; and that the true God alone, is the ſole Diſpenſer of the Kingdoms of the Earth.

He proſecuteth the ſame Subject in the Fifth Book; and proves, in the beginning, That the greatneſs of Empires depends not upon Chance, nor upon a particular Conjunction of the Stars: Which gives him occaſion to ſpeak of Deſtiny, and to refute judicial Aſtrology at large. He acknowledges a Deſtiny, if by this Term is meant a ſeries, and concatenation of all Cauſes, which God foreſaw from all Eternity; but he adviſes Men rather not to uſe that word which may have an ill Sence. He endeavours to make God's Fore-knowledge, and the infallibility of thoſe Events, which he foreſees, to agree with Man's Free-Will. Then from this Diſpoſition of Things, he comes to enquire into the Cauſes of the Roman Victories, and he meets with none more probable than their Honeſty. He confeſſes, That God rewarded their moral Vertues with thoſe ſorts of Recompences; adding, That thereby God made the Inhabitants of the eternal City, to know what Recompence they were to expect for their Chriſtian Vertues. Since the counterfeit Vertues of the Heathen were ſo well rewarded, that he ſet this Example before their Eyes, to teach them how much they ought to be in love with their Heavenly Country for an immortal Life, ſince the Inhabitants of an Earthly Country were ſo much in love with it, for an humane, and a mortal Glory; and how hard they were to Labour for that Heavenly Country, ſince the Romans had taken ſuch great Pains for their Earthly One. " He examineth afterwards, wherein conſiſts the true Happineſs of Chriſtian Kings, " and Princes: And he ſhews, That they are not Happy for having reigned long, for dying " in Peace, and leaving their Children ſucceſſors of their Crowns, nor for the Victories which " they obtained, becauſe ſuch Advantages are common to them with ungodly Kings: But " that Chriſtian Princes are ſaid to be Happy, when they ſet up Juſtice, when in the midſt " of the Praiſes that are given them, and the Honours that are pay'd unto them, they are not " ſwell'd with Pride, when they ſubmit their Power to the Sovereign Power of God, and uſe " it to make his Worſhip to flouriſh. When they fear, love, and worſhip God; when they " preferr, before this which they now enjoy, that wherein they are not afraid to meet with " any Competitours; when they are ſlow to Puniſh, and ready to Forgive; when they puniſh " only for the good of the Publick, and not to ſatisfie their Revenge; and when they forgive " purely that Men may be Corrected, and not that Crimes may be Countenanced; when being " obliged to uſe Severity, they temper it with ſome Actions of Meekneſs, or Clemency; when " they are ſo much the more temperate in their Pleaſures, by how much they have a greater " Liberty to exceed; when they affect to Command their Paſſions, rather than all the Nati- " ons of the World, and they do all theſe Things, not out of Vain-Glory, but to obtain eter- " nal Happineſs; and, in ſhort, when they are careful to offer unto God, for their Sins, the " Sacrifice of Humility, Mercy, and Prayer. Theſe, ſaith St. *Auguſtin*, are the Chriſtian Princes whom we call Happy: Happy even in this World by Experience, and really Happy, when what we look for, ſhall come. Finally, he propoſes the Examples of ſome Chriſtian Emperours, and particularly of *Conſtantine*, and *Theodoſius*, whoſe Greatneſs, and Proſperities, he extols and ſets forth.

In

In the Sixth Book, St. *Auguſtin* proves by the Authority of *Varro*, that the fabulous Divinity of the Heathen is ridiculous; he makes the ſame Concluſion concerning their civil Theology, and grounds what he ſaith of it upon *Seneca*'s Authority. St. *Auguſtin.* Tom. VII.

He goes on in the Seventh, to diſcover the Falſhood of the Heathen civil Theology; ſhewing, That their chiefeſt Divinities, or ſelect Gods, do not deſerve to be called Gods; and that the Chriſtian's God alone governs the World.

The Eighth Book refutes the natural Theology of their Philoſophers: He preferrs the *Platoniſts* before all other Philoſophers, and owns that they knew the True God; ſhewing withall, that they were deceiv'd by honouring *Dæmons*, as ſubaltern Deities, and Mediators betwixt God, and Men: He ſhews, "That the Chriſtians never committed this Miſtake; and that "they are ſo far from adoring the *Dæmons*, which are evil Spirits, that they do not worſhip the "Angels, nor the Holy Martyrs; that they do indeed Honour, and Reverence them as the "Servants of God, but that they did not build Temples for them, nor conſecrate Prieſts, nor "offer Sacrifices unto them. For, ſaith he, who among Chriſtians ever ſaw a Prieſt before an "Altar, conſecrated to God, upon the Body of a Martyr, ſay in his Prayer, *Peter*, *Paul*, or "*Cyprian*, I offer you this Sacrifice? It is offered to God, though it be upon the Monuments of Martyrs; and theſe Ceremonies were appointed to be performed upon their Monuments, for no other end, but to give the True God Thanks for the Victories which they had obtained, and at the ſame time, to ſtir up Chriſtians to imitate their Courage, and to make themſelves worthy to have a ſhare in their Crowns, and Rewards: So that all the Acts of Piety, and Religion, which are done at the Tombs of the Holy Martyrs, are Honours pay'd to their Memory, and not Sacrifices offered to them as Divinities.

But foraſmuch as they owned Two ſorts of *Dæmons*, ſome good, and ſome bad, St. *Auguſtin* examines that Diſtinction in the next Book, where he ſhews by the Principles both of *Apuleius*, and of the Chief of Heatheniſh Authors, that all *Dæmons* are Evil. Whence he concludes, That they cannot be Mediatours between God, and Men. He doth not believe, That Angels deſerve that Title, affirming, That it belongeth to none but Jeſus Chriſt alone.

In the Tenth Book he treateth at large of Angel Worſhip: He ſaith, That they are Creatures, whoſe Felicity is all in God; that they worſhip God, and their Deſire is, that all Men would worſhip him; that they require of us, neither Adoration, nor Sacrifices; and that God doth not expect from us Sacrifices, like thoſe of the Heathen, but a Sarcifice of Union, ſuch as the Church celebrates in the Euchariſt, and which the Faithful know: That the Miracles which were wrought by the interpoſition of Angels, (not of *Dæmons*, whoſe Prodigies are nothing but illuſions:) Theſe Miracles, I ſay, were wrought by God's Power, to make himſelf known unto Men: That the inviſible God becomes viſible by the miniſtry of his Angels, whom he made uſe of to deliver his Law to the World: That it is ſo true, that no Sacrifice is to be offered to any but God; that Jeſus Chriſt, as Man, would be made a Sacrifice himſelf, and not receive one from any Body elſe: That God alone can purifie Men of their Sins, as the *Platoniſts* themſelves acknowledge, that ſo it was neceſſary that God ſhould be made Man to be a true Mediator: That the juſt Men, under the old Law, were not Saved, but by Faith in this Mediator: That Pride alone keeps the *Platoniſts* from owning the Incarnation: That the Soul is not Co-eternal with God, as they imagine: And Laſtly, That the Means of delivering, the Soul which they fought after to ſo little purpoſe, is nothing but the Chriſtian Religion.

In the 11th. Book, St. *Auguſtin* finds the Original of both Cities, in the diverſity of Angels; which gives him occaſion to treat of the Creation of the viſible World, which was immediately preceded by that of the inviſible, that is of the Angels whom he created all in a State of Righteouſneſs, from which ſome are fallen through their own fault. He makes ſome digreſſions to ſpeak of the Trinity, and of ſeveral Circumſtances of the Creation of the VVorld.

Having proved in the 12th. That the difference of good, and evil Angels doth not proceed from their Nature, but from their VVill, becauſe God created nothing but what was both Good, and Perfect. He comes to diſcourſe of Mankind; and proves, That Men are not from Eternity, but that God created Man in time: And he mentions ſomething, concerning the Fall of the Firſt Man, whereof he ſpeaks more at large in the 13th. Book, where he ſhews, That the death, both of Body and Soul, was the Conſequence, and the Puniſhment of *Adam*'s Fall. There one may meet with ſeveral curious Notions concerning Death; and ſeveral Reflections upon the Reſurrection, and the Quality of glorified Bodies. He goes on in the 14th. Book, to ſpeak of the Fall of the Firſt Man, and of the lamentable Conſequences that attended it, and particularly of irregular Deſires, and ſhameful Paſſions. He enquires, VVhether the Firſt Man was ſubject to Paſſions, and how he could Sin, being free from them. Laſtly, He asketh ſeveral Queſtions, rather nice, than neceſſary, how Men ſhould have had Children in the Earthly Paradiſe, had they continued in the State of Innocence.

The Fifteenth Book is the firſt of thoſe wherein he examineth the Progreſs of both the Cities: He finds the Hiſtory of it in the Old Teſtament, where he ſhews who were the Citizens of both thoſe Cities. This Book proſecutes this Hiſtory from the Creation, to the Flood. On the one ſide, we ſee *Abel*, and *Iſaac*, and on the other *Cain*, and *Eſau*: And both theſe Cities may be taken notice of in the Marriages of the Sons of God, with the Daughters of

St. *Auguſtin.* Tom. VII.

Men. The Church is repreſented by *Noah*'s Ark. There are in this Book curious Allegories, and ſeveral Reflections upon the Hiſtory of *Geneſis*. Amongſt other Things, he examines the length of the Lives of the Firſt Patriarchs; and the Difference betwixt the Tranſlation of the *Septuagint*, and the Hebrew Text, about the Number of the Generations.

In the 16th. Book he carries on the Hiſtory of both Cities, from *Noah* to *Abraham*, and from *Abraham* to the Kings of *Iſrael*. He doth not find that the Scripture takes notice of any that ſerved God from *Noah* to *Abraham*. He ſpeaks of the Poſterity of the Children of *Noah*, of the Confounding of Languages, of the Antiquity of the Hebrew Tongue, and of the Multiplication of Mankind. He queſtions whether there be *Antipodes*. In the reſt of the Book he clears the Hiſtory of *Abraham*, and of his Poſterity, which is explained with relation to the City of God.

In the 17th. taking a View of the Hiſtory both of the Kings and of the Prophets, he relates and expounds the Prophecies which are in the Books of *Kings*, in the *Pſalms*, and in the Books of *Solomon*, which relate to Chriſt or his Church.

Now as he had quitted the Hiſtory of the City of the World, when he was come to *Abraham*, ſo he reſumeth it in the beginning of the 18th. Book; which contains an Abridgment of the Hiſtory of the Principal Monarchies in the VVorld, the times whereof he makes to agree with the Hiſtory of the Bible; and he omits not to ſpeak of the Fabulous Hiſtories, and of the Metamorphoſes. Afterwards, he quotes the *Sibylline* Oracles; but he inſiſts moſt upon the Predictions of the Prophets, which he produces in all their Particulars. He ſpeaks alſo of the Books of the *Maccabees*: and having made ſome Reflections upon the Authority of the Hiſtory of the Canonical Books, and of the Tranſlation of the LXX. he deſcribeth in few words the Fall of the Jewiſh Empire; and ſo he comes to the Nativity of Jeſus Chriſt, the Diſperſion of the Jews, the Settlement of the Church, the Perſecutions and Hereſies which immediately followed. St. *Auguſtin* makes very ingenious Reflections upon all theſe Articles; and concludes this Book, by ſhowing, That the End of the VVorld is Unknown; and he refutes a falſe Prediction which the Heathens publiſhed, That the Chriſtian Religion ſhould laſt but Three hundred ſixty five Years.

The 19th. Book treateth of the End of both Cities: Each one aims at the chiefeſt Good; but the Inhabitants of the Terreſtrial know ſo little of it, that their Philoſophers, the Wiſeſt among them, could never agree wherein it conſiſted. *Varro* reckoneth Two hundred eighty eight different Opinions of Philoſophers about it. The Chriſtian Religion diſcovers the Falſity of all thoſe Opinions, by letting Man know, That he cannot be Happy in this Life, but only in Hope; becauſe he cannot enjoy here Peace and perfect Tranquility.

The 20th. Book contains a Deſcription of the Laſt Judgment, of the Renewing of the World, of the Reſurrection, and of the Heavenly *Jeruſalem*.

The 21ſt. treateth of the End of the Earthly City, and repreſents the Horror of the Torments of Dæmons and Damned Men, and of the Eternal Fire of Hell. St. *Auguſtin* refutes the vain Reaſons of thoſe that doubt of it; and the Fancy of ſome, who affirmed, That thoſe Torments ſhould have an End, and that Men ſhould be kept from them by the Interceſſion of the Saints, by the Uſe of Sacraments, and by Almſdeeds.

The Laſt Book is, concerning the Happineſs which the Saints ſhall enjoy to Eternity. The main End which St. *Auguſtin* aims at there, is, To prove the Probability of Man's Reſurrection. His chief Reaſon is grounded upon Chriſt's Reſurrection; atteſted by ſuch credible Witneſſes, that none can rationally doubt of it, the truth thereof having been confirmed by ſo many Miracles. But becauſe Unbelievers demanded why Miracles were not ſtill wrought, St. *Auguſtin* mentions ſeveral that were done in his time, which he pretends to be very certain, and very well atteſted. He ſpeaks again of the Condition of Glorified Bodies, and Crowns his Work with an excellent Pourtraicture of the Happineſs of the Saints. " How great (ſaith he) will " be that Felicity that ſhall be diſturbed with no Evil, and where no other Buſineſs ſhall be " followed but ſinging the Praiſes of God, who ſhall be all in all? ... There will be found " True Glory, where there is neither Error nor Flattery. There is True Honour; ſince it " it is refuſed to none that deſerve it, and it is not given to any that deſerve it not; yea, where " no Unworthy Perſon ſhall pretend to it, becauſe there ſhall be none there but ſuch as are " Worthy. There will be True Peace, where a Man ſhall ſuffer nothing either from himſelf, " or from other Men. He that is the Author of Vertue, ſhall himſelf be the Reward of it; " becauſe there is nothing better than He. He ſhall be the End of our Deſires, whom we ſhall " See to be without End, whom we ſhall Love without Diſguſt, and Praiſe without Weari- " neſs. This Employment will be common to all Men, as well as Eternal Life; but it is im- " poſſible to know what degree of Glory ſhall be proportionable to each Man's Merit; and " yet it is certain, that there is a great difference betwixt the Happineſs of the one and of the " other. But one of the great Advantages of that City, will be, That none ſhall envy thoſe " whom he ſhall ſee to be Above him .... Every one ſhall enjoy a Happineſs, ſome greater, " and others leſs; but every one ſhall have this Gift, Not to deſire a greater than what he " has. And we are not to imagine that Men ſhall be there without Free-Will, becauſe " they cannot take pleaſure in Sin. For he will be ſo much the more Free, who ſhall be " delivered from the Pleaſure of Sinning, ſo as to take an unalterable Pleaſure in not Sinning " any more. ... Wherefore, all the Inhabitants of this divine City ſhall have a Will perfectly

" Free

" Free, exempt from all Evil, fill'd with all manner of Good, enjoying without intermiſſion " the Delights of an Immortal Joy, without remembrance either of his Faults or of his Miſeries, " otherwiſe than to bleſs their Deliverer for the ſame. St. *Auguſtin.* Tom. VII.

They have left out in this Edition the Commentaries both of *Ludovicus Vives*, and of *Leonardus Coquæus*; which exceeded the Text of St. *Auguſtin* by much, and which ſerved but little to underſtand it, though otherwiſe full of Learning and Erudition.

Theſe Books of St. *Auguſtin* are very pleaſant, for the ſurpriſing variety of the things which he hath brought in to ſerve his purpoſe, ſo as all to tend to the ſame end. Their Learning is generally admired; yet they contain nothing but what is taken out of *Cicero*, *Varro*, *Seneca*, and other profane Authors, whoſe Works were common enough in thoſe days; and one may ſay, that there is nothing very curious or elaborate; and in ſome places he is not exact, and he does not directly reſolve moſt of the Difficulties which he propoſes both upon the Text, and upon the Hiſtory of the Books of the Bible. He diſcuſſes very uſeleſs Queſtions, and ſometimes makes uſe of Reaſons too weak to perſuade thoſe that would doubt of what he intends to prove: yet for all that, this is a moſt excellent Book: What I moſt admire in it, is, the Management of the whole Work, the judicious Reflections which he makes upon the Opinions therein related, and the great Principles of Morality which he layeth down upon Occaſion.

At the latter end of this Volume there are ſome Letters which have ſome relation to what St. *Auguſtin* ſaith in the 8th. Chapter of the laſt Book of the Miracles that were done in his time. The Firſt is one of *Avitus*, upon the Tranſlation of a Letter written by *Lucianus*, concerning the Diſcovering of St. *Stephen*'s Body. With this Tranſlation, they have added another Tract, tranſlated out of Greek by *Anaſtaſius* the Library-Keeper, about another Diſcovery of St. *Stephen*'s Relicks at *Conſtantinople*. They have likewiſe placed their Biſhop *Severus*'s Letter, touching the Miracles happened in the Iſland *Minorca*, at the appearing of St. *Stephen*'s Relicks for the Converſion of the Jews: And two Books aſcribed to *Evodius*, Biſhop of *Uzala*, concerning St. *Stephen*'s Miracles; which have been mentioned already.

The EIGHTH TOME.

THE Eighth Volume of St. *Auguſtin*'s Works, contains his Writings againſt Hereticks, excepting thoſe that are againſt both the *Donatiſts* and the *Pelagians*, which make up two diſtinct Volumes. It begins with the ſmall Treatiſe of *Hereſies*, compoſed in the Year 428. at the Requeſt of *Quodvultdeus*, a Deacon, to whom it is directed. Tom. VIII

This Writing was to have had Two Parts: The Firſt, concerning the Hereſies raiſed from Jeſus Chriſt's to St. *Auguſtin*'s time. He promiſed to examine, in the Second, what it is that makes a Man an Heretick. This Second ſhould naturally have been the Firſt; becauſe that to know the Hereſies that have broken out ſince Jeſus Chriſt's time, it is neceſſary to know what is Hereſie. But St. *Auguſtin* finding this Queſtion hard to be reſolved, began with the other that was more eaſie, and never undertook the Second. Therefore this Treatiſe is only a very ſuccinct Catalogue of the Names of Heretical Sects, and of their principal Errors. It beginneth with the *Symonians*, and endeth with the *Pelagians*, and containeth Eighty eight Hereſies: it is by nó means exact, and one ſhall hardly find any thing there which is not taken out of St. *Epiphanius* and *Philaſtrius*.

The Treatiſe *againſt the Jews*, is a Sermon in which St. *Auguſtin* proves by the Prophecies, That the Jewiſh Law was to have an End; That it was to be changed into a New Law; and, That God would reject the Jews, to call the Gentiles.

Theſe Two ſhort Treatiſes are follow'd by St. *Auguſtin*'s Writings againſt the *Manichees*; which are ſet down in the firſt place, becauſe thoſe Hereticks oppoſed the firſt Principles of the Chriſtian Religion. The Firſt of all, is that of the *Uſefulneſs of Faith*, which St. *Auguſtin* compoſed ſometime after he was Ordained Prieſt, in the Year 391. to reclaim his Friend *Honoratus* from the Errors of the *Manichees*, wherein he had been engaged as well as St. *Auguſtin*; becauſe thoſe Hereticks had put him in hope, That without making uſe of Authority, they ſhould diſcover the Truth to him by the Light of Reaſon, and by this one only mean bring him to the Knowledge of God, and deliver him from all ſorts of Errors. St. *Auguſtin* having ſhewed the difference betwixt the Author of a Hereſie, and a Perſon ſurprized with it afterwards, doth at firſt juſtifie the Old Teſtament; ſhewing, That it agreeth exactly with the New, in the Hiſtory, Morals and Allegories; and that the Church puts ſuch a ſenſe upon it, which the *Manichees* themſelves cannot condemn. He overthroweth the *Manichees* Principle; proving, That we muſt Believe before we Know. To this end, he ſuppoſes certain Perſons having no Religion, and ſeeking to be inſtructed in the True, to be like thoſe who ſhould enquire after a Maſter to teach them Rhetorick or Philoſphy. Afterwards he obſerves, That the only Party which theſe Perſons are to embrace at firſt, is to ſide with thoſe who are commonly and generally approved: That it is great Raſhneſs in thoſe who are incapable of themſelves to judge of things, to depart from the Common Voice; to preferr the Judgment of ſome particular Men, before that of the Multitude. So that it is moſt rational, ſince one Party or other is to be embraced, to ſide with

St. Auguſtin. Tom. VIII

with the Catholick Church, eſpecially becauſe it forbids not thoſe that come into her to enquire after the Truth. It ſaith indeed, That we ought to Believe: But it hath an Authority ſo to do; for no Man can Believe, but he muſt be perſuaded, That He in whom he believeth, is worthy of Credit; and this makes the difference betwixt a VViſe and a Credulous Man. But had it not been better to give convincing Reaſons of Things? No; for all Men are not capable of Reaſon, and ſome things cannot be underſtood without the help of a Divine Light. It is very dangerous to follow thoſe who promiſe to make us comprehend all things; becauſe they often boaſt of knowing what they are ignorant of, and often make us believe ſo too. And very ſhameful is that Condition, for Two Reaſons: Firſt, Becauſe ſuch a Perſon takes no more Pains to learn, being falſely perſuaded of his Knowledge: And, Secondly, Becauſe that an inconſiderate readineſs to judge of a thing, is a Mark of a weak Underſtanding. Reaſon makes us apprehend things, Authority makes us believe, but Error perſuades us to affirm raſhly that which is falſe. Upon theſe Principles St. *Auguſtin* proves the Neceſſity of Faith, in Matters of Civil Life, as much as in Matters of VViſdom: For in the firſt place, the VVhole of Humane Society is grounded upon the Belief of ſome certain Things. As for Example: The Honour we render to our Parents, is grounded merely upon our Belief, That they are the Perſons from whom we received Life. Secondly, There is no getting of VViſdom, without conſulting with VViſe Men. But how ſhall we know theſe VViſe Men, except we truſt Others? For unleſs we are VViſe our ſelves, we can never know True VViſdom. VVherefore, we muſt Believe, to ſeek after Religion: For did we not believe that there is ſuch a thing, why ſhould we ſeek for it? All Hereticks own that we muſt believe in Jeſus Chriſt: But what Motives have we to believe Jeſus Chriſt's Authority? Are they not the ſame with thoſe that make us believe the Church? Are they not the Miracles, the Sanctity both of the Doctrine and of the Morals, the Publiſhing of the Goſpel, the Blood of Martyrs, and ſome other Proofs of this nature, which eſtabliſh the Authority of the Church no leſs than that of Jeſus Chriſt? Therefore St. *Auguſtin* concludes thus, "Why ſhould we make any difficulty to throw our "ſelves into the Arms of that Church which hath always maintain'd her ſelf by the Succeſſion "of Biſhops in Apoſtolick Sees, in ſpite of all the Endeavours of Hereticks condemned by her, "or by Peoples Faith, or by the Deciſions of Councils, or by the Authority of Miracles? It "is either a matchleſs Impiety, or a very indiſcreet Arrogancy, not to acknowledge her "Doctrine for a Rule of our Faith. For if the Spirit of Man cannot attain unto Wiſdom, and "ſo to Salvation, but by Faith directing our Reaſon; is it not to be Ungrateful, and neglect the "Succour proffered by God, to reſiſt ſo weighty an Authority? And truly, if any Science, "though common and eaſie, cannot be learned without a Teacher; it is Preſumption, in the "higheſt degree, to refuſe to learn the Sence of the Sacred Books from thoſe that underſtand "them; and to condemn them, without hearing what they ſay.

After this Firſt Book againſt the Foundation of the *Manichæan* Hereſie, St. *Auguſtin* compoſed the Book *Of the Two Souls*, againſt one principal Error of thoſe Hereticks; aſſerting, That there were Two Souls in each Man; a Good one, of a Divine Subſtance, the cauſe of all that is Good in us; and an Evil one, of the nature of Darkneſs, proper to the Fleſh, which is the Principle of all diſorderly Motions, and of all the Evil that we doe. St. *Auguſtin* proves in this Book, Firſt, That the Soul being a Spirit and Life, is more perfect than Corporeal Light, which the *Manichees* believe to come from God. Secondly, That there is no Nature or Subſtance naturally Evil; and that Evil conſiſts only in the Abuſe of our Liberty. Some Paſſages in this Book attribute much to Free-Will; nay, there are ſome which may not agree well with the Doctrine of Grace, and of Original Sin, which St. *Auguſtin* correcteth in his *Retractations*.

There was at that time in *Hippo* a Prieſt, one *Fortunatus*, a Famous *Manichee*, who had ſeduc'd many Inhabitants of that City. The *Catholicks* engaged St. *Auguſtin*, in a Conference with him. What was ſaid on both Sides, was ſet down in Writing by Notaries, and that Act preſerved among St. *Auguſtin*'s Writings. The Diſpute laſted but two Days; and the Queſtions that were diſputed about, were of Nature, and the Original of Evil. St. *Auguſtin* affirms, That Evil proceeds from the Abuſe of Free-Will. The *Manichee* pretends, That there is an Evil Nature Co-eternal with God. In the firſt day's Conference the *Manichee* defended himſelf well enough; but he could not Anſwer St. *Auguſtin*'s Objections next day, and was obliged to ſay, That he would conferr about them with the Heads of his Sect. The Shame of being Confuted in that Conference, obliged him to leave *Hippo*. This Conference is dated the 26th. of *Auguſt*, under the Second Conſulſhip of *Arcadius* and *Ruſinus*, in the Year 392.

About that time, St. *Auguſtin* met with ſome Works of one *Adimantus*, who had been a Diſciple of *Manichæus*, written againſt the Law and the Prophets; which he affirmed to contain things contrary to the Precepts of the Goſpel and of the Apoſtles. He undertook to Anſwer the Objections of that Heretick, and to Juſtifie the Agreement betwixt thoſe Paſſages of the Old and New Teſtament which he had produced, as being contrary. This Book is of the Year 394.

St. *Auguſtin* having refuted the Diſciple, undertakes the Maſter, and Anſwereth the Letter which he called, *The Epiſtle of Foundation*: ſhewing, That *Manichæus* ſet forth in it nothing but Falſhods and Abſurdities. He lays down, at firſt, the Reaſons for his adhering to the Church, in theſe Terms: "Not to ſpeak *(ſaith he)* of that Wiſdom and Underſtanding which "few

" few Men apprehend in this Life, ſeveral Motives keep me in the Boſom of the Catholick " Church; The general Conſent of Nations and People, an Authority grounded upon Miracles, " upheld by Hope, perfected with Charity, and confirmed by Antiquity; the Succeſſion of " Biſhops from St. *Peter* to our time; and the Name of the Catholick Church, which is ſo " peculiar to the True Church, that though all Hereticks call themſelves Catholicks, yet when " you ask, in any Country whatſoever, where Catholicks meet, they dare not ſhew the Place " of their Aſſemblies. Theſe are powerful Motives which keep a faithful Man within the Pale " of the Church, though he be not yet arrived to a perfect underſtanding of the Truth. But " among you *Manichees*, that have none of theſe Reaſons either to invite or to keep me, I hear " none but vain Promiſes, to make me underſtand the Truth clearly. I confeſs, That did you " perform it, I ought to preferr an evident Truth, which none can doubt of, before all the " Motives that make me keep to the Catholick Church. But ſo long as you do only promiſe, " and not give this Knowledge, you ſhall not ſhake that Truſt which I have in the Catholick " Church, which is grounded upon ſuch powerful Reaſons and Motives." He examines afterwards the Principles contained in *Manichæus*'s Letter; and proves, That he not only fails in the Demonſtration of what he affirmeth, but that he is contrary even to Reaſon and Common Sence. This Book is placed in the *Retractations*, among the Books compoſed bout the Year 397. St. *Auguſtin.* Tom. VIII

The moſt conſiderable of all St. *Auguſtin*'s Works againſt the *Manichees*, is, his Treatiſe againſt *Fauſtus*, divided into Three and thirty Diſputes or Arguments; wherein he writes down the Text of this *Manichee*'s Books, which contained moſt part of the Blaſphemies and Impieties of thoſe Hereticks, againſt both the Old and the New Teſtament: which St. *Auguſtin* ſtrongly and ſolidly refutes. This Work was compleated about the Year 400. and ſent to St. *Jerom* in 404.

The next Book contains the Acts of a Conference which St. *Auguſtin* had at *Hippo*, in *December*, 404. with a *Manichee*, one *Felix*. The Diſpute laſted three Days, but we have a Relation but of what happened in the two laſt Conferences. In the Concluſion of the latter, the *Manichee* was Converted, and Anathematized *Manichæus*.

In the ſame Year, St. *Auguſtin* compoſed a Treatiſe *Of the Nature of Good*, againſt the *Manichees*: wherein he ſhews, That God is of an Immutable Nature: That he hath created all other Beings, whether Spiritual or Corporeal, which are all good in their Nature: That Evil proceedeth only from the Abuſe of Free-Will: That the *Manichees* call Evil Good, and Good Evil.

The Book againſt *Secundinus*, is properly an Anſwer of St. *Auguſtin*'s to that *Manichee*, who had exhorted him by a Letter, never to encounter with the *Manichees*, of whoſe Opinion himſelf had been formerly; and he had alſo urged him to return to their Sect. St. *Auguſtin* gives him the Reaſons of his Converſion, and diſcovers ſome of *Manichæus*'s Errors.

The following Treatiſe is againſt a Heretick who was worſe than the *Manichees*, who in a diſtinct Treatiſe aſſerted, That God did not make the World, nor give the Law. St. *Auguſtin* refuteth him, under the Name of *The Adverſary of the Law and the Prophets*, in two Books bearing that Title, compoſed about the Year 420.

Oroſius having conſulted St. *Auguſtin*, in 415. about the Impieties of the *Priſcillianiſts*, and ſome Errors of *Origen*'s Diſciples, St. *Auguſtin* anſwered him in a Book directed to him, entituled, *Againſt the Priſcillianiſts and Origeniſts*. In this ſmall Treatiſe he rejects theſe Errors: 1. That the Soul is of a Divine Nature. 2. That the Torments both of the Dæmons and of Damned Men ſhall have an end. 3. That the Reign of Jeſus Chriſt will not be Eternal. 4. That both Angels and Souls are Purified in this World. 5. That the Stars are Animated. 6. That Angels commit Sins.

The reſt of St. *Auguſtin*'s Treatiſes contained in this Volume are againſt the *Arians*.

The Firſt is an Anſwer to a Diſcourſe of an *Arian*, containing a great many Objections againſt the Divinity of the Son of God, and of the Holy Ghoſt. This Diſcourſe was made the next Year after the Conference with *Emeritus*, held in 417.

Next to this Treatiſe, are, *The Conference with* Maximinus, and *Two Books againſt that* Arian *Biſhop*. The Conference was held at *Hippo*, in the Year 428. whither *Maximinus* was ſent by Count *Sigiſvultdeus*. In the Conference were ſeveral Diſcourſes on both Sides; but *Maximinus* having ſaid many more things than St. *Auguſtin*, and ſpoken laſt, he bragg'd that he had got the Victory: which obliged this Saint to recollect all that had been ſaid in the Conference, and to refute *Maximinus*'s laſt Arguments, which he had not had time to anſwer.

St. *Auſtin*'s Books *of the Trinity*, are rather a Dogmatical Treatiſe, concerning that Myſtery, than Polemical Writings againſt *Hereticks*; for he inſiſteth not ſo much upon refuting their Reaſons, or eſtabliſhing the Doctrines of the Church, as upon ſubtile Reaſonings, to expound and clear this Myſtery. He began them in the Year 400. and finiſhed them in 416. The Firſt Book begins with a Preface containing very important Reflections. He obſerves, at firſt, That Men have Three falſe Notions of the Divinity; that ſome conceive of God as a Corporeal Subſtance, attributing to him Corporeal Properties; that others have ſuch an *Idea* of him, as they have of their Souls, and of other Spirits; and ſo they aſcribe to him the like Imperfections, as Repenting, Forgetting, and Remembring,; and that others entertain ſuch a Notion of God, as may have nothing Common with a Creature; and ſo they conceive none but

Chimerical *Idea's* of him. The Holy Scripture condeſcends to Men's Weakneſs, aſcribing often ſuch Things to God, as belong properly to Bodies, or imperfect Spirits; and ſeldom makes uſe of Terms peculiar to God, becauſe it is very difficult to know, in this Life, the Subſtance, or Eſſence of the divine Nature perfectly. But becauſe ſome Perſons deſire to be informed about this Matter, and ask how Three divine Perſons make one and the ſame Eſſence, he undertakes two things in this Work: Firſt, To ſhew, That the Scripture teaches us ſuch Doctrine; and then to raiſe the Mind, as far as it is capable in this Life, to the knowledge of this Myſtery.

St. *Auguſtin.* Tom. VIII

He proves the Firſt Point in the firſt Seven Books.

In the Firſt, he eſtabliſhes, by Paſſages of Scripture, the Unity, and the Equality of the Three Divine Perſons; and explains the principal Places that were urged by the *Arians*, againſt the Divinity of Jeſus Chriſt. The main Rule which he makes uſe of, is That Jeſus Chriſt being one only Perſon, made up of Two Natures, what is ſaid of the humane Nature ſhould be diſtinguiſhed from that which is ſpoken of the Divine.

In the Second, he confirmeth the former Rule, and layeth down another. That the Scripture ſpeaks things of the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt, which are not ſpoken of the Father, to ſhew, That they receive their Eſſence from the Father: As when tis ſaid, That the Son doth nothing of himſelf; that he receiveth Life from the Father. This, ſaith St. *Auguſtin*, doth not ſhew, That the Son is of a different Nature from the Father, but only, that the Son receiveth his Subſtance from the Father. And by this Rule, he explains the miſſion of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt. He ſpeaks alſo of Apparitions; wherein he pretends, That not one ſingle Perſon, but the whole Trinity, hath either ſpoken, or operated.

This laſt Queſtion is the Subject of his Third Book; wherein he examines, Whether God, in his Apparitions, formed Creatures to make himſelf known unto Men by them; or, Whether theſe Apparitions were by the Miniſtry of Angels, who made uſe of Bodies to accompliſh them. He concludes, in favour of the latter Opinion, rejecting the former, which had been held by all the Fathers before him.

The Fourth is about Chriſt's Incarnation, whereby God hath manifeſted how much he loved us. The Word was made Fleſh, to deliver us from the Darkneſs wherein we lay, to purifie our Hearts, and Minds. His Death delivered us from Two kinds of Death; from that of the Body, by reſtoring Immortality to us; and from that of the Soul, by waſhing us from our Sins. Here he makes a Digreſſion, concerning the perfection of the Number Six, which is neither very ſolid, nor much to the Purpoſe. He diſcourſes afterwards of the wonderful Effects of Chriſt's Mediation; and ſhews, at laſt, That the Humiliation of the Son of God, by his Incarnation, hinders him not from being equal with his Father, according to the Divine Nature.

In the Fifth Book, He refutes the Sophiſms of Hereticks againſt the Myſtery of the Trinity.

In the Sixth, He conſiders in what ſence the Son is called the Wiſdom and Power of the Father: Whether the Father be Wiſe of himſelf; or, Whether he is only the Father of Wiſdom. He puts off the Deciſion of that Queſtion, and treats again of the Unity and Equality of the Father, of the Son, and of the H. Ghoſt.

In the Seventh Book he reſolves the Queſtion propoſed in the Sixth, ſhewing that the Father is not only the Father of Power and of Wiſdom, but that he hath in himſelf both Power and Wiſdom; and that all the Three Perſons of the Trinity are Wiſe and Powerful by the ſame Power and Wiſdom, becauſe they have but one Godhead. Afterwards he explains in what ſence God is ſaid to have but one Eſſence and Three Perſons; or, according to the Greeks, three *Hypoſtaſes*.

Having proved in the Eighth Book that the Three Perſons together are not greater than any one alone, he enters upon the Second Part of his Work by exhorting Men to raiſe up themſelves to the Knowledge of God, thro' Charity, wherein he finds a kind of Trinity.

In the Ninth, He endeavoureth to find a Trinity in Man, who was created after the Image of God; he findeth there a Spirit, a Knowledge of himſelf, and a Love wherewith he loves himſelf: theſe three Things are equal among themſelves, and make but one Eſſence. This is according to S. *Auguſtin*, an Image of the Trinity. Memory, Underſtanding, and Will, furniſh him with another, which he believes is clearer and more like. He explains it in the Tenth Book. He finds ſome reſemblances even in the outward Man, in the inward Senſes, in Knowledge and Wiſdom: and theſe are the Subjects of the following Books.

He concludeth at laſt, in the Fifteenth Book, That though we have here below ſeveral Repreſentations of the Trinity, yet we ſhould not ſeek for it, but in immutable and eternal Things, and that we cannot ſee it in this Life, but by a Figure, and Enigmatically: And thus he pretends, That we have an *Idea* of the Generation of the Word, by the production of the Word of our Underſtanding, and an *Idea* of the proceeding of the Holy Ghoſt, by the Love that proceeds from the Will. But he confeſſeth, That theſe Notions are very imperfect; and that there is an infinite Difference betwixt theſe Compariſons, and the Myſtery of the Trinity.

The Treatiſe *of the Five Hereſies*, or rather the Sermon preached againſt Five ſorts of Enemies to the *Chriſtians*, *Heathens*, *Jews*, *Manichees*, *Sabellians*, and *Arians*, which the *Louvain* Doctors had aſcribed to St. *Auguſtin*, though *Eraſmus* doubted of it, is thrown in this Edition, amongſt the ſuppoſititious Treatiſes. And this was done with a great deal of Reaſon; for

for the Stile thereof is very different from St. *Auguſtin*'s: And the Author of that Sermon preached it, when *Arianiſm* was the predominant Religion in *Africa*, as appears by the 6th. and 7th. Chapters; which ſhews, That St. *Auguſtin* is not the Author of it, but ſome other *African* who lived at the time of the *Vandal*'s Perſecution. The Sermon *of the Creed* againſt the *Heathens*, *Jews*, and *Arians*, is alſo of the ſame time, and probably of the ſame Author. St. *Auguſtin.* Tom. VIII.

The Suit betwixt the Church, and the Synagogue, is the Work of ſome Lawyer, who try'd to Exerciſe himſelf, in making the Church to condemn the Synagogue, after the ſame manner that a Judge condemns a Malefactor.

The Book *of Faith*, againſt the *Manichees*, is reſtor'd to *Evodius* of *Uzalá*, upon the Authority of ancient Manuſcripts, and the different Stile.

The following Memorial, of the manner of admitting the *Manichees*, that were converted into the Church, is very Ancient; and, in all probability, it is an Order of ſome Council of *Africa*.

The Book *of the Unity of the Trinity*, is here reſtored to *Vigilius Tapſenſis*, the true Author, who citeth it himſelf in the Preface to his Books, againſt *Varimadus*, to whom it is attributed in an ancient Copy.

Both the Books *of the Incarnation of the Word*, are taken, as it is obſerved, out of the Tranſlation of *Origen*'s Principles by *Ruſinus*.

The Treatiſe *of the Unity, and Trinity of God*, is made up of Extracts out of ſeveral Paſſages of St. *Auguſtin*'s Works, both Genuine, and Spurious.

The Book *of the Eſſence of the Divinity*, which is likewiſe attributed to St. *Ambroſe*, St. *Jerom*, St. *Anſelm*, and *Bonaventure*, is partly taken out of a Book, written by St. *Eucherius*.

The Dialogue *of the Unity of the Holy Trinity*, was found in Two Manuſcripts, Eight Hundred Years old; in one of them it is aſcribed to St. *Auguſtin*, yet it is clearly written in a different Stile from his.

The Book *of Eccleſiaſtical Maxims*, ought to be quite expunged out of St. *Auguſtin*'s Works, to which it hath no relation; yet it is quoted under that Holy Father's Name, by the Maſter of the Sentences; and it beareth his Name in ſeveral Manuſcripts. *Trithemius* aſcribes it to *Alcuinus*; and *Gratian* citeth it under the Name of *Paterus*: But the vulgar Opinion is, That *Gennadius* writ it, to whom it is attributed by *Algerus*, *Walafridus Strabo*, the Maſter of the Sentences, and *Thomas Aquinas* in ſeveral Places. It is likewiſe cited, under his Name, in ſeveral MSS. This Book contains an Abridgment of the principal Articles of Religion. It is evident, That the Author thereof was not of St. *Auguſtin*'s Opinion, concerning Grace, and Free-Will. They have left out ſome Articles which had been inſerted after the 21ſt. and taken out of St. *Cœleſtine*'s Epiſtles to the Biſhops of *Gaul*, of the Council of *Carthage*, and that of *Orange*.

The NINTH TOME.

THE Ninth Volume of St. *Auguſtin*'s Works, containeth his Treatiſes againſt the *Donatiſts*. Tom. IX.

The Firſt is a Hymn which St. *Auguſtin* compoſed in vulgar, and popular Terms, to teach the moſt unlearned the State of the Queſtion betwixt the *Catholicks*, and the *Donatiſts*, and to exhort theſe to a Re-union with the *Catholicks*. This Writing, which conſiſts but of Two Leaves, is proper, as St. *Auguſtin* himſelf obſerves, for none but very ordinary People.

In 393. he wrote a Book againſt *Donatus* his Epiſtle; and in 398. Two Books againſt the *Donatiſts*: But both theſe Treatiſes are loſt.

We are therefore to begin St. *Auguſtin*'s VVorks againſt the *Donatiſts*, from the Three Books againſt the Epiſtle of *Parmenianus*, who ſucceeded *Donatus* in the See of *Carthage*. There he refutes the Letter which that *Schiſmatick* wrote to *Tychonius*, wherein he accuſed the whole Church of being defiled, for communicating with Perſons that were guilty of ſeveral Crimes. St. *Auguſtin* having proved, That *Cæcilian*, and the greateſt part of the others, who were accuſed by the *Donatiſts*, had been declared Innocent; addeth, That though the Crimes, whereof they accuſed particular Men, were proved, yet the Church would ſtill be the true Church, tho' ſhe had not cut them off from her Communion becauſe ſhe is made up of good and bad Men, and that even theſe may be tolerated for Peace ſake. Theſe Books were compos'd about the Year 400. We muſt not forget to obſerve, That there is in this Edition, *chap.* 3d. of the Firſt Book, a very important Correction of a Paſſage which had much perplexed Hiſtorians. S. *Auguſtin* ſpeaks there of the Roman Council which condemned the *Donatiſts*: and they made him ſay in the common Editions, and in moſt Manuſcripts, that this Council conſiſted of Two Hundred Biſhops. *Uſque adeo dementes ſunt homines, ut ducentos judices, apud quos victi ſunt, victis litigatoribus credat*: and becauſe this was not ſence, they added againſt the Authority of the MSS. *eſſe poſtponendos*. It being certain that S. *Auguſtin* ſpeaketh in this Place of the Council of *Rome*, and that there met but 19 Biſhops; they thought that 19 were to be put inſtead of 200. But the reſtoration made here upon the Credit of the Vatican Manuſcript, reſolves all the Difficulty, and clears the Sence, without adding any thing. Neither 19 nor 200, are mentioned

St. Auguſtin. Tome IX.

tioned in the Text. Thus it runs, *Uſque adeo dementes ſunt homines, ut* CONTRA *judices vitiis litigatoribus credat.* It appears at the firſt ſight, that this is the true Sence, which all the Conjectures of the Learned could not find out. They took the *Contra*, made ſhort with Two C.C. for the Cypher of 200, and they had writ *ducentos* inſtead of this Cypher at all Adventures; and becauſe the Text was then not Sence, the *Louvain* Doctors added *Eſſe Poſtponendos* after *Credat.* One ſingle Manuſcript diſcovers preſently thoſe Miſtakes, and gives the true Sence. And now let Men ſay, That there is no need of comparing the Authors to be publiſhed with ancient Manuſcripts. But to return to our Subject.

The Seven Books *Of Baptiſm* were compoſed by St. *Auguſtin* at the ſame time. He undertakes there to refute the *Donatiſts*, who uſed St. *Cyprian*'s Authority, to defend their Opinion concerning the Nullity of Baptiſm adminiſtred by Hereticks. He ſhews, That if that Saint ſeems to favour them in that Point, yet his Practice and Doctrine condemn'd their Separation. He refutes alſo the Reaſons which that Saint and his Collegues urged to prove, That thoſe were to be re-baptized, who had been baptized by Hereticks. There he handleth ſeveral Queſtions touching the Neceſſity, Validity, Effect, and other Circumſtances of Baptiſm.

After the Books *Of Baptiſm*, St. *Auguſtin* placeth a Treatiſe which he compoſed againſt a certain Book brought by *Centurius* from the *Donatiſts*. But that Diſcourſe is loſt: And ſo immediately after the Books of Baptiſm, follow Three Books againſt a Letter of *Petilianus* Biſhop of the *Donatiſts* at *Cirta*. The Firſt of theſe Books is written in the form of a Letter to the Church: Therein he refutes the Firſt Part of *Petilianus*'s Letter. But having received afterwards the whole Letter, he thought himſelf obliged to anſwer every Propoſition by it ſelf. Whil'ſt this was doing, *Petilianus* having ſeen the Letter that St. *Auguſtin* writ at firſt, returned an Anſwer; to which, St. *Auguſtin* oppoſed a Third Book, wherein without inſiſting upon *Petilianus*'s reproachful Language, he diſcovers the weakneſs of the Anſwers that he brought in defence of his Party. The Firſt of theſe Books, which is rather a Letter than a Book, was compoſed about the Year 400. both the others are of 402.

The next Book is likewiſe written againſt *Petilianus*, and is intituled in the Manuſcripts, *A Letter from St.* Auguſtin *to the Catholicks concerning the Sect of the* Donatiſts: And *Poſſidius* ſeems to have mention'd it under this Title, in the Third Article of his Index. It is likewiſe cited under this Title, and aſcribed to St. *Auguſtin* in the Fifth Council, *Collat.* 5. Yet St. *Auguſtin* does not mention it in his *Retractations*. It may be anſwered, That this Book being written in the form of a Letter, he reſerved to ſpeak of it in the other part of his *Retractations*, which was to contain his Sermons and Letters. And yet we ſee that St. *Auguſtin* ſpeaks of Dogmatical Treatiſes that were long, though compoſed in the form of Letters, in this Part; ſo that it is unlikely that he ſhould have forgot to mention this, when he ſpoke of his other Letters againſt *Petilianus*. The *Benedictines* have made ſome other Obſervations upon this Treatiſe, which may make us doubt whether it is St. *Auguſtin*'s, or no. They obſerve, That the Salutation in the beginning, *Salus quæ in Chriſto eſt*, is extraordinary, and that St. *Auguſtin* never uſed it. They find improper forms of Speech, Tranſitions, Figures and Expreſſions, not very elegant, which do not agree to St. *Auguſtin*'s Stile. Nay, beſides they take notice of a Point of Doctrine different from St. *Auguſtin*'s. For the Author of this Book teaches in the 13th. Chapter, That the Separation of the Ten Tribes from *Judah*, was no Hereſie; but St. *Auguſtin* affirms in the 23d. Epiſtle, and in his Firſt Book againſt *Creſconius*, Chapter 31ſt. That the *Samaritans* made a Schiſm, a Sect, and an Hereſie. And laſtly, They have Collected ſome Paſſages of Scripture which are not of that Tranſlation, which St. *Auguſtin* uſes in other places. They add, That the Author of this Book, Chapter 24th. doubts whether the Water that iſſued out of our Saviour's Side, was a figure of Baptiſm; which St. *Auguſtin* ſets down for a certain Truth in ſeveral places of his Writings.

Theſe Objections are not unanſwerable: St. *Auguſtin* hath not mention'd all his Works in his *Retractations*, and particularly, thoſe that are in the form of Letters. We have already taken notice of ſome that he has omitted. This is found in *Poſſidius*'s Catalogue, and the Author declares in the beginning, That he had written already againſt *Petilianus*'s Letter; The Stile, indeed, is not ſo Elegant as of ſome other of St. *Auguſtin*'s Works; but it is no wonder, becauſe it is a Letter that was to be ſeen and underſtood by all Mankind. For the ſame reaſon, the Hymn againſt the *Donatiſts* might be rejected, which is much flatter, and containing more barbarous Expreſſions. The Salutation agrees very well to the Subject, and is not unworthy of St. *Auguſtin*: And if he never uſed it in other places, it doth not follow that he ſhould forbear it in this. When St. *Auguſtin* reckoned the *Samaritans* among the Heretical Jews, he did not ſpeak of the ancient Inhabitants of *Samaria*, immediately after the diviſion of the Tribes, but of the later *Samaritans*, who were real Hereticks among the Jews. Laſtly, It is no extraordinary thing for St. *Auguſtin* to cite ſome places of Scripture in other terms than he had uſed in other places; or that he ſhould doubt here of ſome things, whereof he ſpeaks more affirmatively at other times.

Though theſe Anſwers ſhould not be ſufficient to remove all ſuſpicion, yet it is certain, That this Book was written in St. *Auguſtin*'s time; and all that can be ſaid is, That it might have been drawn up by ſome of his Friends, and directed in his Name to the *Donatiſts*. It was written in 402. after the Second Book againſt *Petilianus*, and before the Third; It is a new Challenge which he ſendeth to this Biſhop to defend his own Party, and to ſhew that the true

Church

Church is on his side. He describes the Marks of the true Church, and proves, That they do not agree with the *Donatists* Party, but with that of the Catholicks; and then answereth those Passages which the *Donatists* urged for themselves, and the Accusations which they formed against the Church. St. *Augustin.* Tom. IX.

One *Cresconius*, a Grammarian, of the *Donatists* Party, undertook to defend *Petilianus* against St. *Augustin*'s first Writing. As soon as he saw his Letter, he refuted it in three Books, and retorted upon him all his Arguments, by retorting in a Fourth Book the business of the *Maximianists*. These Books were written about the Year 406.

Here should have been placed Three other Treatises against the *Donatists*, which he mentions in his *Retractations*, but they are lost. These were, A Book *of Proofs and Testimonies against the Donatists*; A Treatise against a *Donatist*; And an Advice to the *Donatists* about the Business of the *Maximianists*.

The Book *of one Baptism*, against *Petilianus*, was written after the Conference at *Carthage*. The Principal Question treated of by St. *Augustin*, is concerning the Validity of Baptism administred by Hereticks.

St. *Augustin* being willing to Publish an Account of the Conference of *Carthage*, wrote a Breviary of what was said in the three Days Conference, in 412.

He wrote a Book likewise directed to the *Donatists*, with the same Design; wherein he makes several Reflections upon the Conference of *Carthage*, that he might perfectly undeceive that Party, and shew that they were seduc'd and deceived by their Bishops. He likewise answereth their Cavils against the Judgment of *Marcellinus*. This Book is of the Year 413.

The Treatise to *Emeritus* a *Donatist* Bishop, who was one of the principal Defenders of that Party in the Conference at *Carthage*, is lost. St. *Augustin* had collected there the main Points, wherein they had been baffled, as he says, in the 49th. Chapter of the Second Book of his *Retractations*. After this he went to *Cæsarea*, a City of *Mauritania*, where he met with *Emeritus*, before whom he Preached a Sermon to perswade him to reconcile himself to the Church; but not prevailing by this means, he held a Conference with him, about those things which had been done in the Conference at *Carthage*; and then pressed him so hard upon the Quarrel of the *Maximianists*, that *Emeritus* had nothing to say: This Conference was held in the presence of the Bishops, Clergy, and People, the 20th. of *September* 413. or 418. for the Manuscripts do not well agree about the Consul's Names.

At last, *Gaudentius* one of the Seven *Donatist* Bishops who defended their Party in the Conference at *Carthage*, being pressed by the Threatnings of *Dulcitius*, writ two Letters, which St. *Augustin* answers in his First Book against this *Donatist* Bishop; which is particularly to justifie the severity exercised towards them. *Gaudentius* willing to answer something, wrote a Discourse; wherein, without meddling with the Contest betwixt them, he justified his Party, and calumniated the Church. St. *Augustin* answereth this Treatise in the Second Book. Both these Books of St. *Augustin* are of the Year 420.

There is a Sermon attributed to St. *Augustin*, concerning one *Rusticianus*, a Sub-deacon, who was Re-baptized by the *Donatists*, and then Ordained Deacon; but this Discourse does not agree to St. *Augustin*, as it is proved in the Preface. This Volume ends with a Catalogue of St. *Augustin*'s Works against the *Donatists*, which are in the other Volumes of St. *Augustin*'s Works. We have not spoken particularly of the Matters handled by St. *Augustin*, in every Book against the *Donatists*; because he commonly repeateth the same Arguments, and so we should have been obliged to say often the same things, and for which Reason it was put off to this place; that so I might give an Abridgment of his Doctrine, and a Breviary of his chief Reasons all at once.

It has been observ'd already, That the *Donatists* began their Schism by a Separation of some *African* Bishops, who accused *Cecilian* of several Crimes, whereof they had been convicted themselves. Though they had been condemned in the Council of *Rome*, in that of *Arles*, and at last by *Constantine*'s Judgment, yet they remained firm to their own Opinions, and would by no means be reconciled to the Church. Their Party also was much strengthned by the great number of Bishops whom they ordained, almost in every Church of *Africa*, and by the Multitudes of People whom they drew after them: So that in St. *Augustin*'s time, their Party was very near as strong in *Africa*, as that of the Catholicks. But they held no Communion with all the other Churches in the World, which acknowledged *Cecilian*, his Successors, and those of that Party, for the true Church.

The *Donatists* in their own defence affirm'd, That *Cecilian*, *Felix* of *Aptungis*, who ordained him, *Miltiades* that absolved him, and several others of his Brethren, having been convicted of certain Crimes, ought to be deposed and expelled out of the Church; That their Crime made them cease to be Members of the Church, which ought to be pure and without blemish; That as many as defended them and had Communicated with them, were become Accessaries to their Crime by approving it; and that so, not only the Churches of *Africa*, but even all the other Churches in the World, which held Communion with the Churches of *Cecilian*'s Party, having been defiled, ceased to be Parts of the true Church of Jesus Christ, that was then reduced to the small number of those who would not partake with Prevaricators; but kept themselves in the Primitive Purity. Besides this, They charged the Church with another great Crime, as they esteemed it; which was, That they made Application to the Emperor's Authority to Persecute

St. *Auguſtin.* Tom. IX.

their Party; and that they cauſed ſeveral Violences to be exerciſed againſt them. Now, they perſiſting in the Opinion of St. *Cyprian*, and of the ancient Biſhops of *Africa*; who held, That Baptiſm by Hereticks and Schiſmaticks was invalid, and ought to be renew'd; a neceſſary Conſequence of their Principles, was the Rebaptizing of the Catholicks that came over to their Party.

Theſe are the Grounds on which the Schiſm of the *Donatiſts* ſtood.

There were two ways to deal with them; either by denying the Matter of Fact, or by oppoſing the Matter of Right: Thoſe who firſt writ againſt the *Donatiſts*, inſiſted moſt upon the Matter of Fact; that is, The Juſtification of *Cæcilian*, *Felix* of *Aptungis*, and the reſt. Neither doth St. *Auguſtin* omit this; for he often proves *Cæcilian*'s Innocency, by the Judgments given in his behalf; Firſt, At *Rome*, by Pope *Miltiades*, and other Biſhops; Secondly, In the Council of *Arles*; and at laſt, By the Judgment of *Conſtantine*. He adds, as an abſolute Juſtification, the conſent of all the Churches in the World, which had approved and followed the Judgment of thoſe Councils. He likewiſe produces the Acts that were made to juſtifie *Felix* of *Aptungis*: He defends *Miltiades* and *Hoſius*, againſt the Calumnies laid upon them. And ſhews at laſt, That the *Donatiſts* had no Proofs of what they alledged againſt the Catholick Biſhops. But he doth not think this to be the main Point, and therefore he paſſes to the Matter of Right, and maintains, That though *Cæcilian*, and the reſt of his Brethren, had been guilty of the Crimes laid to their Charge; yet that was not a ſufficient Ground for a Separation from the Church; and that the Church did not ceaſe to be the Church, becauſe it Communicated with wicked Men, ſince either ſhe did not know them; or elſe, ſhe bore with them to preſerve Peace: which brings him to that great Queſtion, Whether the Church here below is made up only of Saints and Righteous Men, or compoſed of Good and Bad. St. *Auguſtin* affirms, That there was always in the Church Chaff and Corn; that is, both good and wicked Men; and that ſuch will be to the Day of Judgment, which ſhall divide the good from the bad; That ſometimes the number of the latter exceeds that of the former; That many cannot be driven out of the Church, becauſe they are not known, and becauſe it is convenient to tolerate ſome for quietneſs ſake, to prevent a Schiſm which might be occaſioned by cutting off from the Communion thoſe Perſons who might draw along with them ſeveral of the Faithful; That it is great raſhneſs to condemn all the Churches in the World, for the Crime of one or two; That the Catholick Church ought to be diffuſed over the whole Earth, and not confined to a ſmall part of the World, as in a Corner of *Africa*. Here St. *Auguſtin* triumphs over his Adverſaries, proving by Prophecies, and other Paſſages both of the Old and New Teſtament, That the Catholick Church was to have a conſiderable Extent.

Theſe are properly the main Points in Controverſie betwixt the Church and the *Donatiſts*; but there are other Secundary Queſtions.

The Firſt, is concerning the Perſecutions, which the *Donatiſts* imputed to the Church as a Crime. St. *Auguſtin* defends the Church very Modeſtly, either by diſapproving ſuch Violences, or by ſhewing that it was lawful to make uſe of the Imperial Laws, and of ſome ſort of Severity to bring the *Donatiſts* back to the boſom of the Church. He chargeth them likewiſe with the ſame things; objecting the Cruelties, Violencies, Sacrileges and Murders committed by thoſe of their Party called *Circumcellians*, and authorized thereunto by *Optatus Gildonianus*.

The other acceſſary Queſtion, which St. *Auguſtin* looks upon as a principal one, is about the Validity of the Baptiſm of Hereticks. St. *Auguſtin* needed only to prove that his Party was the true Church, and ſo Condemn by a neceſſary Conſequence the *Donatiſts*, for Rebaptizing thoſe that had been baptized before by Catholicks, ſince it was agreed on both ſides, that the Baptiſm of the true Church was valid. But St. *Auguſtin* undertook beſides, to prove the validity of the Baptiſm of Hereticks and Schiſmaticks; And that though his Party were not the Church, yet the *Donatiſts* were not to baptize them a ſecond time. He confeſſes, That St. *Cyprian*, and moſt of the *African* Biſhops in his time were of a contrary opinion; That *Agrippinus* his Predeceſſor, had appointed Hereticks to be Rebaptized; That St. *Cyprian* and the Councils held in *Africa* at that time, confirmed *Agrippinus*'s Decree; That this Queſtion remained long undecided, or rather variouſly decided in divers places. But that at laſt the thing was decided in a *Plenary Council* of the whole Church, (in all likelihood he means that of *Arles*) and that after ſuch Determination, it was not permitted to doubt, becauſe the Provincial or National Councils muſt give place to the Authority of Plenary Councils. That St. *Cyprian* was to be excuſed for not taking the right ſide of ſo hard a Queſtion, which was not yet cleared or decided, and ſo much the rather, becauſe he defended his own Opinion without making a Schiſm, and with the Spirit of Peace and Unity: However, That the Letters and Writings of the Saints were not to be rely'd upon, as the Apoſtles Epiſtles, and the other Books of the Holy Scripture.

Now to explain St. *Auguſtin*'s Opinion touching Baptiſm more particularly, we are to obſerve as he doth, That Baptiſm may be ſaid to be of two ſorts; The one adminiſtred in the Name of the Trinity, that is, by invoking of the Trinity; and the other performed without naming the Three Divine Perſons. The latter, St. *Auguſtin* confeſſes to be null; but affirms the other to be valid, whoſoever he be that adminiſters it. So that it matters not who baptizeth, provided that Baptiſm be in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt. Two things are likewiſe to be diſtinguiſhed in Baptiſm, the Sacrament, and the Effect of the Sacrament: The Sacrament is found in thoſe that are baptized by Hereticks; but becauſe they have not Faith, they are deprived of the Effect: For, that Baptiſm may be complete, both as a

Sacrament,

Sacrament, and as to its Effect, the Sacrament muſt be intire; that is, the Perſon muſt be baptized outwardly in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt, and he that receives muſt believe and be converted. The Sacrament is often found without Faith, and Faith without the Sacrament. Children have the Sacrament without Faith. The good Thief had Faith without the Sacrament. God ſupplies in Children the Faith they want, and he ſupplied in the good Thief the Sacrament which he could not receive. But when either of theſe is wanting, by the Man's own Fault, he cannot be excuſed; and he receiveth not the Effect of Baptiſm. When the Sacrament is found without Faith, and without Converſion, it is not neceſſary to be reiterated: It is ſufficient only to ſupply what is wanting; as when one is already converted, it is enough to receive the Sacrament. The difference lieth in this, That the Adult cannot be ſaved without Faith and Converſion, though they may be ſaved without the Sacrament, if ſo be that they do not want it through Contempt or Neglect, but becauſe they lay under an impoſſibility of receiving it. St. *Auguſtin.* Tom IX.

From theſe Principles, St. *Auguſtin* draws the following Concluſions: 1. That Baptiſm conferred by Hereticks in the Name of the Trinity, is good and valid as it is a Sacrament, and ought not to be repeated. 2. That neither the Miniſter's Faith, as to Religion, nor his Sanctity avail any thing to the Validity of Baptiſm. 3. That it is God, and not the Miniſter who gives the Holy Spirit, and worketh the Remiſſion of Sins. 4. That Baptiſm produces this Effect, but in them alone that are well-diſpoſed by Faith and Converſion of the Heart. 5. That the Prayers of the Church, which conſiſts of Saints and Righteous Men; ſupplies the Actual Faith, which Children cannot have. 6. That the Adult who have Faith and are Converted, may be ſaved without actual receiving of the Sacrament, but not without the Sacramental Vow.

As for ſome other Queſtions which might be made about Baptiſm adminiſtred by Infidels, or ſome impious Perſons that are Excommunicated or in jeſt. St. *Auguſtin* ſaith, in the Seventh Book *of Baptiſm*, Chap. 53d. thus, "It is asked, ſaith he, whether that Baptiſm is to be approved, which is adminiſtred by an unbaptized Perſon, who out of Curioſity hath learned the way of baptizing among Chriſtians? It is asked further, Whether it be neceſſary for the Validity of Baptiſm that he, who either adminiſters or receives it, be ſincere? And if they ſhould be only in jeſt, Whether Baptiſm ought to be adminiſtred again in the Church? Whether Baptiſm conferred in Deriſion, as that would be, which ſhould be adminiſtred by a Comedian, might be accounted Valid? Whether it is more Criminal to receive Baptiſm in jeſt in the Church, or to receive it with the ſame Spirit, in Hereſie or Schiſm? Whether Baptiſm adminiſtred by an Actor, may become Valid, when he that receives it is well-diſpoſed.

"St. *Auguſtin* anſwers to theſe and ſuch-like Queſtions, That the ſecureſt way is to return no Anſwer to Queſtions that never were decided in any Council, General, or National. But he adds, Should any man, meeting with me at ſuch Council, ask my Advice about theſe Queſtions, and that it were my turn to declare my Opinion, having not heard other Mens Opinions, which I might preferr before mine own, and if I perceiv'd in my ſelf the ſame Diſpoſitions that I am now in, I ſhould without difficulty acknowledge, That they all receive Baptiſm truly in any place whatſoever, and by whomſoever adminiſtred, if on their part they receive it with Faith, and with Sincerity. I am apt alſo to believe, That ſuch as receive Baptiſm in the Church, or in what is ſuppoſed to be the Church, are truly baptized as to the Sacramental part of the Action whatſoever be their intention. But as for Baptiſm adminiſtred and received out of the Church, in Raillery, Contempt, and to make Sport; I could not approve the ſame without a Revelation.

Theſe are St. *Auguſtin*'s Opinions concerning the Validity or Invalidity of Baptiſm. As to the Anſwers which he makes to the Arguments of St. *Cyprian*, and the other Biſhops of his Opinion, they are grounded for the moſt part upon the Compariſon between concealed Hereticks and Evil Miniſters, with known Hereticks and Schiſmaticks. For ſince the Baptiſm of the former is Valid and not to be renewed; why ſhould not the ſame thing be ſaid of the latter, ſince all the Reaſons that are alledged for the nullity of the Baptiſm of Hereticks may alſo belong to Evil Miniſters? It is ſaid, for example, That to give the Holy Ghoſt one muſt have it; That Hereticks have it not; and conſequently that they cannot give it. Why may we not reaſon after the ſame manner concerning Baptiſm conferred by concealed Hereticks, or by wicked Prieſts? Have they the Holy Ghoſt to give? Thus St. *Auguſtin* overthrows the Reaſons and Teſtimonies brought in by St. *Cyprian* and his Collegues againſt the Validity of the Baptiſm of Hereticks, by ſhewing, That whilſt they prove too much, they prove nothing.

But his great Argument to deſtroy the *Donatiſts*, which he particularly inſiſteth upon in his laſt Book againſt *Creſconius*, is an Argument taken from their Conduct in a Schiſm that was riſen up amongſt themſelves, betwixt *Maximianus*, upheld by ſome other Biſhops of their Sect, and *Primianus* another Biſhop of their Party at *Carthage*; They accuſed one another of ſeveral Crimes, and condemned one another; but *Primianus*'s Party being the ſtronger, prevailed and held a Plenary Council at *Bagais*, wherein they condemned *Maximianus*, and his Adherents, in very reproachful terms, and got this Judgment to be confirmed by the Emperor's Letters. Now, according to the *Donatiſts* Principles, Perſons thus Condemned were out of the Church; all that Communicated with them were out of the Church; all whom they baptized, were to be baptized again. And yet the *Primianiſts* behaved themſelves quite otherwiſe; for they kept

Communion

St. *Auguſtin.* Tom. IX. Communion with ſome of the condemned Biſhops, and owned them for lawful Biſhops; they acknowledged thoſe that were Baptized by the *Maximianiſts*, to be truly Baptized; and they admitted into their Communion thoſe that were of the *Maximianiſts* Party. St. *Auguſtin* compares this their Conduct, with their Behaviour towards the Scripture and the Univerſal Church; and by that Argument convinceth them, That it was only Prejudice and Obſtinacy which kept them in their Separation from the Chruch.

The Supplement that is added to this Ninth Volume, contains not only the Book againſt *Fulgentius* the *Donatiſt*, falſely attributed to St. *Auguſtin*, concerning which the Cenſure of the *Louvain* Doctors, and of *Vindingus*, ſet before it, may be conſulted; but alſo Extracts from ancient Pieces concerning the Hiſtory of the *Donatiſts*, taken out of *Optatus*, *Euſebius*, St. *Auguſtin*, the Conference at *Carthage*, the Councils of *Carthage*, and the Imperial Laws againſt the *Donatiſts*. And that all that St. *Auguſtin* writ againſt the *Donatiſts* might be publiſhed together, they copied out what he ſaid in the Conference of *Carthage*. This Collection is the more uſeful, becauſe there are conſiderable Reſtitutions of ſeveral Paſſages of *Optatus*, from a Manuſcript in the Library at St. *Germains des Prez*. Here is one of the principal. There is a Paſſage in the Firſt Book of *Optatus*, where it is ſaid, That *Eunomius* and *Olympius* were ſent into *Africk* to Ordain a Biſhop, and to Degrade *Cæcilian* and *Optatus*: *Ut remotis duobus unum ordinarent*! This Paſſage obliged *Albaſpinæus* to affirm, That *Donatus* of *Caſæ Nigræ* had been Biſhop of *Carthage*. He likewiſe draws from it great Advantages in favour of the Church of *Rome*: yet this Period is not in the St. *Germains* Copy, and it ſignifies nothing either for that which goes before, or for that which comes after. If we read the Paſſage, we may judge: *Tunc duo Epiſcopi ad Africam miſſi ſunt, Eunomius, & Olympius. Venerunt, & apud Carthaginem fuerunt per dies quadraginta, vel quinquaginta, ut pronunciarent ubi eſſet Catholica. Hoc ſeditioſa pars Donati fieri paſſa non eſt.* This Place is clear and plain: whereas, if this Period be inſerted, *Ut remotis duobus unum ordinarent*, the ſence is alter'd, and it will be contradictory. There is likewiſe, ſome Lines before, another Reſtitution, which is confirmed by St. *Auguſtin*'s Teſtimony, in the Conference at *Carthage*. *Donatus petiit, ut ei reverti licuiſſet, & nec ad Carthaginem accederet.* Whereas they read before, *Ut ei reverti Carthaginem contingeret.* In the Extract out of the Third Book of *Optatus*, they diſtinguiſh Three Perſecutions againſt the *Donatiſts*; and the Governors are named by whoſe Orders they were raiſed. This is not to be found in the ordinary Editions of *Optatus*. I ſhall not mention ſeveral other Corrections, which may make us wiſh that a new entire Edition of this Author were undertaken.

The TENTH TOME.

Tom. X. THE *Tenth Volume*, not yet Printed, is intended for the Books which St. *Auguſtin* compoſed againſt the *Pelagians*.

The Three Books *Of Merits and Remiſſion of Sins*, wherein he treats of Infant-Baptiſm, directed to *Marcellinus*, ought to be ſet in the firſt place; for till then he had not undertaken the *Pelagians*, except in his Sermons, or in Converſation, (as he takes notice in his *Retractations*.) He writ theſe in the Year 412. in Anſwer to the *Pelagians* Queſtions which Count *Marcellinus* had ſent to him at *Carthage*. He ſpeaks there particularly of Infant-Baptiſm, as neceſſary to remit Original Sin; and of the neceſſity of the Grace of Jeſus Chriſt, which juſtifies us, or maketh us righteous; though whil'ſt we are in this Life, we cannot ſo perfectly accompliſh God's Law, but that we are obliged to ſay in our daily Prayers, *Forgive us our Sins.* Theſe are the principal Truths oppoſed by the *Pelagians*. St. *Auguſtin* refutes them without naming the Authors, and ſpeaks of *Pelagius* in good Terms; becauſe ſeveral Perſons had a great Eſteem for his Vertue: And he had not yet ſet forth his Doctrine in his own Name, being contented to propoſe it in other Mens Names, in his Commentaries upon St. *Paul*. St. *Auguſtin*, in the laſt Book, refutes the Explications which he had given of thoſe Paſſages of the Apoſtle that ſpeak of Original Sin.

Count *Marcellinus* having received theſe Three Books from St. *Auguſtin*, ſent him word back again, That he had found a Paſſage which puzzl'd him; St. *Auguſtin* had ſaid, That with the help of Grace, Man might live without Sin; though none was yet arrived to that Perfection in this Life, and that none would ever arrive to it. *Marcellinus* asked St. *Auguſtin* how he could affirm this to be poſſible, if there were no Examples of it. To ſatisfie him about that Queſtion, St. *Auguſtin* wrote the Book *Of the Spirit and of the Letter*: Yet he doth not examine this Queſtion to the bottom; but having anſwered in very few words, That God can do many things which he doth not, he boldly attacks thoſe who durſt affirm, That a Man may fulfil the Commandments, be Juſt and Vertuous, without the ſuccour of Chriſt's Grace. He grounds theſe Reaſonings upon that place of St. *Paul*, *The letter killeth, but the ſpirit giveth life.* By the *Letter*, he underſtandeth the Law and the Commandments, which are unprofitable without the help of Grace, which is the Spring of Faith, of Righteouſneſs, Holineſs, and all Chriſtian Vertues. This Book is of the Year 413.

In the Year 414. two young Monks, *Timaſius* and *James*, having been undeceived by St. *Auguſtin*, as to the *Pelagian* Errors, ſent to him one of *Pelagius*'s Books; wherein he pleaded for

for the Strength of Nature, to the Prejudice of Chriſt's Grace. St. *Auguſtin* immediately engaged to write againſt it, and compoſed upon that Subject the Book *Of Nature and of Grace*: wherein he defends the Grace of Jeſus Chriſt, without Prejudice to Nature, which is delivered and regulated by Grace. He explains in this Treatiſe his Principles concerning the Fall of Humane Nature, and the Neceſſity of Grace to be Juſtified; yet he ſpares *Pelagius*'s Name. St. *Auguſtin* Tome X.

But this Monk having afterwards diſcovered his Opinions, was cited by *Heros*, Biſhop of *Arles*, and by *Lazarus*, Biſhop of *Aix*, to a Council of Fourteen Biſhops, held at *Dioſpolis*, in *Paleſtine*, in the Year 415. wherein he was declared Catholick in the abſence of his Accuſers, having made a ſhew of condemning the Errors whereof he was accuſed. St. *Auguſtin* fearing leſt Men ſhould believe that the Council had approved his Doctrine, wrote a Book, entituled, *Of the Acts of Pelagius*: wherein he declares how Things were carried; and diſcovers at the ſame time, that *Pelagius* had impoſed upon the Fathers of the Council, by profeſſing a Doctrine which he had oppoſed in his Writings. This Book is of the Year 416, or 417. *Pelagius* made uſe of the ſame Artifice to perſuade *Albinus*, *Pinianus* and *Melania*, that he did not maintain the Errors he was accuſed of, by Anathematizing them in appearance. *Cæleſtius* alſo deceived Pope *Zoſimus* by the ſame Fraud, by preſenting unto him a Counterfeit Catholick Confeſſion. Theſe Cheats St. *Auguſtin* diſcovers and refutes in the Treatiſe *Of Chriſt's Grace*, and in that *Of Original Sin*; wherein he ſhews that theſe Confeſſions of Faith are captious and deceitful. Theſe Treatiſes are of the Beginning of the Year 418. It is probable alſo that it was at that ſame time that St. *Auguſtin* writ the ſmall Treatiſe *Of the Perfection of Righteouſneſs*, againſt *Cæleſtius*: where he Anſwers the Objections and Difficulties propoſed by this Man, under the Name of, Definitions againſt the Opinion of the Catholicks, who affirmed, That there never was, nor ever ſhould be a Man that could attain to that Perfection, of paſſing his whole Life without Offending God. St. *Auguſtin* maintains, That God does not grant this Grace even to the greateſt Saints; and ſo that it is ridiculous to believe that Man can compaſs this by the ſole ſtrength of his Free-Will, as *Pelagius* and *Cæleſtius* imagined. He does not mention this Book in his *Retractations*, but St. *Proſper* quotes it ſeveral times.

The Firſt Book *Of Marriage and Concupiſcence*, was compoſed about the latter end of the Year 418. There St. *Auguſtin* Anſwereth one of the moſt malicious of the *Pelagian* Objections againſt Original Sin. If Concupiſcence *(ſaid they)* is Evil, and an Effect of Sin; if all Children are Born in Sin, how comes Matrimony to be approved, which is the Effect and Spring of this Sin? St. *Auguſtin* handleth this nice Queſtion very cunningly, by ſhewing, That though Luſt be a Defect, and a Conſequence of the Firſt Man's Sin, which remaineth even in the Baptized; yet Conjugal Chaſtity is to be approved, which makes a good uſe of an evil thing. He occaſionally diſcourſeth of ſeveral Queſtions about Marriage, which he had treated of in other Books. This Book is dedicated to Count *Valerius*, into whoſe hands the Letter that contained this Objection fell.

Julianus, an *Italian* Biſhop, a Man of VVit, having read this Book, he was reſolved to ſignalize himſelf, by writing Four Books againſt this Treatiſe of St. *Auguſtin*. This Father having ſeen ſome Extracts of them, that were directed to *Valerius*, Anſwered them in the Second Book *Of Marriages and Concupiſcence*, written in 419.

Some time after, he received the Four whole Books of *Julianus*. In reading of them, he perceived that the Extracts ſent to him were not very faithfully drawn; which determined him to undertake another VVork to Anſwer them fully. It is divided into Six Books. In the two firſt he oppoſes the Teſtimonies of the Holy Fathers who dy'd in the Communion of the Church, to *Julianus*'s Calumnies, who had accuſed St. *Auguſtin* of Approving the *Manichean* Doctrine; becauſe he had taught, That all Men inherited Original Sin from *Adam*; which is remitted not only in thoſe of riper Years, but even in Children, by the Grace of Baptiſm. And for this he alledgeth ſome Paſſages out of St. *Irenæus*, St. *Cyprian*, *Rheticius* Biſhop of *Autun*, *Olympius* a Biſhop in *Spain*, St. *Hilary* of *Poictiers*, and St. *Ambroſe*, which prove, That Man is Born in Sin, and is Cleanſed by Baptiſm. But becauſe *Julianus* appealed to the *Greek* Fathers. St. *Auguſtin* produceth likewiſe the Teſtimonies of St. *Gregory Nazianzen*, St. *Baſil*, together with the Judgment of the Biſhops of *Paleſtine*, who condemned *Pelagius*. He Anſwereth a Paſſage of St. *Chryſoſtom* which *Julianus* had cited, and quotes ſeveral other Paſſages out of this Father, which ſuppoſe Original Sin. Having thus ſtrengthned his Opinion with theſe Great Mens Authority, he likewiſe recriminates upon *Julianus* for publiſhing ſuch Principles as ſavoured of the Hereſie of the *Manichees*; and with this he concludes the Firſt Book.

In the Second Book, he refuteth the chief Arguments of the *Pelagians*, againſt Original Sin, by the Authorities of the Fathers; ſhowing, That in their Writings they prevented and reſolved thoſe very Objections, which the *Pelagians* did ſo much depend upon. Having collected a great Number of Paſſages upon that ſubject, he ſaith, That their Authority is ſo much the more conſiderable, becauſe they had ſaid theſe Things without prejudice, before the *Pelagian* Hereſie broke out, following therein the Sence of the Church. " We have ſhewed, *ſaith* " *he, directing his Speech to the* Pelagians, by invincible Authorities, That the Holy Biſhops, " who lived before us, taught the ſame Faith which we maintain, and overthrew the Argu- " ments which you make uſe of, not only in their Diſcourſes, but in their Writings alſo. " We have ſhewed you their Opinions, which are very particular, and clear: It is not their " Power, but God's who made them his Holy Temples, which you ought to Fear. They

St. Auguſtin. Tome X.

" judged our Cauſe, at a time, when they could not be ſuſpected either of favouring, or hating " either Party; they had neither relation to, nor affection for the one, or the other; they were " angry neither with you, nor us; neither you, nor we, could move them to Pity. They pre- " ſerved the Doctrine which they found in the Church, and they taught what they had Lear- " ned: They delivered to their Children what they received of their Fathers. We had not yet " referred our Cauſe to them, and yet they gave judgment on our ſide; neither of us were " known to them, and yet they pronounced in our behalf; we had not had any Diſpute with " you, and they declared the Right to be on our ſide.∴∴- Thoſe Biſhops were Learned, Juſt, " and Wiſe; they ſtrongly defended the Truth againſt Innovations; and none can ſay, that " they wanted Wit, Knowledge, or Freedom. Should a Council be aſſembled from all Parts " of the World, it were hard to find ſuch a Number of Biſhops of that importance; nei- " ther did they all live at the ſame time. They are the choice of the greateſt Men whom God " gave to his Church in ſeveral Ages. Their Teſtimonies are collected in a Book, which may " come to your Hands. The more you ſhould wiſh to have them for your Judges, if you de- " fended the Faith of the Church, the more ought you to fear them when you oppoſe it. I " hope that their Teſtimonies will cure your Blindneſs, as I wiſh it; but if you continue obſti- " nate in your Error, which God forbid, you are no more to look for a tribunal to juſtifie you, " but thoſe wonderful Defenders of the Truth to accuſe you, St. *Irenæus*, St. *Cyprian*, *Rheti-* " *cius*, *Olympius*, St. *Hilary*, St. *Gregory*, St. *Ambroſe*, St. *Baſil*, St. *John Chryſoſtom*, St. *Innocent*, " and St. *Jerom*, with all thoſe that communicated with them, that is to ſay the whole Church. " If you run to that exceſs of Folly, you muſt be anſwered by defending the Faith of theſe " great Men, as the Goſpel it ſelf is defended againſt ungodly Men, and the Enemies of Reli- " gion. This he doth in the Four next Books, which contain the Anſwer to *Julianus* his Four Books. There he treateth particularly of original Sin, of Concupiſcence, of the falſhood of the Vertues of the Heathens, of the neceſſity of Baptiſm, and of Grace; and anſwereth all that *Julianus* had ſaid againſt what he had ſet down in his Book of Matrimony, and Concupiſcence. I do not believe that theſe Books were finiſhed before the Year 424.

Before he had written them, Pope *Boniface* ſent him two Letters of the *Pelagians*: the one of *Julianus* written to *Boniface* himſelf; and the other, in the Name of Eighteen Biſhops of the ſame Opinion which had been ſent to *Theſſalonica*. St. *Auguſtin* having received them, immediately wrote four Books to refute them, which he directed to Pope *Boniface*. In the beginning of the Firſt, to get that *Pope*'s good Will, he thanks him for the Love which he ſhewed towards him, and for the courteous manner wherewith he received his Brother *Alypius* of *Tagaſta*; he complements him upon the Dignity of his See, and tells him, That tho' all Biſhops are obliged to watch for the Defence of Chriſt's Flock, he was yet more particularly engaged to do it, becauſe he was in a more Eminent Place. Afterwards he anſwers *Julianus*'s Calumnies, and proves, that the Catholicks did not deny Free-Will; that they do not condemn Marriage, nor the lawful Procreation of Children; that they do not condemn the Saints of the old Teſtament, neither do they ſay, That the Apoſtles were defiled through diſorderly Deſires, and explains in what Sence St. *Paul* ſaid he was carnal. But they maintain, That Man cannot be Righteous without Grace; that Children are born in Sin; that the involuntary Motions of Concupiſcence, are an Effect of Sin; that the Grace of Jeſus Chriſt doth not only help Man to do Good when he is willing, but makes him willing to do it; that the Saints of the Old Teſtament, were only juſtified by Faith in Jeſus Chriſt; that Baptiſm is not only neceſſary to Children, to enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, but alſo to obtain a ſhare in Life eternal, out of which they are excluded by original Sin alone.

In the Two next Books, he refutes almoſt the ſame Calumnies contained in the other Letter of the *Pelagians*: The Two Firſt are about Free-Will, and Marriage. St. *Auguſtin* adds nothing to what he had ſaid in the fore-going Book. In the Third, they taxed the *Catholicks* with introducing Fatality. St. *Auguſtin* ſhews the difference betwixt Grace and Fate. In the Fourth, they accuſed them of maintaining, That the Law was not given to Juſtifie Man, but to render him more Sinful. St. *Auguſtin* tells them, That they did not underſtand the Opinion of the Church, in that Point; that the Law was given to teach what ought to be done, but that it is Grace which makes us obey the Law; and ſo the Law doth indeed ſhew what Righteouſneſs is, but doth not make us practiſe it. Fifthly, They upbraided the *Catholicks* with believing, That Baptiſm did not remit all Sins; ſo that Men continued partly God's Children, and partly the Children of the Devil. St. *Auguſtin* replies, That Baptiſm doth indeed remit all Sins, but it doth not cure Nature of its Weakneſſes, and Imperfections.∴∴- That the Righteous may, and do Sin often, without becoming therefore the Children of the Devil, becauſe there is no Man ſo Righteous as that he ſinneth not. The Sixth Calumny is concerning the Old Teſtament. St. *Auguſtin* anſwereth, That the Righteous who lived under the Old Teſtament, were juſtified through the Grace of the New; whereof the Old was only the Figure. The Seventh is, that the Apoſtles, and Prophets were not perfectly Holy, but only leſs criminal than others. St. *Auguſtin* anſwers, That they were truly Righteous through Faith, and Charity, but they had not all the perfection of Vertue, which now they have in the other Life. He utterly rejects the Ninth Calumny, whereby they accuſed the *Catholicks* of ſaying, That Jeſus Chriſt had been ſubject to Sin. The Tenth Calumny was expreſſed in theſe Terms: They affirm, That Men ſhall begin in the next Life, to practiſe the Commandments, which

they

they did not practiſe in this. St. *Auguſtin* oppoſes it; ſhewing, That they put an ill Conſtruction upon a Catholick Truth; which is, That the Vertue, and the Righteouſneſs of Men, ſhall only be perfect in the next Life. St. *Auguſtin.* Tome X.

In the laſt Book, St. *Auguſtin* refutes the *Pelagian* Doctrines; and ſhews, That under pretence of commending Nature, Marriage, Free-VVill, the Law, and the Saints of the Old Teſtament, they advanced very dangerous Errors, to which he oppoſes ſeveral Teſtimonies of St. *Cyprian*, and of St. *Ambroſe*.

The Book *of Grace, and Free-Will*, was written by St. *Auguſtin* in the Year 427. upon a Diſpute which happened in the Monaſtery of *Adrumetum*, againſt thoſe who fearing, leaſt by the Doctrine of Grace, Free-VVill ſhould be denied, do indeed deny Grace by defending Free-VVill, becauſe they ſuppoſe that Grace is given according to Merit. This laſt Error St. *Auguſtin* chiefly oppoſes in this Book; ſhewing, That the beginning both of Faith, and good Reſolutions, is an effect of Grace.

The reading of this Book did not ſettle Peace among thoſe Monks: For there was an Objection propoſed, which was obvious enough to every Man's underſtanding. If no Man can do Good, without the Grace of God, and this Grace cannot be merited, no Man is to be reproved, or corrected for not doing his Duty, ſince it is not in his Power to do it, becauſe he wants Grace, and cannot deſerve it. St. *Auguſtin* perceiving the Difficulty of this Objection, for the Solution thereof, compoſed the Book *of Correction, and Grace*, wherein, without retracting any thing of what he had formerly ſaid, he affirms, That Admonition is to be uſed: 1. Becauſe it may happen, that God will touch the Heart of him that is reproved. 2. Becauſe Sinners ſin voluntarily, and without Compulſion; and that they cannot complain that God hath denied them his Grace, or the Gift of Perſeverance, ſince he owes his Grace to no body. He does not content himſelf with Anſwering the Objection; but further explains and confirms his Principles, by ſhewing the difference betwixt the Grace of *Adam* in the State of Innocence, and that which is neceſſary to Man in the ſtate of fallen Nature. He ſpeaks alſo of the Gift of Perſeverance, which is not granted unto all; and of the Power of Grace, and the free Predeſtination of the Elect.

He again inſiſteth upon the ſame Matter, and upon the ſame Principles, in both the Books which he writ in anſwer to *Hilary*'s, and *Proſper*'s Letters. The Firſt is of the Predeſtination of the Saints, and the Second of the Gift of Perſeverance: Wherein he demonſtrates, That the beginning of Faith, and good Purpoſes, is the Gift of God; and that ſo, our Predeſtination, or Vocation, does not depend upon our Merits. The Second Book concerns the Gift of Perſeverance, which he ſhews to depend equally upon God, as the beginning of our Converſion. St. *Auguſtin* compoſed theſe Treatiſes in the Year 429.

St. *Auguſtin*'s laſt Effort againſt the *Pelagians*, fell upon *Julianus* his old Adverſary; who, to maintain the Quarrel he had begun, compoſed Eight Books againſt St. *Auguſtin*'s Second Book *Of Matrimony, and Concupiſcence*. St. *Auguſtin* having received Five of them from *Alypius*, undertook to write againſt them, and was engaged about the Fourth, when he writ the 224th. Letter to *Quodvultdeus*, in the Year 428. It is probable, that *Alypius* ſent him the other Three, but St. *Auguſtin* anſwered but Six; and this Work remains imperfect, as *Poſſidius* affirms. The Six Books of St. *Auguſtin* were publiſhed by F. *Vignier*, from a Manuſcript of the Abby of *Clervaux*, which, in all probability, will be reviſed and corrected in a new Edition from ſome other Manuſcripts. Theſe Books are written by way of Dialogue: There St. *Auguſtin* produces *Julianus*'s own Terms, and Anſwers them plainly, and in few Words.

We referr'd to ſpeak of St. *Auguſtin*'s Four Treatiſes *Of the original of the Soul*, to this place, becauſe they were not written properly againſt the *Pelagians*, though St. *Auguſtin* handleth there ſome Queſtions that have ſome relation to the Diſpute betwixt them: Therefore I think that it had been more proper to have ſet them at the end of the Sixth Volume, than in this place. The occaſion and ſubject of theſe Four Books is this.

A Prieſt of the Province of *Mauritania Cæſarienſis*, one *Victor*, who was Surnamed *Vincentius*, from a *Donatiſt* Biſhop, Succeſſor to *Victor* of that Name, whoſe Memory that Prieſt who had been a *Donatiſt*, did reverence very much: This Prieſt, I ſay, having met in the Houſe of one *Peter*, a Spaniſh Prieſt, with a Writing of St. *Auguſtin*'s, wherein this Saint had ſet down his uſual Doubts about the Soul's Original, wrote two Books againſt him, which he directed to *Peter* himſelf. He affirmed in that Book, That nothing was eaſier than the deciſion of that Queſtion, and that he was ſure that God did every moment create new Souls; but added to this Principle ſeveral erroneous Conſequences: He confeſſed, indeed, That the Soul was no part of God's Subſtance; but he would not ſay that he created it of nothing; He aſſerted, That it had a Body, and ſo that Man was made up of a groſs Body, of a Soul that was a more ſubtil Body, and of a Spirit. He ſaid, That the Soul deſerved to be placed in the Body, to contract ſome Pollution by converſing with Fleſh; but that it was alſo Purified by the Fleſh. That thoſe Children whom God predeſtinated to Baptiſm, were ſaved though they were not baptized; That their Souls went into Paradiſe until the Day of Judgment, and that after the Reſurrection they ſhould enter into the Kingdom of Heaven: That Sacrifices were to be offered for them: And laſt of all, That the reaſon why ſome were Saved and others Damned, was the knowledge which God had of the Good or Evil which they ſhould have done, if they had lived. Theſe

Notions

St. Auguſtin. Tome X.

Notions being very dangerous, and *Vincentius* having maintained them with a great deal of Wit and Eloquence; when St. *Auguſtin* had received theſe Books from *Renatus*, a Monk of *Cæſarea*, he thought himſelf obliged to Anſwer them.

He wrote therefore a Treatiſe to this *Renatus*, who had ſent them; wherein he refuteth the particular Opinions before-named: and among the reſt, That *of Childrens Salvation who die without Baptiſm*; He ſhoweth, That they cannot be ſaved but by that Sacrament; and that the Euchariſt is not to be offered for thoſe that died before the Uſe of Reaſon, and unbaptized: *For*, ſaith he, *The Body of Jeſus Chriſt is not to be offered but for ſuch as are Members of Jeſus Chriſt*; *But none can be a Member of Jeſus Chriſt, but by Baptiſm in Jeſus Chriſt*; *or by dying for Jeſus Chriſt*; "Niſi Baptiſmate in Chriſto, aut morte pro Chriſto." He anſwereth the Example of the good Thief, in whom Faith ſupply'd Baptiſm; and that of *Dinocrates* Brother to St. *Perpetua*, a Child of Seven Years of Age, to whom God granted Salvation, through the Prayers of that Saint, as it is related in the Acts of her Martyrdom. As to this latter Example, St. *Auguſtin* ſaith at firſt, That being not taken out of a Canonical Book, he can ground no Doctrine upon it, and that it is uncertain whether that Child was baptized or no.

After this, he anſwers *Vincentius*'s Notion, That Children were either Saved or Damned, for the Good or Evil which they would have done, if they had lived; This, he ſays, is a fooliſh Opinion: For, how can a Perſon be puniſhed or recompenſed, for Evil or Good Actions which are not, and which ſhall never be? were this true, no Man that is baptized can be ſecure; for who knows whether he ſhould not have Apoſtatiz'd, had he lived? And how can this be made to agree with what the Scripture ſaith of a Man that is taken away, leſt the Wickedneſs of his Sin ſhould corrupt him. Having refuted *Vincentius*'s falſe Conſequences, he ſhews, That thoſe Paſſages of Scripture which he alledgeth to prove the daily Creation of Souls, do indeed prove nothing, and that he takes almoſt all of them in a wrong ſence; yet he condemns not this Opinion, provided that Teſtimonies of Scripture be not abuſed to prove it, and that nothing be alledged contrary to the Doctrine of the Church to uphold it: provided likewiſe that it be not ſaid, 1. That God created ſinful Souls. 2. That Children dying before Baptiſm, are ſaved. 3. That Souls ſinned before their entrance into Bodies. 4. That they are puniſhed for future Sins that ſhall never be.

St. *Auguſtin* was not contented to write this Book to *Renatus*; but he writ beſides, a ſecond Treatiſe upon the ſame Subject, to *Peter* the Spaniſh Prieſt, who had given the occaſion of this Controverſie, to diſabuſe him concerning *Vincentius*'s Opinions.

And laſt of all, he dedicates two Books to *Vincentius* himſelf. In the firſt, he refuteth theſe Errors, which he reduces to theſe Eleven Propoſitions: 1. That the Soul is not created of Nothing. 2. That God creates Souls *in infinitum*. 3. That the Soul loſes its Merit by being united with the Body. 4. That it is renewed by the ſame Fleſh, which cauſed it to loſe its Merit. 5. That it deſerved to be ſinful, before it entred into the Body. 6. That original Sin is remitted in Children that die without Baptiſm. 7. That ſome Children whom God hath predeſtinated to be baptized, do not receive that Sacrament. 8. That one may ſay of them, *He was taken away, leſt Wickedneſs ſhould corrupt him.* 9. That there are Habitations for them in the Kingdom of Heaven. 10. That the Euchariſt ought to be offered for them. 11. That their Souls go into Paradiſe after Death; and that after the Reſurrection they ſhall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.

In the Second, St. *Auguſtin* defends thoſe things which *Vincentius* found fault with in his Book: They are Three. 1. His Doubts of the Original of the Soul. 2. His denying it to be a Body. 3. That he diſtinguiſhed not the Soul from the Spirit. He ſaid, touching the firſt Point, Is it credible that a Man does not know himſelf? if that be, Wherein doth he differ from Beaſts? St. *Auguſtin* anſwers, That Man ought to confeſs his Ignorance, not only as to what relates to the Divinity, but alſo as to many things that concern his Body and Soul: And he produces ſeveral Examples of them. Upon the Second, his Queſtion was, What the Soul is, if it be not a Body? but as he confeſſed at the ſame time that God is not a Body; St. *Auguſtin* asketh him the ſame Queſtions concerning the Nature of God, which he had ſtarted about the Nature of the Soul. He refuteth their Opinion who believed the Soul to be Corporeal, and particularly *Vincentius*'s fancy, That the Soul being entred into the Body, was diffuſed into all the Parts, and by a kind of Congelation, had received the figure thereof. He anſwers the Argument which *Vincentius* had raiſed out of the Parable of *Dives* and *Lazarus*, and from Apparitions; obſerving, That the Soul feels and repreſents Bodies, though it be not a Body, and though there be no Body preſent. As for what is ſaid of *Lazarus*'s Finger, and of the parts of a Soul; he retorts the Argument upon *Vincentius*, becauſe he ſpake likewiſe of the Finger of God, and Scripture aſcribes Members to him, though he be a meer Spirit.

At laſt, St. *Auguſtin* ſaith to the laſt Point, That when the Spirit is diſtinguiſh'd from the Soul, the word *Spirit* is taken in a ſpecial manner for Intelligence or Underſtanding; but not for Spirit, as it is a Nature oppoſed to Body. Laſtly, He exhorteth *Victor* to lay aſide the Surname of *Vincentius*; becauſe, being entred into the Church, he could no longer, without condemning himſelf, look upon *Vincentius* as a Saint, who died a *Donatiſt*. Theſe Treatiſes were compoſed in 419.

Though the main Points treated of in St. *Auguſtin*'s Works againſt the *Pelagians* have been mentioned already: yea, it will not be amiſs, to give here a general view of his Doctrine. God created

created the First Man in a state of Innocence, Holiness, and Grace. He was subject neither to the Necessity of Dying, nor to Sickness, nor Pain, nor the Motions of Lust, nor Ignorance, nor any of the Inconveniencies of Life, or the Imperfections of Nature, which are the Consequences and Effect of his Sin. His Free-Will was entire, and weakened with nothing. It was perfectly indifferent to do either Good or Evil, though it could not do good without the help of Grace; but this Grace which God afforded him, was entirely subjected to his Free-Will: It was a help without which he could not do good; but it did not make him do good. Such was the Condition of the First Man, like that of the Angels before their Sin. Such would have been the Condition of his Posterity, had he continued in that Happy state; but having offended God by his Disobedience, he, and all his Posterity are become subject unto Death, Pain, Sicknesses, Punishments; and what is worse, to Ignorance and Lust, that is to say, to Extravagant Motions which are within us, whether we will, or no. But what is yet more incomprehensible, all his Descendents begotten in the ordinary way, are born in Sin; They all contract the Sin which we call Original, which makes Children the Objects of God's Wrath, and infallibly Damns them, except they are regenerated by Baptism. Baptism doth indeed take away the stain of Sin, but it doth not remove the Punishment, and the Consequences of Sin. Concupiscence, Ignorance, Inclination to Sin, Weaknesses, and other Punishments for Sin, abide still during the whole course of this Mortal Life. Free-Will is not extinguish'd, but it hath not so much strength, and stands in need of powerful assistance to do good. The Grace which it needs to act, is not only that help without which it could neither will nor do that which is good; but also such an assistance as makes it both will and do it infallibly: This Grace is necessary not barely to accomplish entirely what is good, and to continue therein; but it is even necessary to begin Faith, for Prayer, and for the first Motions of Conversion. Yet it bereaves us not of our liberty, because we do not keep the Commandments, but as far as we are willing. It worketh this Will in us, without Violence or Compulsion: for God constraineth no Man to do either good or evil; but to do good the Will must be succoured by Grace, which doth not deprive it of its Liberty: and this Grace is not granted to Merit, but is absolutely free. Since the First Man's Sin, the whole mass of Mankind was corrupt, condemned, and subject to Death. God by free Grace and Mercy takes out of this mass of Corruption whom he pleases, leaving the rest in that condition, out of that Justice which none can find fault with; for what is Man that he should dispute it with God? Doth the Earthen Vessel say to the Potter that framed it, Why hast thou made me thus? However, it may be truly said, That all Men may be saved if they will; if they be not, they can only accuse their own perverse Will, whereby they resist the Call of God. There are some Graces which he refuseth not to Reprobates, wherewith they might do good if they would. To some, he gives the Knowledge of his Law, and they despise it; He inspires into others a desire of being Converted, and they reject it; Some he excites to Prayer, but they neglect to do it; He speaks to the Hearts of several, who harden themselves, that they may not hearken unto his Voice; He overcomes the hardness of some for a time, converting them by an Effectual Grace, who plunge themselves again in Vice. In a word, how strong and powerful soever the Grace is which he gives, yet it may be said in some sence, that Man may always resist it, though he doth not actually do it. God does not grant this Grace to all Men, not only because he oweth it to none; but also because some make themselves unworthy of it: for to say nothing of Children who die before the use of Reason, who are either damned because of Original Sin, or saved by the Grace of Baptism, the Adult who have not the gift of Perseverance, have made themselves unworthy of it, either through their own Sins, or by the Contempt which they have cast upon God's Vocation; or by the Opposition they have made to inward Grace; or lastly, by falling again into the state of Sin, from which God delivered them in his Mercy. And so no Man can either excuse himself or accuse the Justice of God, because every one receiveth what he deserved; every one is rewarded or punished, according to the good or the evil which he hath done, by his Will which co-operates with the most effectual Grace.

St. *Augustin*. Tom. X.

The Effect of this Grace, according to St. *Augustin*, is to make us in love with that which is good; it is a pleasure which draws our heart towards good things, and enables us to keep the Commandments; without this Grace, there is no Action meritorious. The fear of Punishment, though merely servile, is good and profitable, because it regulates the inward Man, but it does not render us Righteous before God. We shall never perfectly accomplish the Precept of loving God in this Life, because we shall never love him so perfectly as in the next: And though through God's Grace, a Man may absolutely avoid all Sin in this Life; yet it never did, nor shall ever happen that a mere Man (excepting the Blessed Virgin, of whom St. *Augustin* would not have us to speak, when Sin is mentioned) passed through this Life without Sin: For this reason, the most righteous say daily, *Lord remit us our Debts*; that is, *our Sins*; But these are not mortal Sins, which bereave the Soul of Righteousness and Holiness; they are venial and daily Sins, which are indeed against God's Law, but do not utterly destroy Charity.

St. *Augustin*'s Principles concerning Predestination and Reprobation, do exactly agree with his Opinion touching Grace. Both those Decrees, according to him, suppose the fore-knowledge of Original Sin, and of the Corruption of the whole mass of Mankind. If God would suffer all Men to remain there, none could complain of that severity, seeing they are all guilty and doom'd to Damnation, because of the Sin of the First Man. But God resolved from all Eter-

nity, to deliver ſome whom he had choſen out of pure Mercy, without any regard to their future Merits; and from all Eternity he prepared for them that were thus choſen, thoſe Gifts and Graces which are neceſſary, to ſave them infallibly; and theſe he beſtows upon them in time. All thoſe therefore, that are of the number of the Elect, hear the Goſpel and believe, and perſevere in the Faith working out by Love, to the end of their lives. If they chance to wander from the right way, they return, and repent of their Sins: and it is certain that they ſhall all die in the Grace of Jeſus Chriſt.

St. Auguſtin. Tom X.

Reprobation is not like Predeſtination; God doth not poſitively caſt away any Man; he predeſtinateth none to Damnation; he only knows thoſe that are left in that maſs of Perdition, and are not of the happy number of thoſe whom he will deliver through Mercy. Theſe Wretches are at laſt Condemned, either becauſe of Original Sin which is not remitted to them, and ſuch are the Children that die without receiving Baptiſm, or for the Sins which by their Free-Will they have added to the firſt Sin; or, becauſe they wanted Faith and Righteouſneſs; or laſtly, becauſe they did not perſevere unto the end.

This is an Abridgment of St. *Auguſtin*'s Doctrine, which is ſet down in his Books againſt the *Pelagians*, and in ſeveral other places of his Works.

The *Supplement* to this Volume, containeth for the moſt part Writings that ſerve to juſtifie St. *Auguſtin*'s Doctrine of Predeſtination and of Grace, and ſome other Treatiſes upon the ſame Subject, attributed to St. *Auguſtin*; the Authors whereof are not well known. St. *Proſper*'s Four Books, in Defence of St. *Auguſtin*, are of the firſt ſort; to which they have added his Epigram, in Commendation of the ſame Father.

Cœleſtine's Letter, the Capitulars that follow it, and the Canons of the Council of *Orange*, are likewiſe Illuſtrious Approbations of St. *Auguſtin*'s Doctrine. Here one might add ſeveral other Treatiſes about Grace, written upon occaſion of thoſe Conteſts raiſed concerning St. *Auguſtin*'s Opinion; ſuch as the Letter of the *African* Biſhops that were baniſhed into *Sardinia*; The Canons of the Council of *Valentia*; with the Treatiſes of *Florus*, *Lupus*, *Remigius* of *Auxerre*, *Ratramnus*, and ſeveral other Authors who writ of theſe Matters in the Ninth Century.

The other VVorks contained in this Addition do not bear the Names of any Authors. The Firſt is a conſiderable Treatiſe, divided into Six Books, and entituled, *Hypognoſticon*; Or, *Reflections and Notes againſt the Pelagians and Cœleſtians*. The Author ſets down the main Doctrines of the *Pelagians* in their own words, and then confutes them Although this Book is conformable to St. *Auguſtin*'s Doctrine, yet it hath not his Style. That Father among the *Benedictines*, who chiefly looks after the New Edition of St. *Auguſtin*, having given me notice, That he thought it might be *Marius Mercator*'s; I have examined it, and found that his Conjecture is not ill grounded. For, in the Firſt place, That VVork is of an ancient Author, who both liv'd and writ at the ſame time with *Pelagius* and *Cœleſtius*, and he was of St. *Auguſtin*'s Opinion; this agrees with *Marius Mercator*. 2. *Marius Mercator* uſually gives his Treatiſes the ſame Title with this; for ſo he entituled his Writing againſt *Julianus*. 3. The Form of this Treatiſe is perfectly like that of his other Treatiſes: he lays down there the very Terms of his Adverſaries, and then refutes them with Notes and Reflections. 4. Having compared this Treatiſe with others of *Marius Mercator*, and particularly with his Book againſt *Julianus*, I found the Style to be the ſame: One may meet with the ſame Terms repeated again, the ſame Figures, the ſame Livelineſs, the ſame Turn, and the ſame Expreſſions. Laſtly, St. *Auguſtin*, in the 193d. Letter, to *Marius Mercator*, in 418. affirms, That this Man had written a Book full of Scripture-Teſtimonies againſt the new Hereticks: and this can belong to no other of *Mercator*'s Treatiſes, but agrees perfectly with this. Theſe are the Conjectures which I thought of, and I doubt not but the *Benedictines* will bring ſeveral others much ſtronger; in the mean time, theſe may be ſufficient to make their Conjecture very probable.

The Book *Of Predeſtination and Grace*, which is among St. *Auguſtin*'s Works, under the Name of an incertain and ſuſpicious Author, is attributed by *Sirmondus* to St. *Fulgentius*, and Printed under his Name among this Father's Works. We ſhall examine whether it be his, when we come to St. *Fulgentius*. However, this ſmall Diſcourſe of *Predeſtination* agrees neither with the Style nor with the Doctrine of St. *Auguſtin*.

Theſe are all this Father's Works. His Life will be added in another Volume, with the Teſtimonies of the Ancients concerning him, the Commendations that have been given him, and very large and uſeful Tables.

Though we have given a ſufficient Account both of St. *Auguſtin*'s Character and Genius, in ſpeaking of his Works; yet it is convenient to ſay ſomething of them here in general. He was a Man of great Extent, great Exactneſs, and great force of Mind. His Reaſonings were very ſtrong. His ordinary Method is, to lay down extenſive Principles, from which he draws an infinite number of Conſequences: ſo that all the Points of his Doctrine have a great Connexion one with another. He argued more upon moſt of the Myſteries of our Religion, than any Author before him. He ſtarts ſeveral Queſtions never thought of before, and reſolves many of them by the mere Strength of his VVit. He often left the Notions of his Predeceſſors, to follow a Path wholly new, whether in Expounding the Scriptures, or in Opinions of Divinity. That may be ſaid of him, as to Divinity, what *Cicero* ſaid of himſelf, as to Philoſophy, That he was *Magnus Opiniator*; that is, that he advanced ſeveral Opinions that were only probable.

bable. But St. *Auguſtin* doth it modeſtly, and with much Prudence, without pretending to oblige others to embrace his Opinions without Examination: whereas, when the Queſtion is about the Doctrine of the Church, he propoſes and maintains it ſtoutly, and as ſtrongly oppoſes its Oppoſers. He had much leſs Learning than VVit; for he underſtood not the Languages, neither had he read the Ancients much. He wrote with greater Facility and Clearneſs, than Politeneſs and Elegancy. Though he had taught Rhetorick, yet either he was not Maſter of the Eloquence of the Orators, or he neglected it: nay, his Expreſſions are not always pure; for he often uſes unproper and barbarous Words. He often uſes little ſtrokes of VVit, and plays with VVords. He repeats the ſame things, and inſiſts upon the ſame Arguments in hundreds of places. He dwells long upon the ſame Thought; to which he gives ſeveral turns, and enlarges frequently upon common places. He treated of infinite numbers of Things, by laying down Principles; and framed (if we may ſo ſay) the Body of Divinity for all the Latin Fathers that came after him. They have not only taken out of his Books the Principles they make uſe of, but often they have only copied them. The Councils have borrowed his VVords to expreſs their Deciſions. In ſhort, *Peter Lombard*, in the Twelfth Century, going about to compoſe an Epitome of the whole Body of Divinity, did little elſe but Collect Paſſages out of St. *Auguſtin*. And though *Thomas Aquinas*, and other Schoolmen, followed another Method; yet, for the moſt part, they have ſtuck to S. *Auguſtin*'s Principles, whereupon they erected their Theological Opinions. St. *Auguſtin.* Tom. X.

After this, no Man needs wonder that his VVorks were ſo much looked after formerly, and ſo many times publiſhed ſince Printing was invented. The Edition of St. *Auguſtin*'s VVorks was one of the firſt conſiderable Things that Printers committed to the Preſs. *Amerbachius* undertook it in 1495. This *Gothick* Edition was followed by that of *Baſil*, in Nine Volumes, in the Year 1506. and by that of *Paris*, in 1515. with long Lines, publiſhed in 1528. and in 1526. which is the faireſt for its Character. The Editions of *Guillard* and *Chevallon*, which came out not long after, are likewiſe pretty fair ones.

In 1571. Two came out; the one in *Paris*, by *Morellus*; and the other at *Lions*. The Doctors of *Louvain* having carefully Reviſed St. *Auguſtin*'s VVorks, cauſed them to be Printed at *Antwerp*, in 1577. The following Editions are only new Impreſſions of this. The firſt and the faireſt was done at *Paris*, 1586. and was followed by thoſe of the Years 1609, 1614, 1626, 1635, 1652. not to mention that at *Venice* in 1584. that at *Colen*, in 1616. and the laſt Edition at *Lions*. Now they having Printed, from time to time, ſeveral Treatiſes of St. *Auguſtin* that were not in the former Editions, Father *Vignier* thought fit to collect them into a Body, that might ſerve for a Supplement to all the Editions of St. *Auguſtin*. He joyned to it the imperfect Treatiſe againſt *Julianus*, and ſome Sermons which had not been Printed before, and publiſhed them all in Two Volumes, in *Folio*, at *Paris*, in 1655. This Labour becomes uſeleſs by the laſt Edition of St. *Auguſtin*, which excelleth and effaces all the fore-going Editions.

ZOSIMUS.

POpe *Innocent* I. dying the 12th. of *March*, 417. *Zoſimus* was promoted into his Place upon the 18th. of the ſame Month. Though he ſat but One Year, Nine Months, and ſome Days in the Roman See, yet he very much exerted his Authority in the Diſputes which he had with the Biſhops both of *Africa* and *Gaul*. This appears by his Letters, which we are now to diſcourſe of according to the Order wherein they ought to be placed. To underſtand thoſe which concern *Africa*, we are to know, That *Cœleſtius*, *Pelagius*'s Diſciple, having been condemned in the Council of *Carthage*, aſſembled in 412. thought it convenient to appeal to the Pope, contrary to the Order and Cuſtom of that Time. The *Africans* did not much trouble themſelves about that Appeal; neither did he much value it himſelf; for without taking it out, he went to *Epheſus*, where he found means to be Ordained Prieſt. Some Years after he came to *Conſtantinople*; from whence he was Expelled by *Atticus*, who diſcovered his Error, and writ againſt him to *Theſſalonica*, to *Carthage*, and into *Aſia*. That happened at the ſame time that *Zoſimus* was raiſe to the Popedom. *Cœleſtius* being informed of it, came immediately to *Rome*, to prepoſſeſs this new Pope, and to ingratiate himſelf with him, by making him a Judge in his Cauſe. And indeed, *Zoſimus* finding this a fit Opportunity to promote his Deſign of Encreaſing his Authority, and drawing to himſelf the Appeals of Cauſes judged in other places, he failed not to hearken to *Cœleſtius*, and to admit him to juſtifie himſelf. He left all other Buſineſſes, to ſtick particularly to this. He made *Cœleſtius* appear in St. *Clement*'s Church; examined the Heads of the Accuſation that was formed againſt him. He cauſed him to make a Confeſſion of Faith, whereby he diſowned the Errors which *Heros* and *Lazarus* had laid to his Charge. He enquired after the Qualifications of thoſe Accuſers; whom he found (as he ſaith) to have been wrongfully Ordained, Expelled out of their Biſhopricks, and ſeparated from the Communion of the reſt. *Zoſimus*, though much prepoſſeſs'd in *Cœleſtius*'s *Zoſimus.*

Zoſimus. *Cœleſtius*'s behalf, yet durſt not give Judgment in his Caſe without writing to the *African* Biſhops; but he did it after ſuch manner as ſufficiently diſcovered how much he favoured him: For after he had writ all this that we have ſaid, he declares, That if *Cœleſtius*'s Accuſers came not to *Rome* within Two Months, to Convict him of maintaining other Opinions than thoſe which he then profeſſed, he ſhould take it for granted that he was Innocent. At the latter end, he declares all theſe Queſtions to be only vain Subtilties, and unprofitable Conteſts, which rather deſtroy than edifie; and are Effects of an imprudent Curioſity, and of too great an itch of Speaking and Writing. This Letter was written about *July*, in the Year 417.

After the writing of this Letter, *Zoſimus* received one from *Prailus*, Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, in *Cœleſtius*'s behalf, with *Pelagius*'s Confeſſion of Faith. This News, the Abſence of the Accuſers, and the Silence of the *Africans*, who returned no Anſwer to his Letter, confirmed him in the Judgment which he had made of *Cœleſtius*'s Doctrine. He deals with their Accuſers, as with moſt unworthy Perſons. He upbraids *Lazarus*, as one that made it his practice to accuſe the Innocent; and as one that had been condemned by *Proculus*, Biſhop of *Marſeilles*, in a Synod at *Turin*, for having falſely and calumniouſly accuſed *Britius*, Biſhop of *Tours*. He adds, That having been Ordained Biſhop of *Aix*, ſome time after, by the Favour of *Conſtantine* the Tyrant, he retained the Shadow of the Prieſthood ſo long as the Power of that Tyrant laſted. As for *Heros*, he reproacheth him for following the ſame Party, and for doing Violence. Afterwards, he tells the *African* Biſhops, That they were to blame, in being ſo eaſily perſuaded upon the Word of thoſe Accuſers; and makes no ſcruple of declaring *Pelagius* and *Cœleſtius* Innocent, ſeeing their Accuſers had not appeared.

Zoſimus's Firſt Letter was carried by *Baſiliſcus*, a Subdeacon, who cited *Paulinus* to the Pope's Tribunal; but he did not concern himſelf to appear: And the *African* Biſhops were not at all moved by *Zoſimus*'s Pretenſion; on the contrary, they ſtood by the Judgment which they had given firmly; which alſo had been confirmed by his Predeceſſor. They told him plainly, That this Cauſe being born in *Africa*, and judged there, *Cœleſtius* could not Appeal, nor he take Cognizance of it. Laſtly, They made a Proteſtation, to prevent *Zoſimus* pronouncing Judgment by default in the behalf of *Cœleſtius* and *Pelagius*: Yea, they went further, for without waiting for the Pope's Judgment, they confirmed what they had done, and condemned the Doctrine of *Pelagius* and *Cœleſtius* a-new. Having taken this Precaution, they writ again to *Zoſimus*, and ſent him all the Acts of what had been done in *Africa* againſt *Cœleſtius*: ſhewing him at the ſame time, That it was not enough to oblige *Pelagius* and *Cœleſtius* to approve in general what was in Pope *Innocent*'s Letter, but that they ought to be made to acknowledge particularly all the Catholick Truths that were contrary to their Errors.

Zoſimus having received theſe Letters, with the Advertiſements of the *Africans* who had likewiſe written to Court about the buſineſs, durſt not go any further, and was contented to aſſert his Authority, by writing to them, That though he had power to judge all Cauſes, and none had any right to reform his Judgments, yet he would do nothing without communicating it unto them: That he was ſurprized, that they ſhould write to him as if they had been perſuaded that he had given credit to all that *Cœleſtius* had ſaid to him: That he had not proceeded ſo faſt; becauſe too much Deliberation cannot be uſed, when a Supreme Judgment is to be pronounced: and, That after the firſt Letter which he received from them, he left all in the ſame Condition that it was before. This Letter, of the 19th. of *March*, 418. is the Tenth in the uſual Order of *Zoſimus*'s Letters.

It appears by this, that the Pope began to alter his Mind, concerning *Cœleſtius*, and to miſtruſt his Sincerity. But he was fully convinced of his Double-dealing, when the time of Judgment came: for having cauſed him to be cited to come and condemn the Six Articles that were laid to his Charge clearly, if he would be abſolved of the Judgment that was given againſt him in *Africa*, he not only refuſed to appear, but fled from *Rome*. *Zoſimus*, provoked to ſee himſelf deceived, wrote to all the Biſhops a long Letter, wherein he condemned *Cœleſtius*'s Articles, and *Pelagius*'s Writings. This Letter is not all extant, but only ſome Fragments of it produced by St. *Auguſtin* and *Marius Mercator*. It was very long, and contained the whole Hiſtory of this Affair. He gave this Judgment after *April*, in the Year 418.

Zoſimus had likewiſe ſome Conteſts with the Biſhops of *Gaul*. The Churches of *Arles* and *Vienna* had long diſputed the Right of Primacy, over the Provinces of *Gallia Narbonenſis*, and *Viennenſis*. This Conteſt had been laid a-ſleep for ſome time by a Decree of the Council at *Turin*, which ordained, That in Expectation of an abſolute Deciſion of that Quarrel, both Churches ſhould enjoy the Right of *Metropolis* over the Churches that were near to each of them. But *Zoſimus* was no ſooner promoted to the Popedom, but he declares for *Patroclus*, Biſhop of *Arles*; and granted him by his Letter all that he could wiſh for: For he gave him, in the firſt place, the Right of giving *Formed Letters* to all the Eccleſiaſticks of *Gaul* that would come to *Rome*; forbidding abſolutely that any ſhould go out of *Gaul* without that ſort of Letters from him, whereby it appeared what they were, and whence they came. This Privilege did belong to the Church of *Arles*; as indeed *Zoſimus* ſaith, That he granted it not to *Patroclus*, becauſe of his Church, but for his Deſerts. *Meritorum ejus Contemplatione.* The ſecond Advantage which *Zoſimus* would have *Patroclus* enjoy, was annex'd to the Dignity of his Church,

and

and concerns the Metropolitical Rights which he ordains him to have over the Province of *Gallia Viennenſis*, and both the *Narbonenſes*, which implies the Right of Ordaining all the Biſhops of thoſe Provinces. *Zoſimus.*

Laſtly, *Zoſimus* annexed to the Biſhoprick of *Arles*, all the Pariſhes and Territories which formerly belong'd to it. He added, That all the Conteſts that ſhould ariſe in the Provinces of *Gallia Viennenſis*, and *Narbonenſis*, were to be carried to the Biſhop of *Arles*; except the Buſineſs was of Conſequence; in which caſe, he affirmed it neceſſary, That he ſhould examine the ſame himſelf at *Rome*: *Niſi magnitudo cauſæ noſtrum deſideret examen.* He obſerves beſides in that Letter, That *Trophimus* was ſent to *Arles* by the See of *Rome*, and that through his means the *Gauls* received the Faith of Jeſus Chriſt. This Letter was written ſoon after the Promotion of Pope *Zoſimus*, the 20th. of *March*, of the Year 417. It is the Fifth in the common Editions.

About the latter end of that Year he writ Two more; wherein he confirms the Metropolitical Rights to the Church of *Arles*; rejecting even with Scorn the Canon of the Council at *Turin*, and condemning *Proculus* of *Marſeilles*, and *Simplicius* of *Vienna*, who oppoſed his Deſign. In both thoſe Letters he grounds the Primacy of the Church of *Arles* upon its being founded by *Trophimus*, who was ſent from the See of *Rome*. Theſe Letters are the Seventh and the Eighth. The former is directed to the Biſhops of *Gallia Viennenſis*; and the ſecond, to *Narbonenſis*; and the latter to *Hilary* of *Narbon*, who maintained, That to him belonged the Ordinations of the Biſhops of the firſt *Narbonenſis*. Both theſe Letters are dated the 27th. of *September*, 417.

He that moſt oppoſed *Patroclus*, was *Proculus* Biſhop of *Marſeilles*, who conſtantly Ordained Biſhops in his Province, notwithſtanding the Pope's Prohibitions. *Zoſimus* undertook him, and cited him to *Rome*. But he not much regarding that Citation, continued to maintain his Rights, and to Ordain, as he had done before. This brought upon him a Condemnation from *Zoſimus*, who writ againſt him, not only to *Patroclus*, but alſo to the People of *Marſeilles*, That they ſhould Expell him out of his Biſhoprick. His Ninth Letter, to *Patroclus*, is upon this Subject, *September* 27th. 417. And the Eleventh, to the ſame, written *March* 2d. 418. and the Twelfth, to the People of *Marſeilles*, dated on the ſame day. Yet notwithſtanding the Pope's Judgment and Threatnings, *Proculus* remained peaceable Poſſeſſor of his Biſhoprick; and was always acknowledged Lawful Biſhop, not only by the *Gallican*, but alſo by the *African* Biſhops. And St. *Jerom* tells us, in his Letter to *Ruſticus*, That this *Proculus* of *Marſeilles*, who was uſed ſo ill by the Popes, was a moſt Holy and Learned Biſhop.

The Grudge which *Zoſimus* bore to *Proculus*, made him Condemn likewiſe two Biſhops Ordained by him, called *Urſus* and *Tuentius*,; againſt whom he writ a Circular Letter to the Biſhops of *Africa*, *Gaul* and *Spain*; it is the Seventh, dated *September* 20th. 417. He ſaith of theſe two Perſons whom *Proculus* had Ordained, That they had been both Condemned. The firſt by *Proculus* himſelf, and the ſecond by other Biſhops: That this Man, after his Condemnation, came to *Rome*; where he did Penance, and abjured the Errors of the *Priſcillianiſts*. He reproaches *Proculus* for regarding neither his Judgment, nor the Judgment of others. He ſpeaks alſo againſt *Lazarus*, whom *Proculus* Ordained Biſhop of *Aix*, who had aſſiſted at the Ordination of *Urſus* and *Tuentius*. He declares, That thoſe Ordinations were Illegitimate, having been performed in prejudice of the Biſhop of *Arles*, who alone had the Right to Ordain in the Provinces of *Narbon* and *Vienna*. Laſtly, He adviſes the Biſhops of *Gaul*, *Spain* and *Africa*, not to own either *Urſus* or *Tuentius* for Biſhops, and not to communicate with them.

By theſe Letters one plainly ſees the Reaſon why *Zoſimus* did ſo much deſire to invalidate the Judgment given againſt *Cœleſtius* and *Pelagius*. Their Accuſers were *Heros* and *Lazarus*; *Patroclus*'s Adverſaries, and Friends of *Proculus* of *Marſeilles*. He openly declar'd for *Patroclus*. He eagerly proſecuted *Proculus* and his Adherents. He would have been glad to find Matter of Condemation againſt *Heros* and *Lazarus*, by cauſing them to be looked upon as Falſe Accuſers. Perhaps this is the only thing that made him favour *Cœleſtius* and *Pelagius* at firſt: But ſince both of them were convicted of Hereſie by the Biſhops of *Africa*, *The Love of Truth* prevailed in him, over the ſecret Satisfaction which he would have had by the Condemnation of *Heros* and *Lazarus*.

We have three Letters beſides aſcribed to *Zoſimus*, which do not ſeem to have had any relation to either of theſe Affairs we have now ſpoken of.

The Firſt is directed to *Heſychius*, Biſhop of *Salona*; to whom he preſcribes with much Imperiouſneſs, and with a very Commanding Tone, the Diſtances which he ſhould cauſe to be obſerved between the Sacred Orders. The Date is of *February*, 418.

The Second is directed to the Clergy of *Ravenna*. He ſpeaketh there againſt thoſe who durſt go to Court to Complain againſt him: telling the Clergy of *Ravenna*, That they were Excommunicated. The Letter is of the 2d. of *October*, of the ſame Year.

The Laſt, if it be true, is directed to the Biſhops of the Province of *Byzacena* in *Africa*; and not to the Biſhops of *Byzantia*, as it is in the common Title. There he blames thoſe Biſhops for admitting Lay-men to Judge Church-men. It is dated *Novemb.* 14th. 418. But it is very probable that it is Suppoſititious, becauſe it is of a very different Style from the reſt.

Zoſimus. *Zoſimus* writes purely, and nobly. He ſpeaks with Vigour, and Authority, and turns every thing to his own Advantage. He diſcerneth the weak ſide of his Adverſaries, and omits nothing that can do them Hurt. In a word, He writes like a Man throughly skill'd in Buſineſs, who knows the ſtrong, and the weak ſide of every Thing, and the exact Management of Affairs.

BONIFACE I.

Boniface I. After the Death of Pope *Zoſimus*, the Church of *Rome* was divided about the Election of his Succeſſor. The Arch-Deacon *Eulalius*, who aſpired to the Biſhoprick of *Rome*, ſhut himſelf up in the Church of the *Lateran*, with part of the People, ſome Prieſts, and ſome Deacons, and made them chuſe him in *Zoſimus*'s room. On the other ſide, a great Number of Prieſts, ſeveral Biſhops, and part of the People, being aſſembled in the Church of *Theodora*, elected *Boniface*. Both were ordained. *Eulalius* was ordained by ſome Biſhops, among whom was the Biſhop of *Oſtia*, who uſed to ordain the Biſhop of *Rome*. *Boniface* was likewiſe ordained by a great Number of Biſhops, and went to take Poſſeſſion of St. *Peter*'s Church.

Symmachus, Governour of *Rome*, having try'd in vain to make them agree, writ to the Emperor *Honorius* about it. In his Letter of the 29th. of *December*, 418. he ſpeaks in *Eulalius*'s behalf, and judges *Boniface* to be in the wrong. The Emperor believing his Relation, ſent him word immediately, That he ſhould expell *Boniface*, and uphold *Eulalius*. The Governour having received this Order, ſent for *Boniface* to acquaint him with it, but he would not come to him; ſo that the Governour ſent to him, to ſignifie the Emperor's Order, and kept him from returning into the City. The Biſhops, Prieſts, and the People that ſided with *Boniface*, wrote immediately to the Emperor, to entreat him, that he would order both *Eulalius*, and *Boniface*, to go to Court, that their Cauſe might there be judged. To ſatisfie them, the Emperor ſent to *Symmachus* an Order of the 30th. of *January* 419. ſignifying, That he ſhould enjoin *Boniface*, and *Eulalius*, to be at *Ravenna*, about the 6th. of *February*. *Honorius* conven'd ſome Biſhops thither to judge of their Cauſe; and that they might not be ſuſpected of favouring any one ſide, he commanded, That none of thoſe who had ordained either of them, ſhould be a Judge in the caſe. The Biſhops that were choſen to judge this Cauſe being divided, the Emperor put off the Judgment till *May*, and forbad *Eulalius*, and *Boniface*, to go to *Rome*; and ſent thither *Achilleus*, Biſhop of *Spoleto*, to perform the Epiſcopal Functions, during the *Eaſter* Holy-Days. In which time he prepared a numerous Synod, and invited the Biſhops both of *Africa*, and *Gaul*; but *Eulalius* could not endure that Delay, and ſpoiled his buſineſs by his impatience: For whether he diſtruſted his Right, or whether he was of a reſtleſs temper, he returned to *Rome* the 16th. of *March*, and would have ſtay'd there, notwithſtanding the Emperor's Orders, which obliged *Symmachus* to uſe Violence to drive him out of *Rome*, and the Emperor having been informed of his Diſobedience, waited for no other Judgment, but cauſed *Boniface* to be put in poſſeſſion, in the beginning of *April* 419.

One of the Firſt Things that *Boniface* did, was to write to the Emperor, to entreat him to make an Edict, to prevent, for the future, the Intrigues, and Cabals that were made uſe of to get the Biſhoprick of *Rome*. This Letter bears Date the Firſt of *July*. To cut off the Root of theſe Diviſions, *Honorius* ordained, That if ever Two Men ſhould be ordained Biſhops of *Rome*, that neither ſhould remain in Poſſeſſion, but that both the Clergy, and People ſhould chuſe a Third.

Boniface's Second Letter, ought to go before this now mentioned, if the order of their Dates were obſerved, ſince this is of the 13th. of *June* 419. It is directed to *Patroclus*, and to the other Biſhops of the Seven Provinces of *Gaul*, concerning *Maximus* Biſhop of *Valence*, who was accuſed, by the Clergy of that City, who had carried their Accuſation directly to the Pope, in all probability about the Conteſts which had been in that Province, concerning the Right of Primacy. *Boniface* accuſes that Biſhop, not only for refuſing to appear at *Rome* to plead for himſelf, but for avoiding to appear before Provincial Synods, to which he was remitted by the Popes his Predeceſſors. Yet he declares, That he would not condemn him, becauſe he ought to have been judged in his own Province: Wherefore he deſireth them to call a Council before the Firſt of *November*, that he might appear there to make his own defence to the Accuſations formed againſt him; adding, That if he refuſed to appear, he ſhould hope no longer, that his abſence could put a ſtop to his Condemnation. "For, ſaith he, it is a ſhrew'd "Mark of a Man's Guilt, who, when he is accuſed, and has ſo many occaſions of clearing him-"ſelf, yet neglects to make uſe of them.

Boniface's Third Letter to *Hilary*, Biſhop of *Narbonna*, of the 2d. of *February* 422 overthrows all that *Zoſimus* had done in the behalf of the Church of *Arles*. For upon the Complaint of the Inhabitants of *Lodevæ*, a City of *Gallia Narbonenſis Prima*, againſt *Patroclus*, Biſhop of *Arles*, for ordaining a Biſhop without conſulting with the Metropolitan, he declares, That it was an Action againſt the Canons of the Council of *Nice*, which he could not patiently bear with, becauſe he was obliged to maintain the Canons. Wherefore he ſends word

to

to the Biſhop of *Narbon*, That if that Church be of his Provence, he ſhould go to that City, and there perform a lawful Ordination, and put a ſtop to the Biſhop of *Arles*'s Preſumption, who undertook beyond the Bounds of his Juriſdiction. Laſtly, He ordaineth, That for the future, every Province ſhall be ſubject to its own Metropolitan. Nothing can be more contrary than the Opinions of *Zoſimus*, and *Boniface*, concerning the Dignity, and Juriſdiction of the Church of *Arles*. *Zoſimus* is perſuaded, That the Biſhop of *Arles* ought to ordain all the Biſhops of Seven Provinces; and *Boniface* declares, That that is a violation of the Canons. The former ſaith, That the Biſhop of *Arles* is the ſole Metropolitan; and the latter affirmeth, That none can be Metropolitan of Two Provinces. *Zoſimus* is of Opinion, That the Pretenſions of *Hilary*, of *Narbon*, and of the other Metropolitans of the Seven Provinces, that they have a Right to ordain the Biſhops of their reſpective Provinces, are extreamly raſh. On the contrary, *Boniface* maintains, That it is a well-grounded Right; and that the Pretenſion of the Church of *Arles* to ordain in thoſe Provinces, is a breach upon the Canons, to which oppoſition muſt be made. The one forbids *Hilary* of *Narbon*, to ordain the Biſhops of his Province, when he asks it of him: The other enjoins him to do it without asking. Can there be a greater contrariety of Opinions betwixt Popes, who ſucceeded each other immediately. This made St. *Leo* ſay in the Epiſtle to the Biſhops of *Provincia Viennenſis*, That the See of *Rome* had taken away from *Patroclus* what it had given him, by a more juſt Sentence, than that by which it was granted. ID IPSUM QUOD PATROCLO A SEDE APOSTOLICA TEMPORALITER VIDEBATUR ESSE CONCESSUM, POSTMODUM ESSE SENTENTIA MELIORE SUBLATUM. Is it becauſe thoſe Popes thought themſelves abſolute Maſters of theſe Things? If ſo, Why ſhould they alledge the Canons, and profeſs to obſerve them? Is it becauſe they believed that Privileges attended the Perſons of Biſhops, and not their Churches? Wherefore then did *Zoſimus* exalt the Dignity, and Antiquity of the Church of *Arles* ſo high, becauſe it was founded by *Trophimus*? We are therefore to conclude, That there is no other Reaſon of that contrariety, beſides the difference of the Opinions of the Two Popes: But which of the Two was in the Right, and which in the Wrong, is a great Buſineſs to be decided, which we ſhall find afterwards ſharply debated in the time of St. *Leo*. In the mean time we may obſerve, That the common Right was on *Boniface*'s ſide, and that we do not ſee any Privilege authentick enough, or any Cuſtom ſufficiently eſtabliſhed, whereby we ſhould allow to the Church of *Arles*, what *Zoſimus* grants to it. There are beſides Five of this Pope's Letters to *Ruffus* Biſhop of *Theſſalonica*, and to the Biſhops of *Illyricum* recorded in the Council that was aſſembled under *Boniface* II. in 531. *Boniface* I. was peaceable Poſſeſſor of the See of *Rome* until the Year 423. though there were ſtill ſome Chriſtians of *Eulalius*'s Party.

Boniface I.

SYNESIUS.

SYNESIUS, originally of *Cyrene*, a City of *Pentapolis*, a *Platonick* Philoſopher, and Diſciple of the famous *Hypatia*, having ſpent part of his Life in worldly Employments, was converted, and choſen Biſhop of *Ptolemais* in the Year 420. He was hardly brought to accept of that Office, which ſeemed to him to be contrary to that Philoſophical Life, wherein he had lived till then: Neither could he reſolve to leave his Wife; nor was he yet fully perſuaded of all the Articles of the Chriſtian Religion. He believed that Souls were created before Bodies, and could not conceive that the World was to have an end: He did not believe the Reſurrection of the Dead, as it is believed in the Church; imagining, That what is ſaid in the Scripture, had ſome myſtical, and ſecret Sence. He urges theſe Reaſons in his 105th. Letter, to prevent their ordaining him Biſhop. *Baronius* thinks, That he did not really hold ſuch Opinions, but that he feigned to have them to avoid the Epiſcopal Function. But this Conjecture is not at all probable, becauſe he affirms with an Oath, that he expreſſed his real Sence: Wherefore it is better to ſay with the Ancients, that *Syneſius*'s Merit, and the need which the Churches of *Africa* ſtood in of his Protection in a moſt difficult time, ſuperſeded theſe Conſiderations, in hopes that being ordained Biſhop, he would ſubmit his Opinions to thoſe of the Church. It is related in the *Pratum Spirituale*, that when he was Biſhop, a very remarkable Thing happened to him; which ſhews, That he had altered his Opinion, concerning the Reſurrection of Bodies. A Heathen Philoſopher, one *Evagrius*, *Syneſius*'s old Friend, came to *Cyrene*. *Syneſius* uſed all his Endeavours to convert him. After ſeveral Sollicitations to that purpoſe, this Philoſopher declared to him at laſt, That the Reſurrection of the Body was one of thoſe Things which he was moſt diſpleaſed with in the Chriſtian Religion. *Syneſius* affirmed, That whatſoever the Chriſtians taught was true, and never left him, till he had Converted, and Baptized him. This Man, ſometime after his Baptiſm, having given *Syneſius* a Summ of Money to diſtribute to the Poor, demanded a Bond to repay it him again in the next Life. *Syneſius* readily gave him one. The Philoſopher kept it, and ſome time before his Death, commanded his Children to put it into his Coffin. Three Days after, he appeared to *Syneſius* in the Night, and bad him come to his Grave, and take his Bond

Syneſius.

Syneſius. Bond, becauſe he was pay'd; and to aſſure him of it, he had ſigned a Diſcharge with his own Hand. *Syneſius* not knowing that his Children had put the Bond in his Coffin, having ſent for them, and learned of them how the buſineſs had been carried, telling them withal what had happened, went to this Man's Grave, with his Clergy, and the chief Men of the Town, and cauſed the Coffin to be opened; where they found the Bond, with a Receit newly written in *Evagrius*'s own Hand at the Bottom. The Author of the *Pratum Spirituale*, relates this Hiſtory, as having learned it of *Leontius* of *Apamea*, who came to *Alexandria*, in the time of the Patriarch *Eulogius*, to be Ordained Biſhop of *Cyrene*; adding, That that Man certified, That this Bond was ſtill kept in the Veſtry of the Church of *Cyrene*. This may give ſome Credit to a Story which would deſerve none, were it ſolely grounded upon the Teſtimony of the Author of the *Pratum Spirituale*, who is known to be of no great Authority. However, *Evagrius* and *Photius* affirm, That *Syneſius* was no ſooner Ordained Biſhop, but he yielded to the Opinion of the Church, concerning the Reſurrection.

Syneſius's Treatiſes are Philoſophical Diſcourſes, written with great nobleneſs and loftineſs. The Catalogue of them is as follows,

A Diſcourſe *of reigning well*, ſpoken in the preſence of the Emperor *Arcadius* about the Year 398. when he was Deputy of his own Province that was waſted by the *Barbarians* Incurſions, to obtain ſome Succours, and ſome eaſe of the Emperor. *Syneſius* ſpeaks there of Government with a wonderful freedom, and declaims openly againſt Courtiers, againſt the Luxury and Ambition of Princes. He lays down moſt excellent Inſtructions for Kings; He ſhows what are the truly Royal Vertues, and the Qualities of a good Prince. And diſcovers at laſt the ſpring of the Empire's Misfortunes, which was the Credit and Power that was given ſome time ſince to the *Goths* in the Affairs of the Empire. He compoſed at the ſame time another Diſcourſe directed to *Paonius*, to whom he ſent Aſtronomical Tables which he had made. This Diſcourſe contains a Commendation of Philoſophy, and particularly of Aſtronomy, with a Deſcription of the Work which he ſent.

The Book Intituled *Dion Pruſæus*, begins with the Praiſes of that great Man, mention'd in *Philoſtratus*. There *Syneſius* juſtifies himſelf againſt thoſe that blamed him for applying himſelf to the Study of Philological Learning, and againſt ſuch as found fault that the Books he made uſe of were not very exact. He ſhews with great Eloquence, That the Study of the fine Learning of Poetry and Rhetorick is of very great Uſe, and not unworthy of a Philoſopher. Afterwards he ſtrongly oppoſes the ſecond Calumny; proving, That it is ſometimes good for the exerciſe of a Man's Parts, to uſe Copies that are not ſo very Correct.

The Praiſe of Baldneſs, is one of the moſt Ingenious of all *Syneſius*'s Works; and though the Matter ſeems not to afford much of it ſelf, yet he enlarges and beautifies it with variety of wonderful Reaſons and Figures.

The two Books *of Providence* contain, the Hiſtory, or rather the Romance of two Brothers, Kings of *Egypt*, called *Oſiris* and *Typhon*. It is thought that he deſcribes under thoſe borrow'd Names, the State of the Empire in his time.

In the Book *of Dreams*, there are ſeveral curious Obſervations upon the Original, Vertue, and Significations of Dreams.

Syneſius's Letters are written with inimitable Eloquence, Pureneſs, and Dexterity: They are full of Hiſtorical Paſſages, Sublime Notions, Fine Railleries, Moral Reflections, and Pious Expreſſions. There are 155. of them: We ſhall ſpeak of thoſe only that relate to Religion, and the Church's Affairs, which are but very few.

To this may be referred what he ſaith in the Fourth Letter of a Shipwrack; He obſerves, That their Pilot was a Jew, who quitted the Helm on the *Saturday's*-Eve after Sun-ſet, and that he could not be perſwaded to take it again, what Threatnings ſoever were uſed, till the Ship was in an unavoidable Danger of periſhing. This Letter is of the beginning of the Year 410.

In the 5th. Letter directed to certain Prieſts, he Exhorts them to proſecute the *Eunomians*, and to hinder their Meetings; yet ſo, that it might appear, that they had no deſign upon their Eſtates.

In the 9th. he commends a Letter that was written by *Theophilus* Biſhop of *Alexandria*.

In the 11th. he declares, How unwilling he was to be made a Biſhop, and prays God who called him to that State, to give him ſtrength to diſcharge the Duties of it with Applauſe and recommends himſelf to the Prieſts and Peoples Prayers both Publick and Private.

In the 12th. he exhorts a Prieſt and a Biſhop called *Cyril*, to return to the Church from which they had been divided for a time; affirming, That *Theophilus*, their common Father, had admitted them if he had been alive. This Letter was written after *Theophilus*'s Death, which happened in *October* 412.

The 13th. is an Epiſtle written from *Alexandria*; wherein he aſſigns the Day to his Clergy when they were to obſerve the Feaſt of *Eaſter*: The Day there ſet agrees with the Year 412.

Andronicus Governor of *Pentapolis*, a cruel Man, exerciſed ſeveral Violences againſt the People. *Syneſius*, who was of a meek and merciful temper, uſed all his Endeavours to hinder that Man's Cruelties, and to help thoſe Wretches whom he tormented. Among the reſt, he ſuccoured a Man of Quality, *Andronicus*'s Enemy, whom that inexorable Governor perſecuted without any

any Cause. That charitable Action provok'd him, and made him utter in his Anger these Impious words: *That that Unfortunate Man fled to the Church in vain, and that no Man should be taken out of* Andronicus's *hands, though he held Jesus Christ by the feet.* *Synesius* having heard this Blasphemy, excommunicated him in a Synod held in the Year 411. and with him *Thoas*, the Chief Minister of all his Cruelties, with his whole Family. After this Excommunication, he pronounced a Discourse against him, which is the 57th. of his Letters. There he describes that Governor's Cruelty; He speaks of his own former Life, and with what reluctancy he accepted the Bishoprick; He bewails the deplorable Condition of his Country, declaring, That he was altogether unfit to manage a Business of that Nature; wherefore he intreats his Brethren, either to choose one in his room, or give him a Collegue that was versed in Business. *Synesius.*

In the 58th. Letter, he gives Notice to all Bishops in the Name of the Church of *Ptolemais*, That an Excommunication was pronounc'd against *Andronicus*, declaring, That they ought to shut their Church-Doors against him and all his Accomplices; That if any Man receives him, not regarding the Sentence of a small Church, he breaks the Unity of the Church, and that he will have no fellowship with him.

Andronicus struck with that Excommunication, seem'd to be sorry for his Fault, and promised to do Penance. *Synesius* knowing his humour, did not think fit to admit him; but the other ancienter Bishops were not of that Opinion, and judged that the Excommunication was to be suspended; and that they should forbear sending the Letter that declared him Excommunicated, having taken his word, That thenceforth he should not offer the like Violences. But this Governor, instead of keeping his Promise, was more Cruel than ever; So that *Synesius* published the Excommunication that had been pronounced, and wrote to the Bishops to give an Account of the Governor's relapse in the 72d. Letter. He makes another Description of this Governor's Violences in the 79th. But at last this cruel Man received the Punishment of his Cruelties, and was dealt withal as he had dealt with others. *Synesius* charitably pity'd his Condition, as he observes in the 89th. Letter to *Theophilus*.

In the 66th. *Synesius* maliciously asks *Theophilus*, How he should entertain *Alexander*, who had been ordained by St. *Chrysostom*, Bishop of *Basinopolis* in *Bithynia*; giving him to understand at the same time, That he approved not of his Behaviour towards those who sided with that holy Patriarch of *Constantinople*. He readily tells *Theophilus*, That he reverenc'd his Memory; and, That at least Men ought not to hate an Enemy when he is dead. He adds, That *Theophilus* himself had writ to *Atticus*, exhorting him to admit into his Communion those of St. *Chrysostom*'s Party. That as for this, *Alexander* who was born at *Cyrene*, formerly a Monk, then raised to the Dignity of a Deacon, and a Priest, and at last ordained Bishop of *Basinopolis* by St. *John Chrysostom*, that he was withdrawn into his own Country. *Synesius* durst not admit him to the Communion, nor to partake of the Church's Prayers; but he received him privately into his House, and shewed him much Friendship, it being his Custom so to deal with all guilty Persons. He intreats *Theophilus* to answer him plainly and clearly, whether he should look upon *Alexander* as a Bishop, or no? This Letter is of the latter end of the Year 410. or the beginning of 411.

The 57th. to the same *Theophilus*, contains several remarkable Points of Discipline; shewing the Power of the Bishop of *Alexandria* over all *Egypt*. He had appointed *Synesius* to compose some Disputes among the Bishops of *Pentapolis*, and in this Letter *Synesius* gives him an exact account of what he had done. There were in *Pentapolis* two Villages, *Palebiscus* and *Hidrax*, near *Libya*. Both these had formerly been Subject to the Bishop of *Erythra* the neareſt City. Since that under *Orion* Bishop of *Erythra*, an Easie Man; the Inhabitants of both these Villages had caused a Young Man, *Syderius* by Name, to be ordained their Bishop, who had served in *Valens*'s Army, that they might have a Man of Courage to protect them; without observing the Formalities requisite in a Legal Ordination, for he was ordained by one only Bishop, and without the Approbation of the Bishop of *Alexandria*. But this happening when the Heretical Factions were formidable, they forbore the Severity of the Laws: And St. *Athanasius* caused *Syderius* to be translated to *Ptolemais*; but towards the latter end of his Life, he returned to his former Church. After his Death, *Palebiscus* and *Hydrax* were reduced to their former dependency upon the Bishop of *Erythra*; the Inhabitants of those Places being willing, according to the Bishop of *Alexandria*'s Letters, to own *Paulus* of *Erythra*, for their Bishop. Since that, *Theophilus* upon the Information of some particular Men, offered to give them a Bishop, and gave *Synesius* a Commission to go and ordain him. He being come to the Village, found the People resolved to have no other Bishop but *Paul*, and could never bring them to consent that he should ordain a particular Bishop. He writ all this to *Theophilus*, and insinuates, That though the Inhabitants of those Villages were ready to obey, if he would absolutely impose a Bishop upon them; yet it was not convenient to do it.

There was another Business also to be decided at *Hydrax*. In this Town there was a Castle situate upon an Hill, whereunto belonged a great enclosure, which might have yielded a good income, if they rebuilt the Walls which had been thrown down with an Earthquake. The dispute about it was betwixt *Dioscorus* Bishop of *Dardania*, and *Paulus* of *Erythra*: The latter to take Possession, consecrated there a Chappel, and alledged, That that place had been long since consecrated. *Synesius* having examined the case, found that formerly Publick Prayers had been made in that Castle during the *Barbarians* Incursions. But he thought that this was not

Syneſius. ſufficient to make the place Sacred, becauſe that by the ſame Reaſon, all others would prove Conſecrated places, wherein Publick Prayers, and Holy Myſteries had been celebrated in time of War. As for the Chappel, it was proved that *Paul* had conſecrated it to make himſelf Maſter of the Place. *Syneſius* declared, That it was an ill Example, to make uſe of the Church's Prayers, of the Holy Table, and of the Myſtical Veil, to invade another Man's Eſtate. And ſo far from looking upon that Chappel as conſecrated, he made no Scruple of declaring it to be common. "For, ſaith he, we are to diſtinguiſh Superſtition from true Religion. Superſtition is a Vice "adorned with the Name of Vertue; but Wiſdom makes us diſcover it to be a third ſort of "Impiety: And ſo I do not think that there is any Sanctity in a thing unjuſtly undertaken; "neither do I regard the Conſecration that is alledged. It is not with Chriſtians as with Hea-"thens. They do not imagine that their God is made to come down with Words and Cere-"monies; They require a pure Heart, and free from Paſſions: And when Wrath or Anger "cauſes Miniſters to act, they do not believe that the Holy Ghoſt accompanies their Motions. *Paul* did not refuſe to take away the Chappel, but ſince *Syneſius* urged to have it done, he preſented a Petition full of Invectives againſt *Dioſcorus*, but he ſoon confeſſed his Fault and begg'd Pardon. Then *Dioſcorus*, who would yield nothing whil'ſt *Paul* diſputed it, propoſed of himſelf to come to an Agreement with *Paul* about that Caſtle, and ſo exchanged it, with ſome Lands hard by, for ſome other Lands which *Paul* gave him in another place, which lay more convenient for him, though of leſs Value. *Syneſius* gave *Theophilus* an account of all this, and commended *Dioſcorus* for relieving the Poor of *Alexandria*.

A Third Buſineſs that *Syneſius* had order to compoſe, was a Quarrel betwixt two private Perſons, *Jaſon* and *Lamponianus*; The latter being accuſed to have Slandered the other, choſe rather to confeſs, than to be convicted, and was required to do Penance, and to ſeparate from the Aſſemblies of the Faithful. The People requeſted that he might be Abſolved. *Syneſius* referred the Matter to the Biſhop of *Alexandria*, and only gave order to the Prieſts to admit him to the Communion of the Church, if he ſhould be in danger of Death: *For*, ſaith he, *as much as in me lies, I will take Care that no man ſhall die bound with Eccleſiaſtical Bonds.* He adds, That Abſolution ſhould not be granted in caſe of Neceſſity, but upon this Condition, That if he Recover, he ſhall be in the ſame State as before. *Lamponianus* was indebted to the Church One hundred forty ſeven Crowns of the Poor's Money, which he had loſt by ſome Misfortune, which he promiſed to pay; but required time to Work, that he might get that Summ.

Syneſius writ again to *Theophilus* about ſome Abuſes that were practiſed in thoſe Parts. Biſhops accuſed one another of Ill Behaviour, rather to make the Governors get Money, than becauſe they had any Grounds for ſo doing. *Syneſius* prays him to make an Order directed to him, whereby that Abuſe might be forbidden; but without reproving any particularly, that it might not appear that he had accuſed them. He ſaith, That with ſuch an Order, he would put a ſtop to that Infamy *of Biſhops*. *For*, ſaith he, *God forbid that I ſhould ſay, the Infamy of the Church.* He obſerves, That this will turn to greater Advantage for the Accuſers, than for the Accuſed, becauſe they ſhall be delivered from a greater Evil, ſince it is a greater Evil to do injury, than to ſuffer; becauſe the one comes from our ſelves, and the other concerns other Men. The laſt thing which *Syneſius* acquaints *Theophilus* withal, is concerning certain Biſhops, who quitted their Biſhopricks without being expelled, to go from Church to Church, to receive there the Honours due to their Character. His Opinion is, That they ſhould not be received, nor Precedency given them; that they might be obliged to return to their Churches. And thus, he thinks, thoſe ought to be dealt withal in Publick; as to what ſhould be done privately, he waits for an Anſwer to the Letter he writ to *Theophilus*, concerning *Alexander*, which is that now mention'd; He concludes this Letter with theſe very humble words: *Pray to God for me, and you ſhall Pray for a poor forlorn Man who wants all things, and needs help, not daring to addreſs to God for himſelf; for I perceive that every thing is againſt me, ſince I undertook to Miniſter at the Altar, who am laden with Sins; who was brought up out of the Church, and followed all my life-time a Profeſſion different from this.* This Letter is of the Year 411.

In the 76th. Letter *Syneſius* recommends to *Theophilus*, *Antonius*, who had been choſen Biſhop of *Olbiata*, a Town of his Province, and was going to *Alexandria*, to be ordained by *Theophilus*, according to the Cuſtom of that time.

The 95th was written by *Syneſius*, Seven Months after he was made Biſhop; He expreſſes, with what difficulty he accepted of the Office, and begs of God Grace to diſcharge it well.

The 105th. is that famous Letter which he writ to his Brother, when he was choſen Biſhop of *Cyrene*; wherein he ſets down the Reaſons that kept him from being promoted to that Dignity. The reſt of the Letters contain nothing that is remarkable touching Religion.

We have but two Homilies of *Syneſius* which are not entire. The Firſt is the beginning of a Homily upon God's Law, of which he underſtandeth what is ſaid in the 75th. *Pſalm, In the Hand of the Lord there is a Cup*, &c.

The Second is likewiſe imperfect. It is the Fragment of a Sermon preached upon *Eaſter*-Eve. Both theſe Fragments ſhew, That *Syneſius* did not excel in this kind ſo much as he did in others; yet he was Eloquent, and compoſed Pieces of Rhetorick very well; as appears by his Diſcourſe *concerning the Ruine of his Province*; And by his *Panegyrick* upon *Anyſius*, which come after the two Homilies now mentioned; but there is a particular ſort of Eloquence neceſſary for the Pulpit, which he ſeems not to have had. He had a better genius for Hymns; We

have

have Ten of his which are very excellent, in which there are some Platonick Principles concerning the Trinity. This Author ascribes much to God's Help, and to the Grace of Jesus Christ, which he requires us to ask by fervent Prayer, that we may be delivered from those Passions and disorderly Desires of Lust, wherewith we are transported. We have lost a Philosophical Work of his, Intituled, *Cynegeticks*, mentioned in the 153d. Letter. *Synesius.*

Synesius's Stile, according to *Photius*'s Judgment, is great and lofty, but something Poetical. He chiefly excelleth in Narratives and Descriptions. He varies the Matters which he treats of, with long Prefaces, and frequent Digressions. He makes them agreeable by excellent Passages out of Histories and Fables, and by the best Thoughts of the Profane Poets. His Philosophy hath nothing harsh or disgusting. He has found a way to render it pleasant and easie. He seems to have designed only to recreate, when he discovers the main Points of Wisdom. The Reader is brought insensibly to the Knowledge of most Important Truths, when he thought to read only pleasant Relations. He observes in his first Letter, That he writ two sorts of Books, some of the most refined Philosophy, and others Rhetorical Pieces; but that they are easily known to be all written by the same Person, who applies himself sometimes to serious things, and sometimes to pleasant ones.--And indeed, it maintains every where the same Character. His Philosophical Works are adorned with Rhetorical and Poetical Figures, and his Pieces of Eloquence are supported with Philosophical Thoughts. He had a thorough Knowledge of *Plato*'s Writings, and from that Fountain, he drew the noblest and the sublimest Notions in the old Philosophy, concerning the Knowledge of the Supream Being, and Principles of Morality. He wrote but little touching our Religion, and he was far from understanding it so well as he did *Plato*'s Philosophy. Yet one may see by his Letters that he was a very Wise, Prudent and good Bishop. He avoided Business as much as he could; but when he was ingaged, he acted very dexterously, and brought every thing to a good issue. His Behaviour was accompanied with great Freedom and Uprightness of Heart. He wanted neither Courage nor meekness, as there was occasion. His endeavours to avoid being a Bishop, and his manner of speaking of himself, show his great Humility. The Year of his Death is not known.

The Book *of Dreams* was Printed in Greek and Latin, Translated by *Ficinus*, at *Venice* in 1497. and at *Lyons* in 1541. In 1553. *Turnebus* published most of his Works in Greek. The Letters were Printed in Greek at *Venice* in 1499. at *Basle* in 1558. and at *Paris* in 1605. with *Turnebus*'s Translation. The Hymns were likewise Printed in 1590. with the Poems of St. *Gregory Nazianzen*, and those of St. *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, and Reprinted in 1603. in Latin by *Portus*. In 1653. *Janus Cornarius* translated most of *Synesius*'s Works, and his Translation was Printed at *Basle* in 1560. The Discourse *of Government* of the same Translation, was Printed by it self at *Francfort* in 1583.

At last, *Petavius* having review'd and translated a-new all *Synesius*'s Works, caused them to be Printed in Greek and Latin at *Paris* by *Morellus* in 1612. With *Nicephorus*'s Notes and Commentary upon the Book *of Dreams*. This Edition was corrected and augmented in 1640. wherein *Synesius*'s Works are joined with St. *Cyril*'s Catechetical Lectures.

POLYCHRONIUS.

POLYCHRONIUS Bishop of *Apamea*, Brother of *Theodorus* of *Mopsuesta*, and Disciple of *Diodorus* of *Tarsus*, writ some Commentaries upon *Job* and *Ezekiel*; whereof you may find some Fragments in the Greek *Catena*, and in St. *John Damascen*, if any Credit may be given to that sort of Quotations. There are Spurious Acts of St. *Sixtus* with *Polychronius*, dated after his Death. He lived about the latter End of the Fourth Century. *Polychronius.*

Councils

Councils Aſſembled,

From the Beginning of the FIFTH CENTURY, To the YEAR 430.

The Canons *of a* Council, *ſuppoſed to have been held at* Rome *under Pope* Innocent I.

Spurious Council of *Rome*, under *Innocent* I.

SIRMONDUS hath publiſhed ſome *Regulations*, written in the Name of a Synod at *Rome*, to the Biſhops of *Gaul*; which are certainly ancient, though it be unknown to what time they are to be referred: but becauſe they appeared to *Sirmondus* to be written in the Style of St. *Innocent*'s Letters, he believed they might belong to this Pope however, they are placed immediately after his Letters, and theſe are the Contents of them.

After a ſhort Preface, in the two firſt Canons, according to *Sirmondus*'s Diſtinction, they ſpeak of thoſe Virgins Penance, who having ſolemnly put on the Veil, and received the Prieſts Benediction, commit Inceſt, or contract prohibited Marriages; it is ordained, That they ſhall do ſeveral Years Penance, to bewail their Fault. Penance is likewiſe impoſed upon thoſe that made the ſingle Vow of Virginity, though they made no ſolemn Profeſſion, nor received the Veil; when they happen to Marry, or ſuffer themſelves to be taken away. The Third Canon, is, concerning the Sanctity of Biſhops, of Prieſts, and of Deacons: they are told, That they ought to give Example to the People; That they are obliged to remain Unmarried: and ſeveral Reaſons are alledged for it. Prieſts and Biſhops (ſay they) are to preach Continence to the People: With what Confidence ſhall they do this, if they keep it not themſelves? They are obliged to offer frequently the Holy Sacrifice, to Baptize, Conſecrate and Adminiſter: To do it with the greater Reverence, they muſt be Chaſt both in Body and Spirit. In the Fourth, thoſe ſeem to be excluded out of the Clergy, that have born any Secular Offices.

In the Fifth Canon, it is obſerved, That the Church of *Rome* doth not admit to Sacred Orders thoſe who defiled the Sanctity of their Baptiſm by any carnal Sin. In the Sixth, other Biſhops are exhorted to follow the Cuſtom of that of *Rome*: becauſe that as there is but One Faith in the Church, ſo there ſhould be but One Diſcipline.

It is obſerved in the Seventh Canon, That Prieſts and Deacons may adminiſter Baptiſm in the *Eaſter* Holy-days, in Pariſhes, in the preſence of the Biſhop, in whoſe Name they adminiſter it at that time: but when Neceſſity obliges them to Baptize at any other time, that muſt be done by the Prieſt, and not by the Deacon.

The Eighth Canon, about the Benediction of the Holy Oyl, is very obſcure. It is probable, that all that is ſaid there, amounts to no more than, That there is no need o ſeveral Perſons to Bleſs it. The Ninth declares, That it is not lawful now, as it was under the Old Law, to Marry a Brother's Wife, nor to keep Concubines with a Wife.

The Tenth forbids thoſe to be ordained Biſhops, that have exerciſed Secular Functions, though they were Choſen by the People: becauſe their Approbation is of force, only when they chuſe one worthy of that Office.

The Eleventh Canon ſpeaks very ambiguouſly concerning a Man's Marrying his Uncle's Wife; or an Aunt's Marrying with the Son of her Husband s Brother.

The Twelfth appoints, That a Biſhop ſhould be choſen out of the Clergy.

The Thirteenth declares, That thoſe who go from one Church to another, ſhall be deprived of their Office.

The

The Fourteenth contains that Order ſo often repeated in the Canons, That a Clerk depoſed by his own Biſhop, is not to be admitted. This Order is defended in very ſtrong Terms, and eſtabliſhed upon very good Reaſons. If another Biſhop's Clerk is not permitted to do the Functions of his Miniſtry, except he brought his Dimiſſory Letters; how much rather is it forbidden to receive and admit to the Communion a Clerk condemned by his own Biſhop. This would be to partake of another Man's Sin; to offer Injury to a Brother, and ſuſpect him without ground to have done Unjuſtly.

The Fifteenth Canon confirms and renews the Law of the Council of *Nice*, touching the Ordination of Biſhops by the Metropolitan, and the Biſhops of the Province; and forbids Biſhops to meddle with thoſe Ordinations that belong not to them.

The Sixteenth is, againſt the Abuſe of thoſe Biſhops who had Ordained ſome Lay-men that had been Excommunicated by their own Biſhop.

The Council of Milevis.

THis Council was aſſembled at *Milevis*, a City of *Africa*, the 26th. of *October*, 402. It is one of thoſe the *Africans* called *General*; that is, it was not compoſed of Biſhops only of one Province, but of Deputies from all the Provinces of *Africa*. *Aurelius*, Biſhop of *Carthage*, preſided there. The Biſhops confirmed at firſt what had been done in the laſt Councils of *Hippo* and *Carthage*; and then made ſome New Orders about ſome particular Conteſts among the *African* Biſhops. Council of *Milevis*, in cccii.

The Firſt is concerning the Precedency of the Older Biſhops. Having juſtified the Equity of following the ancient Order, according to the eſtabliſhed Cuſtom of *Africa*, it was ordained, to prevent the Conteſts that might happen upon that Subject, That they ſhould keep Two Liſts, which they called *Matricula's*, or Archives of all the Biſhops of *Numidia*; the one to be preſerved in the City of the chief See; that is, in *Carthage*, or in that City whoſe Biſhop was Metropolitan by Seniority: and the other in the Civil Metropolis; that is, in *Conſtantina*. This Order ſeems to have been made upon the Occaſion of that Conteſt betwixt *Victorinus* and *Xantippus*, Biſhops of the Province of *Numidia*, who both pretended to the Primacy of that Province, as appears by St. *Auguſtin's* 59th. Letter.

The Second Canon is, touching the Accuſation formed againſt *Quodvultdeus*, Biſhop of *Centuria*. His Accuſer preſented himſelf to the Synod, and cauſed *Quodvultdeus* to be asked, Whether he would have his Cauſe debated in the Council. The Biſhop conſented at firſt; but the next day he was of another mind, and retired. The Biſhops ordered, That he ſhould not be admitted to the Communion of the other Biſhops, till his Buſineſs was decided, yet without depriving him of his Biſhoprick; becauſe they thought it unjuſt to do it before his Cauſe was judged.

The next Order was, concerning *Maximianus*, Biſhop of *Vaga*, who offered to quit his Biſhoprick for the good of the Church, (as it is obſerved in St. *Auguſtin's* 69th. Letter.) The Council ordained, That a Letter ſhould be ſent both to him, and to his People, to oblige him to withdraw; and, That the People ſhould chuſe another.

The Fourth Canon is likewiſe to prevent Conteſts about the Seniority of the Biſhops; enjoyning the Biſhops Ordained in *Africa*, to take Teſtimonial-Letters of thoſe that Ordained them; marking both the Day and the Year of their Ordination.

The Laſt Canon forbids any Man to be admitted into the Clergy of one Church, who performed the Duty of a Reader in another.

Theſe Canons are in the Code of the *African* Church, from the Eighty ſixth, *&c.* to the Ninetieth incluſively.

Of the Councils held by St. Chryſoſtom *at* Conſtantinople *and at* Epheſus, *in the Years* 400, *and* 401.

BOth theſe Councils examined the Accuſations brought by *Euſebius* of *Valentinople*, againſt *Antoninus* Biſhop of *Epheſus*. The Hiſtory of them is in the Life of St. *Chryſoſtom*, (*pag.* 8.) of this Volume. Councils at *Conſtantinople* and *Epheſus*, by St. *Chryſoſtom*, cccc, & cccci.

A Council aſſembled in the Year 403. *in a Suburb of* Chalcedon, *called*, The Oak, *in which St.* Chryſoſtom *was Condemned.*

THe Hiſtory of this Synod is likewiſe in the Life of St. *Chryſoſtom*, (*pag.* 9.) It is taken out of *Palladius*, and out of the Abridgment of the Acts of this Council, quoted by *Photius*, Cod. 59th. of his *Bibliotheca*. Council at the *Oak*, againſt St. *Chryſoſtom*. ccccii.

The Council of Carthage, *in the Year* 403.

Council of *Carthage*, cccciii. UPON the Three and twentieth Day of *Auguſt*, in the Year 403. was held at *Carthage* a general Council of *Africa*, wherein the Biſhops that had been ſent to the Churches beyond the Seas, about the *Donatiſts* Buſineſs, having reported what they had found, and the Excuſes of thoſe Provinces that had ſent no Deputies being allowed, a Command was laid upon the Catholick Biſhops of each City, to ſend a ſort of a Summons to the *Donatiſt* Biſhops of the ſame Cities, to oblige them to enter upon a Conference. And that this might be done uniformly, they preſcribed a Form for this Act, which ſhould be made in the Preſence of publick Officers. Wherefore the Biſhops of this Council deſired, That the Proconſul *Septimius*, would ſend word to the Officers to help them in the Buſineſs, and to give them authentick Acts of thoſe Summons. This Petition is regiſtred in the Acts of the Third Conference at *Carthage*, in the 183 Ch. of the Third Day.

The Council of Carthage, *in the Year* 404.

Council of *Carthage* cccciv. THE *Donatiſt* Biſhops having anſwered theſe Summons of the Catholick Biſhops, only with Violences and Threatnings, the Catholicks aſſembled in a Council held the next Year upon the 25th. of *June*, deputed *Theaſius*, and *Evodius*, to the Emperors, to obtain from them ſuch Orders, as might prevent the Violences which the *Circumcellians* exerciſed againſt the Catholicks; and to Petition at the ſame time, that *Theodoſius*'s Law, which impoſes Ten Pounds Penalty upon ſuch as ordained Hereticks, or admitted them into their Aſſemblies, might take place againſt thoſe who ſhould detain the Proteſtations of Catholicks; and that the Law might be renewed which diſabled Hereticks either to give, or receive Legacies. Theſe were the Contents of the Memorials, given to both thoſe deputed Biſhops. *Aurelius* had a Commiſſion to write to the Emperors in the Name of all the Biſhops; and they alſo charged him to write to the Judges, till the Deputies were come back to obtain of them ſome Protection for the Church; and he is deſired to write to the Biſhop of *Rome* about it.

The Council of Carthage, *in the Year* 405.

Council of *Carthage* ccccv. THIS Council, aſſembled upon the 21ſt. of *Auguſt*, made no general Canons for *Africa*, but only regulated ſome particular Buſineſſes, which the Collector of the *African* Code hath expreſſed in theſe Terms. "It was ordained in this Council, That all the Provinces "ſhould ſend their Deputies to the general Council. Deputies were ſent with a Letter to *Mi*-"*zonius*, to let him know, That he might ſend Deputies with all Freedom. It was thought "fit to write to the Judges, to entreat them, That they would uſe their Endeavours "to reconcile the *Donatiſts*, and the *Catholicks*, as had been already done at *Carthage*. And "they were to write to the Emperor, to thank him for excluding the *Donatiſts*. But Pope *In*-"*nocent* having declared in his Letter which was read in the Council, That it was not convenient "to ſend Biſhops beyond the Seas, his Advice was approved, and they ſent only Clerks of the "Church of *Carthage*, to return the Thanks of the *African* Biſhops.

The Council of Carthage, *in the Year* 407.

Council of *Carthage*, ccccvii. THIS Council, aſſembled upon the 13th. of *June*, made a great many very uſeful Regulations.

The Council of *Hippo* ordained, That a general Council of *Africa* ſhould Yearly be held at *Carthage*. This diſcharges the Biſhops of that annual Fatigue; and leaves it to the Prudence of the Biſhop of *Carthage*, to call one, when, and where he thought fit. This is the ſubſtance of the Firſt Canon of this Synod, which is the 95th. of the *African* Code. The Second ordains, That whoever appeals from an Eccleſiaſtical Judgment, may chuſe ſuch Judges as he ſhall think fit, with the Conſent of his Accuſer; and that, from their Judgment, there ſhall be no Appeal.

After this, they admitted the Deputies of the Provinces, and ordered, That Five Men ſhould be appointed to ſee the Canons put in Execution.

The Third ordains, That *Vincentius*, and *Fortunatianus*, who were deputed to the Emperor, ſhould ask leave to nominate Advocates from among thoſe that were actually in the Service of the Church, that they might have Power to maintain the Church's Intereſts, and to go in to the Judges Courts, as the Biſhops did, and make ſuch Remonſtrances as they ſhould think neceſſary.

They diſcourſed of the Deputies Power at Court; and it was judged convenient, not to preſcribe to them what they ſhould ſay there. The Deputies of the Province of *Mauritania Cæſarienſis*

Cæsariensis complained, That enquiry having been made after *Primosus* to cite him to the Council, he could not be found.

The Fourth Canon, which is the 98th. in the *African* Code, forbids the establishing of Bishops in those Cities that had none before, without the Authority of a Metropolitan, and of a Council of the whole Province.

In the next, The People that are reconciled to the Church, and had a Bishop before their Reconciliation, are allow'd either to chuse one, or to submit themselves to the nearest *Catholick* Bishop. For those who had no Bishop before, they are subjected to that Bishop who converted them, if that Conversion happened before the Emperor's Law was enacted; but if since, then they must have their dependance upon their natural Bishop.

In the Sixth Canon, Judges are nominated to examine the Business of certain Deputies, who came not to the Synod, according to their Primate's Order.

In the Seventh, it is resolved to write to Pope *Innocent* about the Dispute betwixt the Church of *Rome*, and that of *Alexandria*, that so both those Churches might be at peace, and keep a good Correspondence with each other.

The Eighth Canon forbids divorced Persons to be married to others. This Regulation is there judged to be conformable to the Law of the Gospel, and to the Decision of the Apostle St. *Paul*. But since the civil Laws gave leave to the Husband, to marry after putting away his Wife, it is said, That the Emperor should be entreated to make another Law against that Custom.

The Ninth Canon prohibits the use of other publick Prayers, Prefaces, or Recommendations, or the practising of another Form of laying on of Hands, besides those which are approved by the Councils, and composed by Men of known Piety.

By the Tenth, those are to be degraded from the Honour of Priesthood, that should desire of the Emperor to be try'd by Secular Judges, but they are not restrained from desiring of him to be try'd by Ecclesiastical ones.

The Eleventh provides, That those shall be absolutely degraded, who having been Excommunicated in *Africa*, repaired to remote Churches, to be admitted to Communion.

The Twelfth and last Canon, which is the 106th. in the *African* Code, appoints, That such Clerks, or Bishops as desire to go to Court, shall be obliged to take testimonial Letters of their respective Bishop, or Metropolitan, directed to the Bishop of *Rome*, and containing the Reasons that bring them thither, that so the Bishop of *Rome* might grant them another Letter to go to the Court. It does not permit that Bishop, who had a Letter to go to *Rome* only, to have one from the Pope, to go to Court, except a new Business should happen, which he should acquaint the Bishop of *Rome* withal, and which should be mentioned in the Letter that he should give him. It is provided likewise, That in that sort of Letters, shall be set down the Day of *Easter* for that Year, that they may not want Date, or the *Easter* of the Year past, if that of the present is not exactly known.

Two Councils of Carthage, *in the Year* 408.

THE former of these Councils is of the 14th. of *June*, 408. All that is said of it in the *African* Code, is, That *Fortunatianus* was made Deputy against the Heathens, and the Hereticks. Two Councils of *Carthage*, ccccviij.

The latter is of the 12th. of *October*. There they deputed the Bishops *Restitutus*, and *Florentius* to Court, to ask for Succor against the Heathens, and Hereticks, at the same time that *Severus*, and *Macarius* were Executed, and *Theasius*, *Evodius*, and *Victor* were Murthered upon their Account.

The Council of Carthage, *in the Year* 409.

THIS Council assembled upon the 13th. of *June*, is not a general Council, but a particular one. There it was declared, That one Bishop alone could not give Judgment. Council of *Carthage*, ccccix.

The Council of Carthage, *in the Year* 410.

UPON the Twelfth of *June* 410. a Council assembled at *Carthage*, deputed Five Bishops to the Emperor, upon occasion of a Law of *Valentinian*, which granted Liberty of Conscience, that it might not prejudice the Laws made against the Hereticks of *Africa*. Council of *Carthage*, ccccx.

The

The Council of Ptolemais.

Council of *Ptolemais*, in cccxi.

ANDRONICUS, Governour of *Pentapolis*, guilty of great Oppreſſion, and Injuſtice, which he exerciſed in that Province, was Excommunicated by a Synod of Biſhops held at *Ptolemais*. There *Syneſius* made a Speech againſt him. But this Governour having ask'd Pardon, and promiſed to behave himſelf otherwiſe, the publiſhing of the Sentence of the Synod was ſuſpended. There is an Account of this Matter in the Abridgment of the 57th 58th. and 72d. Letters of *Syneſius*. Mention is made alſo of Aſſemblies of ſome Biſhops, in the 67th. Letter of the ſame Author.

The Conference at Carthage.

Conference of *Carthage*, in cccxi.

THE Catholick Biſhops had often demanded, ever ſince the Year 403. a Conference with the *Donatiſt* Biſhops, to examine the Reaſons which theſe pretended for their Separation from the Church in an amicable manner. The *Donatiſt* Biſhops had conſtantly refuſed it, till the Year 406. and then conſented to have one. They cauſed this Deſign to be authorized by an Order of the Emperor *Honorius*, diſpatched at *Ravenna* the 14th. of *October* 410. Count *Marcellinus* was nominated Preſident; and for the Execution of that Order, Two Rules were made; the one to appoint the Day of the Conference, and the other to fix the manner of Proceedings, and to oblige the Biſhops of both ſides, to declare whether they accepted of it.

The Conference began at *Carthage* upon the Firſt Day of *June* 411. The *Donatiſt* Biſhops met there to the Number of 278. and the Catholicks were 286.

Marcellinus ordered, That Seven Biſhops of each Party ſhould be choſen to ſpeak, of whom the chiefeſt of the Catholicks were St. *Auguſtin*, and *Alypius*, and that beſides theſe, Seven ſhould be named to aſſiſt as Councellors, and Four to over-look, that the Notaries ſhould faithfully ſet down what ſhould be ſaid. He commanded alſo, That every one ſhould ſet his Hand to what he aſſerted; and that whatſoever was done ſhould be communicated to the People. He ordered, That the Thirty Six deputed Biſhops ſhould be admitted into the Place of the Conference. But the *Donatiſts* would be all there; and the Catholicks were contented, that their Eighteen Deputies only ſhould be preſent.

The Firſt Day was ſpent in perſonal Conteſts, concerning the Biſhop's Qualifications. *Marcellinus* confeſſed at Firſt, That it was above his capacity to be a judge of that Cauſe; and that it ſhould rather be decided by thoſe, of whoſe Diſputes he undertook to judge. He cauſed the Emperor's Letter to be read, whereby he was appointed to be Judge. He promiſes them not to judge of any thing that ſhould not be clearly proved by either Party. He gave the *Donatiſts* leave to chuſe one to be judge with him of that Cauſe.

Nothing Remarkable was done in the Second Meeting on the 3d. of *June*. The *Donatiſts* having deſired time to examine the Acts of the Firſt, *Marcellinus* granted it to them, and adjourned the Conference to the Eighth Day of that Month.

An Accident happened about the manner of their Seſſion. *Marcellinus* having deſired the Biſhops to ſit down, the *Donatiſts* pretended, That it was forbiden by Scripture. The Catholick Biſhops would not keep their Seats, while the *Donatiſt* Biſhops were ſtanding. *Marcellinus*, out of Reſpect to the Biſhops, cauſed his Seat to be taken away.

In the Eighth Day of the Third Seſſion, the *Donatiſts* diſputed long about the Qualities of Oppoſers, and Defenders. But at laſt, St. *Auguſtin* obliged them to come to the main Queſtion, which was, Where was the Catholick Church? The *Donatiſts* confeſſed, That that was it, which was ſpread throughout the whole Earth; and ſo they had only now to examine Which Party was united with the Churches of other Parts of the World: And in this Point, the Catholicks had the upper hand. To divert the Queſtion, the *Donatiſts* deſired, That the Acts which they had in their Hands might be read: And ſo they entered upon the Examination of *Cæcilian*'s caſe. They preſented a Memorial, wherein they affirmed, That the Faults of every particular Member, infected a whole Community; and conſequently, that *Cæcilian* being guilty, the Catholicks were in the wrong for keeping with him, and that they had a ſufficient Reaſon to divide from him. This was the Point in Queſtion. St. *Auguſtin* anſwered it fully, proving out of Holy Scripture, that the Church upon Earth will always conſiſt of good and evil Members. He confirmed that Propoſition by St. *Cyprian*'s Authority, and urged the *Donatiſts* Example againſt themſelves, alledging their Behaviour towards the *Maximianiſts*. After this, St. *Auguſtin* concludes, That though *Cæcilian* had been guilty, yet that argued nothing againſt the Cauſe of the Church.

Yet *Marcellinus* would have it examined, Whether he was really Guilty: His Innocence was proved, as well as that of *Felix* of *Aptungis*, who ordained him by Acts of the Judgments given in their behalf, whereby they had been pronounced guiltleſs of the Crimes lay'd to their Charge.

The

The Fourth Conference being ended, and the Biſhops of both ſides withdrawn, *Marcellinus* gave Judgment for the Catholicks, whom he declared Conquerors; and the Biſhops being called in, he read it to them.

The Council of Cirta, *or* Zerta.

THIS Council was aſſembled at *Cirta*, or rather *Zerta*, in *June* 412. The Council writ a Synodical Letter, to refute the falſe Rumours which the *Donatiſts* had ſpread abroad concerning the Conference at *Carthage*. This Letter is the 141ſt. amongſt St. *Auguſtin*'s Letters. Council of *Cirta*, in ccccxij.

The Firſt Council of Carthage, *againſt* Cœleſtius.

COELESTIUS came from *Rome*, to *Carthage*, with a Deſign to be there ordained Prieſt in the Year 411. But his Error being diſcovered by *Paulinus* the Deacon, who formerly had been a Reader in the Church of *Milan*, he was put off to a Council of *Carthage*, held about the latter end of the Year 411, or the beginning of 412. by *Aurelius* Biſhop of *Carthage*. He was particularly asked, Whether he believed original Sin. He would never acknowledge it as a matter of Faith; and affirmed, before the Council, that ſeveral Catholicks held, That Children were not born in Sin, but in the ſame State wherein *Adam* was, before he had offended God. The Biſhops of this Council being not able to make him alter his Opinion, Excommunicated him, and he was forced to leave *Africa*. St. *Auguſtin* relates ſome Fragments of the Acts of this Council, in the Second Book *of Grace, and Original Sin*. *Marius Mercator* hath alſo written the Hiſtory of that Council. Council I. of *Carthage* againſt *Cœleſtius*, in ccccxj.

The Conference of Jeruſalem.

PELAGIUS, *Cœleſtius*'s Tutor, being retired into *Paleſtine*, was well received by *John* of *Jeruſalem*, who had protected *Rufinus*, whoſe Diſciple *Pelagius* was: But *Paulus Oroſius* being then in that Country, and being well acquainted with *Pelagius*, and *Cœleſtius*'s Errors, with the judgments given againſt the latter, and with the Writings both of St. *Jerom*, and of St. *Auguſtin* againſt them, accuſed *Pelagius* in a Synod, or rather in a Conference held at *Jeruſalem* the 30th. of *July*, in the Year 415. in the preſence of *John*, Biſhop of that City, who cauſed *Pelagius* though a Lay-Man, to come in, and ſhewed him much Reſpect. *Oroſius* having oppoſed to him both St. *Jerom*, and St. *Auguſtin*'s Authority, it was little regarded. He then accuſed him of believing, That Man may be without Sin. *John* of *Jeruſalem* affirmed, That if he maintained that Man could be free from Sin, without God's Help, that was indeed impious, but ſince he acknowledged that Man needeth divine Succour, he could not be accuſed: And he asked *Oroſius*, whether he would deny the Aſſiſtance of *God*. *Oroſius* profeſſed, that he did not, and anathematized all thoſe that ſaid it; but he ſaw, that they underſtood not one another, and that the Interpreter was not Faithful; ſo that he was obliged to ſay, That *Pelagius* was an Heretick; and that they ought to ſend him to thoſe Judges that underſtood Latin; and that *John* having declared himſelf, his Protector could not be his Judge. After ſeveral Altercations it was agreed, that they ſhould write to Pope *Innocent* about it. In the mean time, *Oroſius* coming to *John*, Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, Seven and forty Days after, was called by him Heretick, and Blaſphemer; having affirmed, That Man could not be without Sin, no not with God's Grace. *Oroſius* gives an Account of this whole Matter, in his Apology; which certainly, is an Ancient Monument. Conference of *Jeruſalem*, in ccccxv.

The Council of Dioſpolis.

HEROS, and *Lazarus*, Two Biſhops of *Gaul*, who had been obliged to quit, the one the Biſhoprick of *Arles*, and the other, that of *Aix*, and to retire into the *Eaſt*, joined with *Oroſius*, to accuſe *Pelagius*; and drew up a Petition, containing the Errors whereof they accuſed him, which they pretended to be taken out of his Books, and maintained by *Cœleſtius* his Diſciple. This Accuſation was preferr'd to a Synod of Fourteen Biſhops, held at *Dioſpolis*, anciently called *Lydda*, a City of *Paleſtine*. *Eulogius* of *Cæſarea* was Preſident, and *John* of *Jeruſalem* held the Second Place. Though they were abſent, yet their Petition was read; (for one of them was very ſick at that time) and they queſtioned *Pelagius* about the Errors alledged againſt him. This Man anſwered all the Heads of his Accuſation, by diſowning all the Errors imputed to him, or by giving a Catholick Sence in appearance, to what either *Cœleſtius*, or himſelf had aſſerted. Whereupon, the Synod abſolved him, as having ſufficiently anſwered the Charge of his Adverſaries. St. *Auguſtin* produces the Acts of this Council, in the Book of *Pelagius*'s Acts; and there is an Abridgment of them in his 106th. Letter. He makes uſe alſo, of the Authority of the Fathers of this Council againſt *Julianus*. St. *Proſper* likewiſe Council of *Dioſpolis*, in ccccxviij.

quotes the Fathers of this Council with high commendation, for condemning *Pelagius*'s Errors. Yet St. *Jerom* calleth this Council, a Pitiful Aſſembly, becauſe they ſuffered themſelves to be impoſed upon by *Pelagius*'s Diſſimulation.

A Second Council of Carthage *againſt* Pelagius *and* Cœleſtius.

The Council of Milevis *againſt the ſame.*

Counc. II. of *Carthage*, and of *Milevis*, againſt *Pelagius* and *Cœleſtius* in ccccxvj

HEros and *Lazarus* were not contented to accuſe *Pelagius* before the Council of *Dioſpolis*, but they gave *Oroſius* Letters directed to the Biſhops of *Africa*; who, as they well knew, were leſs favourable to *Cœleſtius* and *Pelagius*. Theſe without receiving thoſe Letters, aſſembled both at *Carthage*, and at *Milevis*; where they condemned the Opinions attributed to *Cœleſtius* and *Pelagius*, and decreed, That the Authors of ſuch Doctrines were to be Anathematized, unleſs they condemned their Errors very clearly. The Biſhops of both theſe Councils writ to Pope *Innocent*, to authorize their Deciſion by the Concurrence of the See of *Rome*: Their Letters were followed by another from five Biſhops, who writ by themſelves to the Pope about the ſame Subject. Theſe Letters are the 175th. 176th. and the 177th. among St. *Auguſtin*'s Letters. The Pope anſwered them, and approved the Judgment of the *African* Biſhops; as appears by his Letters dated the 25th. of *January* 417.

The Council of Carthage, *held about the latter end of the Year* 417.

Council of *Carthage* in ccccxvij.

THe Biſhops of *Africa* having received *Zoſimus*'s Letter, aſſembled about the latter end of the Year 417. to deliberate about what they ſhould do. They anſwered him immediately, That he was to blame, for offering to retract the Cauſe of *Pelagius* and *Cœleſtius*, which had been judged, and proteſted againſt whatſoever he might do in their behalf, without hearing them. This Letter is not extant, but it is mention'd in the 3d. Letter which *Zoſimus* writ to them. After the firſt ſtep, they collected all that had been done againſt *Cœleſtius*; and having confirmed the ſame, they ſent it to Pope *Zoſimus* by the Subdeacon *Marcellinus*: and further, they deputed Biſhop *Vindemialis* to carry it to Court. To this Synod muſt be referred what *Proſper* ſaith in his *Chronicon* upon the Year 418. and elſewhere, That it conſiſted of Two hundred and fourteen Biſhops. They wrote a long Letter to the Pope; wherein they complained, That he did too eaſily believe *Cœleſtius*; telling him, That he ſhould have been obliged to revoke his Errors by Name. They diſcovered the Evaſions which he uſed to elude the difficulty, by equivocal Terms. They ſent him a Memorial of thoſe Errors, whereof they were to exact of him a clear and preciſe Condemnation; and exhorted him to maintain what was done by his Predeceſſor. Father *Queſnel* believes, not without probability, That in this Synod were concluded the Nine Canons concerning Grace; which are commonly aſcribed to the Council of *Milevis*. But if they were propoſed in this Council, they were not concluded upon nor ſubſcribed till that which was Aſſembled in *May* next Year, to which the Code of *African* Canons attribute them. The Endeavours of the *Africans* had good Succeſs; for the Emperor *Honorius* made an Edict againſt *Pelagius* and *Cœleſtius*, the laſt day of *April*, 418. And ſhortly after, Pope *Zoſimus* publiſhed, as we have ſaid, his Sentence againſt them.

The Council of Carthage *in the Year* 418.

Council of *Carthage* in ccccxviij.

THe *African* Biſhops willing to confirm what they had done againſt *Pelagius* and *Cœleſtius*, Aſſembled upon the Firſt day of *May* of the Year 418. and made Eight Canons againſt the *Pelagian* Errors, and ſome other Orders about the Buſineſs of the *Donatiſts*.

The Firſt pronounceth an Anathema againſt any who dares affirm, That *Adam* was created Mortal; ſo that he muſt have died, whether he had ſinned or not, becauſe his Death was not an Effect of Sin, but a Law of Nature.

The Second likewiſe declares an Anathema againſt ſuch as deny, That Children ought to be baptized as ſoon as they are Born; or ſuch as own that they may be baptized, and yet affirm, That they are born without Original Sin.

In ſome places there is a Third Canon, which is an Addition to this; wherein thoſe that affirm That there is a particular place, where Children dead without Baptiſm do live happily, are condemned; and to this Notion is oppoſed what our Saviour ſaith, That none can enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, *except he be regenerate of Water and the Holy Spirit*. *Photius* citeth this Canon in his Collection. It is found in another Manuſcript, and in the Code of the Romiſh Church, publiſhed by Father *Queſnel*. And laſtly, St. *Auguſtin* ſeems to own it, when he ſays, That the difference which the *Pelagians* made betwixt Eternal Life and the Kingdom of Heaven, had been condemned in an *African* Council; yet this Canon is not found in the ancient Code of the *African* Church. The Collectors of this Canon have not own'd it, and in the Chapters about Grace attributed to Pope *Cœleſtine*, the 3d, 4th, and 5th. Canons are cited, which ſhould be

be the 4th, 5th, and 6th, if this were the Third. Perhaps this Canon was added, or look'd upon as an Explication of the foregoing.

The Third Canon in the common Editions pronounces Anathema againſt all that ſhould ſay, That the Grace which juſtifies Man through Jeſus Chriſt our Lord, doth only remit Sins committed; but that it is not given to ſuccour Man that he may Sin no more.

The Fourth expounds the Nature of this Grace, by condemning thoſe who ſhould ſay, That it doth no further help us, than as it gives us the knowledge of what we ought to do, but not by enabling us to fulfil the Commandments, which it gives us the knowledge of.

The Fifth is againſt thoſe that hold, That Grace is given only that we may do that which is good with leſs difficulty; becauſe one may abſolutely accompliſh the Commandments by the Power of his Free-Will, without the help of Grace.

The Sixth declares, That St. *John* did not ſay merely out of Humility; *If we ſay that we have no Sin, we deceive our ſelves.*

The contrary Truth is confirmed in the Seventh Canon, by theſe words of the Lord's Prayer, *Forgive us our Treſpaſſes*, &c. And they are condemned who affirm, That the Righteous do not ſay this Prayer for themſelves, but for others.

In the Eighth there is a Condemnation of another way of eluding the force of theſe words, by ſaying, That the Righteous pray out of Humility, but not truly. It is ſaid, That God would never endure that Man who in his Prayers ſhould lye not only to Men, but to God himſelf; by asking with his Mouth, That God would forgive his Sins, and ſaying in his Heart that he had none.

After theſe Eight Canons concerning Grace, ſome Orders are ſet down.

The Firſt, Is to reform the Fifth Canon of the Council of *Carthage* in the Year 407. whereby it was Enacted, That thoſe Biſhops who converted any *Donatiſts*, ſhould have the Juriſdiction over them. This Order having bred ſome Diſputes, it was thought fit here to reform it; and it is enjoyn'd, That in what place ſoever any *Donatiſts* are reconciled, they ſhall be of the ſame Dioceſs with the Catholicks of that place.

When there were two Biſhops in the ſame place, namely, The ancient *Catholick* and the reconciled *Donatiſt*, it might occaſion ſeveral Difficulties, which the Council prevents in the next Canon, which enjoins, That the junior Biſhop ſhall make a diviſion of thoſe places where there were many Catholicks and *Donatiſts*, and that the ſenior ſhall have his choice. That if there is but one place where the Catholicks and *Donatiſts* were intermixt, that Place ſhall belong to that Biſhop of the two, the place of whoſe reſidence is the neareſt; That if they prove equally diſtant, the Choice ſhall be left to the People. And if the ancient Catholicks deſire to have their own Biſhop, and the reconciled, him they had before, then the Majority of voices ſhall carry it; but if they be equal, then the ſenior ſhall have the Precedency. Laſtly, If the Places cannot be equally divided; As for example, if the number of Diviſions ſhould be odd, then two equal Diviſions ſhall be made, and the Place over and above ſhall bediſpoſed of, as is ſaid juſt before.

In the Third Rule it is provided, That whoſoever hath enjoy'd a place Three Years, ſhall remain in quiet Poſſeſſion, if there be a Biſhop in the Church of that Dioceſs, where naturally he ought to have been.

The Fourth is againſt thoſe Biſhops who violently took Poſſeſſion of the Juriſdiction of ſuch places as they pretended to be of their Dioceſſes, without having the matter in Diſpute adjudged by Biſhops.

The Firſt ordains, That thoſe that ſhall neglect to procure the Re-union of places dependent from their Dioceſſes, ſhall be put in mind of it by the Neighbouring Biſhops; That if they are not converted within Six Months after ſuch Admonition, they ſhall belong to the Dioceſs of that Biſhop that can convert them; if it appears that the Biſhop of the place hath neglected it. It is added, That if a Conteſt happens betwixt two Biſhops of different Provinces, the Metropolitan of the Province where the place in diſpute is ſituated ſhall appoint Judges, or the Parties ſhall chooſe one, or three.

This gives occaſion for renewing the Canon, which forbids any Appeal to be made from the judgment of Judges thus choſen.

It is enacted by the Seventh Order, That a Biſhop neglecting to reconcile the *Donatiſts* that are in his Dioceſs, ſhall be admoniſhed, and if they be not reconciled in Six Months, they ſhall not communicate with him until he hath reconciled them. Provided always, That he who had the execution of the Emperor's Orders was in his Province.

It is added in the Eighth, That if it be proved, that any Biſhop affirmed that theſe *Donatiſts* were come into the Communion of the Church, and it was not ſo, he ſhall loſe his Biſhoprick.

The Ninth enjoins, That if the Prieſts, Deacons, and other Clerks, complain of their Biſhop's Judgments, they ſhall be judged by the Neighbouring Biſhops, with the conſent of their own; That if they appeal from this Judgment, it muſt be to the Council of *Africa*, and it Excommunicates thoſe that ſhall make their Appeals to Judges beyond the Seas.

The Tenth contains an Exception from that Prohibition of veiling a Virgin before the Age of Five and twenty, when being in danger of Death, ſhe deſires it, or her Parents for her.

Laſtly, That they might not too long detain the Biſhops out of their Dioceſſes, they choſe three out of each Province, and gave them Power to order all things with *Aurelius*, who is deſired to Subſcribe the Canons and Rules now mentioned; which were alſo Subſcribed by all the Biſhops.

Of

Of the Council of Tella, *or* Zella, *and of ſome other Councils of* Africa.

Council of *Tella*, or *Zella*, &c. cccxviij.

AMong the *African* Councils, is reckoned one held the 22d. of *February* in the Year 418. at *Tella* or *Zella*; whereof a Decree is produced which confirms the Fourth Letter attributed to Pope *Syricius*, and under whoſe Name ſome Canons are found in the Collection of *Ferrandus* the Deacon. They do not agree about the Name of the place where this Council was celebrated. It is ſaid in the beginning, That it was Aſſembled at *Tella*; ſome think that it ſhould be *Zella*, inſtead of *Tella*; becauſe ſome Canons are quoted under that Name by *Ferrandus*.

Sirmondus thinks that we ſhould read *Telepta*, becauſe *Donatianus* of *Telepta* preſided; yet all Editions conſtantly call this the Council of *Tella*, and we read in the *Notitia*, of the Proconſular Province of *Africa*, that there was a City called *Tella* in that Province, which was a Biſhops See. This City differs from *Telepta*, and from *Zella*, which were in the Province of *Byzacena*. And though *Ferrandus* citeth Canons under the Name of a Council of *Tella* and *Zella*, yet it doth not follow, that he believed it to be the ſame Council; on the contrary, it is probable, that the Canons Regiſtred in his Collection under different Names, were made by different Councils.

But it is very likely, as Father *Queſnel* hath obſerved, That both the Council of *Tella*, and the Canons Regiſtred in *Ferrandus* under that Name, are Suppoſititious.

For, Firſt, *Tella* being a City of the Proconſular Province, what likelihood is there that a Council of the Province of *Byzacena* ſhould be called there? and that *Donatianus* the Metropolitan of *Byzacena* ſhould Preſide in it?

Secondly, Is it credible, That a numerous Council ſhould be Aſſembled in *February*, at a time that a General Synod of *Africa* was Summoned for the Month of *May*?

Thirdly, Wherefore do they ſuppoſe that the Legates of the Proconſular Province ſhould aſſiſt at a Council of the Province of *Byzacena*?

Fourthly, This Council is ſuppoſed to have been Aſſembled to receive the Fourth Letter of Pope *Syricius*. This Letter is Spurious as we have ſhewed, and though it were not, How unlikely is it, that the *Africans* would go about to confirm it ſo late? Is there any Example of their ſo doing? What reaſon had they to do it? Why ſhould they make uſe of the Pope's Letter written ſeveral Years before to make Regulations by?

In the Fifth place, Some of the Canons in *Ferrandus*'s Collection, under the Name of the Council of *Tella*, do not ſuit with the *African* Cuſtoms. That in the 6th. *Ch.* forbids *ONE Biſhop alone to ordain another Biſhop, except the Biſhop of* Rome. The *African* Biſhops had been far enough from approving this Exception ſo contrary to the Canons, and to Cuſtom. The others are taken out of *Syricius*'s Epiſtle againſt the *African*'s pertinacioufneſs, who did not own the Canons of other Churches, except thoſe of the Council of *Nice*, and ſuch as had been made in *African* Councils. As for the other Canons cited under the Name of the Council of *Tella*, or *Zella*, they may be true, and it is probable that they are of another Council; namely, Thoſe that are in the 3d. 16th. 65th. 68th. and 218th. Chapters. The others are in the 4th. 6th. 30th. 138th 174th. Chapters.

There is mention in this Council, of another Council held at *Thisdry*, under whoſe Name there are two Canons in *Ferrandus* the Deacon's Collection, *Ch.* 76th, and 77th. In this Collection there are likewiſe ſome Canons of other *African* Councils, of which we have no other knowledge. The Learned *Baluzius* collected them in his new Collection of ſuch Councils as were omitted in the preceding Collections. *Vol.* 1. *Page* 366. and 367.

Council of Carthage *in the Years* 418. *and* 419. *Concerning the Cauſe of* Apiarius.

Councils of *Carthage* concerning *Apiarius*, in cccxviij & cccxix.

URbanus Biſhop of *Sicca*, a City of *Mauritania Cæſarienſis*, and formerly St. *Auguſtin*'s Diſciple, did both degrade and excommunicate *Apiarius*, a Presbyter, as one that had been unlawfully ordained. This man repaired to Pope *Zoſimus*, who received him kindly, and admitted him to the Communion. This Pope's action, contrary to the Rules of the Church, that forbid Biſhops to receive thoſe Clerks that are excommunicated by their Brethren, amazed the *African* Biſhops. But *Zoſimus* ſeeking an opportunity to extend his Dominion and increaſe his Authority, would not let this occaſion ſlip. Wherefore he ſent Legates into *Africa*, a Biſhop called *Fauſtinus*, and two Prieſts, *Aſellius* and *Philip*; not only to cauſe *Apiarius* to be reſtored, but alſo to make them admit of the Canons of the Council of *Sardica*, concerning the Appeals of Biſhops to the See of *Rome*, and the Judgments of Clerks.

The *Africans* ſeeing that the Pope undertook to protect *Apiarius*, judged it more convenient to accommodate the buſineſs; and ſo they found this Medium, to put him out of the Church of *Sicca*, and give him leave to do the Functions of his Order any where elſe. But before they came to a concluſion, ſuſpecting that *Zoſimus*'s Legats were not come into *Africa* without ſome Deſign, they urged them to give an account of their Commiſſion. At firſt they would have made ſome Propoſals of their own; but the *Africans* without heſitation, deſired to ſee the Writings of their Commiſſion, and ſo they were obliged to read the Memorial of their Inſtructions; which contained

contained four Heads. The Firſt was, touching Appeals to the See of *Rome*. The Second, To hinder Biſhops from going to Court. The Third, That Prieſts ſhould be permitted to have their Cauſes examined by Neighbouring Biſhops. By the Fourth they were commanded, either to Excommunicate *Urbanus* Biſhop of *Sicca*, or to cite him to *Rome*, except he retracted what he had done. The Second Head admitted no Diſpute; becauſe the *African* Biſhops had already enacted, That neither Biſhops nor Prieſts ſhould go to Court. They anſwered the Fourth, by compoſing the buſineſs as we have ſaid; ſo that only the Firſt and the Third remained to be decided, and they were of great conſequence. The Pope's Legates alledged to ſupport their Pretenſions, the Canons of the Council of *Sardica*, which allow Appeals to the See of *Rome* for Biſhops condemned by a Provincial Synod, and permit a Clerk condemned by his own Biſhop, to appeal to the Biſhops of the Neighbouring Provinces.

Though the *Africans* had no knowledge of theſe Canons, yet becauſe the Pope's Legates poſitively urged them, they promiſed, out of the reſpect they paid to that Council, to obſerve the Canons, until they were inform'd whether they were belonging to the Council of *Nice*, or no. This was their reſolution in the firſt Council held about that buſineſs at *Carthage* in Autumn of the Year 418. which they acquainted *Zoſimus* withal.

After this Pope's Death, The Biſhops of *Africa* being aſſembled in an Univerſal Synod at *Carthage* the 23d. day of *May*, to the number of 217. *Fauſtinus* the Pope's Legate ſitting in that Synod, next after *Aurelius* Biſhop of *Carthage*, and *Valentinus* Metropolitan of *Numidia*, and *Aſellius* and *Philippus* the Prieſts after the Biſhops, the Canons of the Council of *Nice* were read, as they had the Copies of them on both ſides. The *Africans* not finding in their Code the Canons which the Pope's Legates affirmed to have been enacted by the Council of *Nice*, *Alypius* propoſed, That they ſhould ſend Deputies to the Biſhops of *Conſtantinople*, *Alexandria*, and *Antioch*, to clear this diſpute, by taking Copies of the true Acts of the Council of *Nice*: This Advice was approved, and they concluded, that in the mean time they ſhould obſerve the Contents of thoſe Canons: And they reſolved to write to Pope *Boniface* about what they had done, and to pray him to write to the *Eaſtern* Patriarchs; That this Point might be cleared. This being done, they repeated the Creed and the Twenty Canons of the Council of *Nice*, according to the Copy which *Cæcilian* Biſhop of *Carthage*, had brought from that Council whereat he aſſiſted. They added to theſe, Three and thirty other Canons conformable to thoſe of the Council of *Nice*. The Firſt is only an Advertiſement of *Aurelius*, concerning the Canons of the Council of *Nice*. The Second is a Confeſſion of the Holy Trinity. The Third confirms the Rule of the Council of *Carthage* of the Year 401. concerning the Celibacy of Biſhops, Prieſts and Deacons. It is ſaid, That their Miniſtery obligeth them to it. *Fauſtinus* confirms this Order in the Fourth Canon. The Fifth is againſt the Covetouſneſs of the Clergy, that uſurp upon their Brethren. The Sixth reneweth the Law which forbids the Prieſts to conſecrate the holy Chriſm, and to reconcile Penitents publickly, and to conſecrate Virgins. The Eighth gives a Prieſt leave to reconcile Penitents in caſes of neceſſity. The Ninth provides that the Accuſation of one that is guilty of any Crime ſhall not be admitted againſt a Biſhop. The next is againſt either Biſhops or Prieſts, who receive a Perſon excommunicated by his Biſhop, without his conſent.

Both the Tenth and the Eleventh pronounce an Anathema againſt thoſe Prieſts, who being reproved by their Biſhops, are ſo bold as to raiſe an Altar againſt an Altar, or make a Schiſm.

The Twelfth ſettleth the neceſſary number of Judges, to decide Eccleſiaſtical Cauſes. A Biſhop is to be judged by Twelve Biſhops; A Prieſt, by Six Biſhops, with his reſpective Biſhop; and a Deacon by Three only. The Thirteenth Canon reneweth the ancient Laws about Biſhops Ordinations; namely, That a Biſhop cannot be ordained without the Primate's conſent; and that three Biſhops at the leaſt muſt be preſent at the Ordination. In the Fourteenth, there is an Exception of the Twelfth for the Province of *Tripolis*, where there were few Biſhops, declaring, That in this Province a Prieſt may be judged by Five Biſhops, and a Deacon by Two: and for the ſame reaſon, they ſay, That one Deputy may ſerve.

To maintain Eccleſiaſtical Authority among Clerks, The Fifteenth forbids them to make their Complaints before Civil Judges, when they are cited before Eccleſiaſtical ones; and in caſe they do, though they get the better, yet they muſt be depoſed, if it be a Criminal buſineſs; and if it be a Civil Matter, they ſhall loſe what they have got. It was alſo provided by theſe Canons, That if the Sentence of the firſt Eccleſiaſtical Judges, was reverſed by a Superiour Judgment; yet this ſhall do no Prejudice to the former Judges, except they are convicted of having given Judgment out of Paſſion or Favour. It is added, That there can be no Appeal from choſen Judges, though they were fewer in Number than is appointed. Laſtly, Prieſt's Children are forbidden to exhibit Publick Spectacles, or to be preſent at any; They declare alſo, That the ſame ought to be forbidden all Chriſtians.

The Sixteenth forbids Biſhops, Prieſts, and Deacons to be Farmers, Attornies, or to get their Living by any ſordid Commerce. Readers are obliged to Marry when they come to the Age of Puberty, or to make a Vow of Continency. Clerks are not to take Uſe for Money Lent. They will not have Deacons to be ordained, nor Virgins conſecrated before they are Five and twenty Years old. Laſtly, Deacons are forbidden to Salute the People; That is, to ſpeak to the People in Reading, as Biſhops were wont to do in Preaching.

The 17th. grants to the Province of *Sileſia*, that had been ſeparated from *Numidia*, the Right of having a Primate, or Metropolitan, but dependent upon the Primate of *Numidia*.

The 18th. enjoyns, That Biſhops Ordaining either Biſhops or Clerks, ſhall make them underſtand the Canons. It forbids the giving the Euchariſt to the Dead, and renews the Order of the Council of *Nice*, about the Celebration of Provincial Councils.

The 19th. ordains, That whoſoever accuſes a Biſhop, muſt do it before his Metropolitan; who ſhall cite him to appear within a Month before him, and before the Judges whom he hath choſen: That in the mean time the Biſhop ſhall not be ſuſpended from the Communion: That if at the Month's end he gives good Reaſons for his not appearing, he ſhall have another Month; but if he doth not appear at his ſecond Summons, he ſhall be ſuſpended from the Communion until he hath juſtified himſelf: and, That if afterwards he comes not to the Univerſal Council, he ſhall be look'd upon as having condemned himſelf: That the Accuſer is not to be kept from Communicating, if he appears upon all Set-days; but upon his withdrawing, he ſhall be ſuſpended, but yet ſo as not to hinder his Proſecution. Laſtly, They forbid the admitting of a noted Perſon to form an Accuſation, except it be concerning his particular Intereſt. The 20th. gives Rules for the Judgment of Prieſts and Deacons; but other Clerks are left to the ſole Judgment of the Biſhop.

The 21ſt. forbids Clergy-mens Sons to Marry Heretical or Heatheniſh Wives. The 22d. hinders Clerks to give their Eſtates to Hereticks, though they were their Parents. The 23d. forbids Biſhops to go out of *Africa* without leave from the Metropolitan of their reſpective Province, from whom they are to receive a formed Letter, or a Letter of Recommendation. The 24th. prohibits the Reading of any other beſides Canonical Books in the Church, whereof the Catalogue there ſet down agrees with that of the Council of Trent. It is noted at the latter end of this Canon, That the Contents thereof are to be notified to *Boniface*, and the Biſhops of *Italy*, that they may confirm it: and that the *African* Church hath learned from her Father's Tradition, That the Books expreſſed in that Catalogue, ought to be read in the Church. The 25th. confirms the Law of Celibacy, for the Superior Orders; and it extends it to Subdeacons, but other Clerks are left at their liberty.

The 26th. forbids the Selling the Goods of the Church, or of Biſhops, without the Metropolitan's leave, unleſs there be an urgent Neceſſity; in which caſe they are to adviſe with the neareſt Biſhops.

The 27th. provides, That Prieſts and Deacons ſhall not be put to publick Penance; and, That ſuch as were Re-baptized, ſhall not be promoted to the Prieſthood. The 28th. forbids thoſe Prieſts and Deacons who find fault with the Judgments of their own Biſhops, to ſeek for Judges out of *Africa*; but they are permitted to have their Cauſe examined by neighbouring Biſhops, but with the Conſent of their own Biſhop: wherein this Canon differs from that of *Sardica*, which gave Clerks leave indifferently to chuſe neighbouring Biſhops for their Judges, without ſeeking for the Conſent of their own Biſhop.

The 29th. declares, That he condemneth himſelf, by ſuffering himſelf to be Excommunicated by an Eccleſiaſtical Judgment, who neglects to appear, and yet doth not forbear Communicating before he is heard. The 30th. ſaith, That if the Accuſer hath ſome reaſon to fear any thing in the place where the Accuſed dwelleth, he may chuſe a place hard-by to produce his Witneſſes.

The 31ſt. puniſhes thoſe Clerks who refuſe to be promoted to Superior Orders by their Biſhops, by depriving them of the Functions of their Miniſtery. The 32d. declares, That the Biſhops, Prieſts and Deacons, who being poor when they were Ordained, have afterwards purchaſed Eſtates out of the Churches Revenue, ought to be dealt withal like thoſe who detain other Mens Eſtates unlawfully gotten, except they bequeath them to the Church: but they are permitted to do what they pleaſe with ſuch Eſtates as come to them either by Succeſſion or by Donation. Finally, The 33d. and laſt forbids Prieſts to Sell the Churches Goods unknown to the Biſhops; and the Biſhops, without acquainting the Council and their Prieſts with it: even the Metropolitan is not permitted to uſurp what belongs to his Church. This is what was enacted in the Firſt Seſſion of this Council. Afterwards the Canons of former *African* Councils were read, in the ſame order in which we ſee them in the Code of the *African* Church.

The laſt Seſſion of this General Council was upon the 28th. of *May*, of the ſame Year. Several Biſhops complained, That they were kept there too long, and ſo deſired to return to their Dioceſſes: wherefore they nominated Deputies of each Province to compleat what remained yet to do; but before they ſeparated themſelves, they added Six Canons more to the former. The 1ſt. forbids the receiving the Accuſation of an accuſed Perſon. In the 2d. they would not have ſuch admitted for Accuſers as are Slaves, or Freed-men, nor infamous Perſons, as Mimicks, or Stage-Players, no more than Hereticks and Heathens. In the 3d. it is provided, That if the Accuſation conſiſts of ſeveral Heads, and the Accuſer cannot prove the Firſt, he ſhall not be ſuffered to propoſe the reſt.

The 4th. preſcribes the Qualifications of Witneſſes, according to what hath been ſaid of Accuſers; that is, That whoſoever was not qualified to be an Accuſer, could not be admitted for a Witneſs: adding, That the Domeſticks of an Accuſer could not be Witneſſes, nor ſuch as were under the Age of Thirteen Years.

The 5th. provides, That if a Biſhop declares that ſuch a Perſon hath confeſſed a Crime to him alone, and that Perſon denies it, and refuſes to do Penance; that Biſhop ought not to think that Injury is done to him, if the thing is not believed upon his Word, though he ſaith, That he will not Communicate with that Perſon, out of a Scruple of Conſcience. The next

Canon

Canon adds, That in this caſe, if the Biſhop will not communicate with that Perſon, the other Biſhops ſhall not communicate with that Biſhop; that ſo Biſhops may not offer to ſay what they cannot prove. Theſe Canons ſhew, That Crimes were confeſſed to Biſhops,; and that the Biſhops excommunicated Men, and put them to publick Penance for thoſe Crimes, though they were ſecret ones; but that the Biſhop could not oblige thoſe outwardly to do publick Penance, who had confeſſed their Crimes ſecretly to him, unleſs he had other Proofs to convict them.

After this, *Aurelius* concluded the Synod, putting off to the next day the writing to *Boniface*. All the Biſhops ſubſcribed and approved what had been done and read in the Synod.

The next day they compoſed the Letter to *Boniface*; wherein the *African* Biſhops gave him an Account of what had been done about the Memorial of Inſtructions which *Zoſimus* had given to his Legates; and promiſed him to ſee the two Canons of the Council of *Sardica* executed, concerning the Appeals of the Clergy, and the Judgments thereupon, until they had received out of *Greece* the true Copies of the Council of *Nice*; upon Condition, That if theſe Canons were not there, they would not endure this new Yoke, which ſeemed to be an Effect of Ambition; and that they ſhould be ſuffered to enjoy their ancient Privileges.

Theſe Copies were not long in coming; they received them in *November* of the ſame Year, with obliging Letters from St. *Cyril*, and *Atticus* of *Conſtantinople*; but they did not find the Canons alledged by *Zoſimus*'s Legates, but only the Confeſſion of Faith, and the Twenty ordinary Canons. They had no ſooner received them, but they ſent the ſame to Pope *Boniface*.

This ſeemed to have put an end to the Diſpute; and indeed, it was not ſpoken of any more in *Boniface*'s time, but it was renewed under the Pontificate of Pope *Cœleſtine*. For this *Apiarius*, to whom the *African* Biſhops had ſhewed Kindneſs for the Pope's ſake, inſtead of behaving himſelf wiſely, gave great occaſions of Complaint againſt him; ſo that they were obliged to condemn him. He failed not, to procure his Reſtoration, to apply himſelf to the ſame Means that had before proved effectual: he went to Pope *Cœleſtine*, who received him kindly, and admitted him to Communion: he wrote in his behalf to the *African* Biſhops, and ſent *Fauſtinus* to procure his Reſtoration. The *African* Biſhops met to judge him. At firſt he rejected their Judgment, under pretence of maintaining the Privileges of the See of *Rome*, and demanded to be admitted to the Communion, ſince *Cœleſtine*, to whom he made his Appeal, had admitted him. This Oppoſition, back'd by *Fauſtinus*, did not hinder the *African* Biſhops from undertaking the Examination of the Crimes laid to his Charge. At the third time of their Meeting, *Apiarius* confeſſed, "That he was guilty of the Crimes he was accuſed of, ſo that there "was no more need of Pleading." But the *African* Biſhops ſeeing of what Importance it was, to prevent that for the future the *African* Councils ſhould not be thus impoſed upon, they writ a Letter to Pope *Cœleſtine*. In which having related in what manner *Apiarius*'s Buſineſs was concluded, they intreated him earneſtly to hearken no more to thoſe that ſhould come from *Africa*, and not to admit any more to his Communion any Man that was Excommunicated by the *African* Biſhops. "For (*ſay they*) your Holineſs may take notice, That it was ſo decreed in the "Council of *Nice*; and though mention is made there only of Clergy and Laity, yet there is "a great deal more reaſon to obſerve this Rule, with reſpect to Biſhops; and it would prove "a great Diſorder, ſhould your Holineſs allow Communion againſt the Rules to Biſhops Ex-"communicated in their Provinces. Likewiſe, your Holineſs ought to reject thoſe Prieſts, "and other Clergy-men who apply themſelves to you, to avoid the Puniſhment which they "deſerve; ſo much the rather, becauſe we no where read that the Canons have taken away "this Privilege from the *African* Church; and that according to the Decree of the Council of "*Nice*, the Judgment of Prieſts, and of other Clerks, belongs to the Metropolitan. For the "Fathers of that Council were wiſe and juſt enough to ſee that all Cauſes ought to be decided "in thoſe very places where they have their birth; and that each Province ſhall not want the "Light of the Holy Spirit, which is neceſſary to direct and enable them to do Juſtice to their "People; ſo much the rather, that every one who thinks himſelf wrong'd by the Sentences of "Judges that are put upon them, may have their recourſe to a Synod of that Province, or even "to a National Council. Were it not great raſhneſs in any one of us, to believe that God can "inſpire by his Spirit one ſingle Perſon to do Juſtice, and deny the ſame to a great number of "Biſhops aſſembled in a Council? And how can it be imagined, that Judgment given out of "the Country, and beyond the Seas, can ſtand, ſince it is often impoſſible to tranſport Wit-"neſſes? They add, That they had ſent to Pope *Boniface*, *Cœleſtine*'s Predeceſſor, the true Copies "of the Council of *Nice*, where the Canons alledged by *Fauſtinus* are not found. They adviſe "him to ſend no more Clerks into *Africa* to ſee his Judgments executed, leſt he ſhould ſeem to "introduce into the Church, which Breaths nothing but Humility, the Pomp and Vanity of "the Age; and then they entreat him, not to ſuffer *Fauſtinus* to abide any longer in *Africa*.

The Council of Ravenna, *in* 419.

THis Council was aſſembled at *Ravenna*, in *April*, 419. by order of *Honorius* the Emperor, to judge betwixt *Eulalius* and *Boniface*, who diſputed about the See of *Rome*. For ſince the Biſhops could not agree, the Emperor purpoſed to call another more numerous Council, to which Council of *Ravenna*, in CCCXIX

which he invited Biſhops out of *Gaul* and *Africa*. In the mean while it was ordered in this, That *Eulalius* and *Boniface* ſhould keep out of *Rome*; and that *Achillaus*, Biſhop of *Spoleto*, ſhould take care of the Church till the Conteſt was ended. But *Eulalius*'s Precipitation juſtified *Boniface*'s Right, and was the cauſe that no other Council met upon that Subject. You may ſee what was ſaid about it in the Account of Pope *Boniface*.

The Council of Carthage, *in the Year* 420.

Council of *Carthage*, in cccxx.

WHat we have ſaid hitherto concerning the Councils of *Africa*, celebrated in the beginning of the *Fifth Century*, ſufficiently ſhews, That the Vigilancy of thoſe Biſhops made them meet often, and gives reaſon to conjecture, That Yearly Councils were held at *Carthage*; but we have not the Acts of all thoſe Councils. *Poſſidius*, in St. *Auguſtin*'s Life, intimates, That in 420. there was a Meeting of Biſhops at *Carthage*, where a young Virgin confeſſed that ſhe had ſuffered infamous things from the *Manichees*. St. *Auguſtin* relates the ſame thing in his Treatiſe *Of Hereſies*, ch. 46. and the Author called *Prædeſtinatus*, hath not forgot to reckon this Meeting among the *African* Councils; but it may be that it was only an Aſſembly of Biſhops, like that wherein St. *Auguſtin* cauſed *Heraclius* the Prieſt to be elected his Succeſſor, which cannot be called a Council.

The Council of Conſtantinople, *in the Year* 426.

Council of *Conſtantinople*, in ccccxxvi.

THis Council was aſſembled by *Theodoſius*'s Command, to Ordain *Siſinnius* Biſhop-Elect of *Conſtantinople*, in the room of *Atticus*. *Theodorus* of *Antioch* was preſent, and there condemned the *Maſſalian* Hereſie by a Synodical Letter: And *Neon*'s Opinion was, That as many as ſhould be convicted of favouring that Sect, ſhould be Expelled, without hope of Re-admiſſion, whatſoever Promiſes they might make. The reaſon of that extraordinary Severity came from this, That thoſe Hereticks made no ſcruple of Abjuring their Sect, even with the moſt dreadful Oaths. This Synod is mentioned in the Council of *Epheſus*, where the Synodical Letter is confirmed, *p.* 3. *Act.* 7.

The Council of Carthage, *in the Year* 427. *againſt* Leporius.

Council of *Carthage*, againſt *Leporius*, in ccccxxvii.

Leporius, Prieſt and Monk of *Marſeilles*, embu'd with *Pelagius*'s Errors, having likewiſe maintained that which *Neſtorius* publiſhed not long after, was driven out of *Gaul*: God's Providence directed him to *Africa*; where he was undeceived of his Errors by *Aurelius* and St. *Auguſtin*, who moſt charitably inſtructed him. After he was fully perſuaded of the Truth, they made him ſubſcribe a Confeſſion of Faith; wherein he ſharply condemned thoſe Errors which he had publiſhed, concerning the Perſon of Jeſus Chriſt, and made a clear Profeſſion of the Faith of the Church. *Aurelius*, St. *Auguſtin*, and ſome other Biſhops, being aſſembled, ſigned that Profeſſion, and wrote a Letter to *Proculus* of *Marſeilles*, and the other Biſhops of that Countrey; whereby they atteſted *Leporius*'s Converſion, and intreated them to receive him charitably. This *Leporius* having been preſent at the Aſſembly which St. *Auguſtin* called at *Hippo*, to chuſe *Heraclius* for his Succeſſor, held at the latter end of the Year 426, could not be ſent back before 427.

The Council of Conſtantinople, *in the Year* 428.

Council of *Conſtantinople*, in ccccxxviii.

Neſtorius having been choſen Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, in 428. after *Siſinnius*'s Death, *Philip*, an ancient Prieſt of the Church of *Conſtantinople*, found fault with ſome of *Neſtorius*'s Sermons, and refuſed to Communicate with him. This provoked *Neſtorius*, who cauſed him to be cited to his Council, and perſuaded *Cœleſtius* to accuſe him. But *Philip* being come to the Council, and *Cœleſtius* not appearing, *Philip* remained fully juſtified. This Council is ſpoken of in the *Memorial* which St. *Cyril* gave to *Poſſidonius*, and which was carried to *Rome*.

We conclude here the former Part of the *Third Volume*, which gives an Account of the Authors of the Fifth Age of the Church, that we may not enter upon the Hiſtory of the Council of *Epheſus*, which we ſhall ſpeak of in the latter Part.

The END of the FIRST PART of the THIRD TOME.

A CHRO-

A CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL AUTHORS Mentioned in the Third VOLUME.

Giving an Account of their Names, Time of their Birth, their Country and Employments, Time when they Flouriſhed, and the Time of their Deaths.

EVAGRIUS PONTICUS,

A Diſciple of the *Macarii*. Deacon of *Conſtantinople*. Flouriſhed from the Year 380. to the End of that Century. Died *Anno* 406.

MARK,

The Hermit. Flouriſhed about the end of the Fourth Century.

SIMPLICIANUS,

Biſhop of *Milan*, Succeſſor to St. *Ambroſe*. Flouriſhed at the end of the Fourth Century. Died in 400.

VIGILIUS,

Biſhop of *Trent*. Flouriſhed towards the end of the Fourth Century. Suffered Martyrdom in the Year 400.

PRUDENTIUS,

Of *Saragoſa*. A Chriſtian Poet. Born in the Year 348. Flouriſhed at the end of the Fourth Century. Died in 410.

DIADOCHUS,

Biſhop of *Photice*. Flouriſhed, according to ſome, at the end of the Fourth, or as others, at the end of the Fifth Century.

AUDENTIUS,

Biſhop in *Spain*. Flouriſhed at the end of the Fourth Century.

SEVERUS ENDELECHIUS,

A Chriſtian Poet. Flouriſhed towards the end of the Fourth Century.

FLAVIANUS,

Biſhop of *Antioch*. Flouriſhed from the Year 380. to the end of that Century. Died in the Year 404.

St. *JOHN CHRYSOSTOM,*

Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*. Born in 347. Flouriſhed from the Year 370. to the beginning of the next Century. He Preached in 380. and was Ordained Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* in 398. Was Depoſed in 403. and driven away in 404. Died in Exile in the Year 407.

ANTIOCHUS,

Biſhop of *Ptolemais*. A Famous Preacher, about the end of the Fourth Century.

SEVERIANUS,

Biſhop of *Gabala*. Flouriſhed towards the end of the Fourth Century.

ASTERIUS,

Biſhop of *Amaſea*. Flouriſhed towards the end of the Fourth Century.

ANASTASIUS,

Biſhop of *Rome*. Ordained in the Year 398. Died in 402.

CHROMACIUS,

Biſhop of *Aquileia*. Flouriſhed towards the end of the Fourth Century.

GAUDENTIUS,

Biſhop of *Breſcia*. Ordained in the Year 387. Died towards the Year 410.

JOHN,

Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*. Ordained in 387. Died in the Year 416.

THEOPHILUS,

Biſhop of *Alexandria*. Ordained in 395. Died in 412.

THEODORUS,

Biſhop of *Mopſueſtia*. Flouriſhed at *Antioch*, towards the end of the Fourth Century: And was Ordained Biſhop in the beginning of the Fifth.

PALLADIUS,

A Monk, and afterwards Biſhop of *Helenopolis*. Flouriſhed, chiefly at the beginning of the Fifth Century. Died after the Year 421.

St. *INNOCENT* I,

Biſhop of *Rome*. Ordained in 402. Died in 417.

St. *JEROM.*

Presbyter. Born in the Year 345. Flouriſhed from the Year 370 to his Death. Died in 420.

RUFINUS TORANIUS,

Presbyter of *Aquileia*. Flouriſhed from the Year 372. Died in 410.

SOPHRONIUS,

Flouriſhed at the beginning of the Fifth Century.

SULPICIUS SEVERUS,

Presbyter of *Agen*. Flouriſhed from the Year 390. to 420. Died in 420.

St. *PAULINUS*,

Biſhop of *Nola*. Baptized in 389. after having been Conſul in 378. Ordained Prieſt in 393. and Biſhop in 409. Died in 431.

PELAGIUS,

A *Britiſh* Monk. Publiſhed his Errors towards the end of the Fourth Century.

COELESTIUS,

A *Britain*, Diſciple of *Pelagius*. Taught his Hereſie about the beginning of the Fifth Century.

NICEAS,

An *Italian* Biſhop. Flouriſhed about the beginning of the Fifth Century.

OLYMPIUS,

A Biſhop in *Spain*. Flouriſhed about the beginning of the Fifth Century.

BACCHIARIUS,

A Chriſtian Philoſopher. Flouriſhed about the beginning of the Fifth Century.

SABBATIUS,

Biſhop in *Gaul*. Flouriſhed about the beginning of the Fifth Century.

ISAAC,

A Converted *Jew*. Flouriſhed about the beginning of the Fifth Century.

PAULUS OROSIUS,

A *Spaniſh* Prieſt. Flouriſhed under the Emperours *Arcadius* and *Honorius* about the beginning of the Fifth Century.

LUCIAN,
Presbyter.
AVITUS,
Spaniſh Presbyter.
EVODIUS,
Biſhop of *Vzala*.

SEVERUS,
Biſhop of *Minorca*.
MARCELLUS, *Memorialis*.
EUSEBIUS,
URSINUS,
Monk.
MACARIUS,
Monk of *Rome*.
HELIODORUS,
Presbyter of *Antioch*.
PAUL,
Biſhop.
HELVIDIUS,
VIGILANTIUS,
Prieſt.
} Wrote about the beginning of the Fifth Century.

St. *AUGUSTIN*,

Biſhop of *Hippo*. Born at *Tagaſta* the 13th. of *Nov.* 354. Was Converted in 387. Ordained Prieſt in 391. and Biſhop in 395. Began to Write in 387. and did not leave off writing till his Death. Died the 28th. of *Auguſt* in the Year 430.

ZOSIMUS,

Biſhop of *Rome*. Ordained in 417. Died in 418.

BONIFACE I.

Biſhop of *Rome*. Ordained in 418. Died in 423.

SYNESIUS.

A Platonick Philoſopher. Biſhop of *Ptolemais*. Famous for his Skill in Human Learning, about the end of the Fourth and the beginning of the Fifth Century; and was Elected Biſhop in 410. Died after the Year 412.

A CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE of the *COUNCILS* held in the *Fourth Age* of the *Church*.

The Figure ſhews the Year according to the Vulgar Æra.

THE Synod of *Rome* under *Innocent* I. 430
Council of *Milevis*, 402
Councils held at *Conſtantinople* & at *Epheſus*, 400, 401
Council *at the Oak* in the Suburbs of *Chalcedon*, 403
Council of *Carthage*, 403
Council of *Carthage*, 404
Council of *Carthage*, 405
Council of *Carthage*, 407
Two Councils of *Carthage*, 408
Council of *Carthage*, 409
Council of *Carthage*, 410
Council of *Ptolemais*, 411
Conference at *Carthage*, 411
Council of *Zerta*, 412
Firſt Council of *Carthage* againſt *Celeſtius*, 412
Conference at *Jeruſalem*, 415
Council of *Dioſpolis*, 418
Council of *Milevis*, 416
Council of *Carthage*, 417
Council of *Carthage*, 418
Council of *Tella*, or *Zella*, [or as ſome think *Telepta*] 418
The Second Council of *Carthage* againſt *Cœleſtius*, 416
Councils of *Carthage* concerning the Cauſe of *Apiarius*, 418, 419
Council of *Ravenna*, 419
Council of *Carthage*, 420
Council of *Conſtantinople*, 426
Council of *Carthage* againſt *Leporius*, 427
Council of *Conſtantinople*. 428

A TABLE

A TABLE of all the *Works* of the *Eccleſiaſtical Authors* mentioned in this Volume.

EVAGRIUS PONTICUS.

Genuine BOOKS *ſtill Extant.*

PArt of a Gnoſtical Book and a Practical Book, contained in One hundred and Seventy one Sentences, with Eleven Inſtructions for Monks; Publiſhed by *Cotelerius* in the Third Tome of the *Monumenta Eccleſiæ Græcæ*, pag. 68.

A Treatiſe entituled *Antirrheticus*, or rather a Summary of that Treatiſe; publiſhed by *Bigotius* at the end of *Palladius*.

The Hiſtory of *Pachon*, among the Works of St. *Nilus*.

Sentences attributed to St. *Nilus*, which are found in the Works of that Author, from *Page* 543. to *Page* 575.

Other Sentences, which are at the end of the Firſt Volume of the *Bibliotheca Patrum*. Gr. Lat.

A Small Treatiſe of the Names of God, publiſhed by *Cotelerius* in the Second Vol. of the *Monumenta Eccleſiæ Græcæ*, pag. 116.

Fragments and Sentences of *Evagrius*, in the *Code of Monaſtick Rules*, in the *Apophthegms of the Fathers*, and in the *Aſcetical Treaſure*, publiſh'd by *Poſſinus*.

Three Fragments quoted out of the Gnoſtical and Practical Books, produced by *Socrates*, Book 3. chap. 3. Book 4. chap. 23.

BOOKS Loſt.

The Gnoſtical, Practical and Antirrhetical Books.

Six hundred Problems.

Two Books of Sentences.

MARK the Hermit.

Genuine BOOKS *ſtill Extant.*

Eight Spiritual Diſcourſes in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*.

BOOK Loſt.

A Ninth Diſcourſe againſt the *Melchiſedecians*.

SIMPLICIANUS.

Genuine BOOKS *ſtill Extant.*

Two Letters, in Saint *Auguſtin*.

BOOK Loſt.

A Letter mentioned by *Gennadius*.

VIGILIUS of *Trent.*

Genuine BOOK.

A Letter concerning the Martyrs, related by *Surius* at the 23d. of *May*.

PRUDENTIUS.

Genuine BOOKS.

Pſychomachia.
Caſhemerinôn.
Periſtephanôn.
Apotheoſis.
Hamartigenia.

Two Books againſt *Symmachus*.

An Abridgment of ſome Hiſtories of the Old and New Teſtament.

BOOKS Loſt.

The *Dittochæon*.

A Commentary upon the Six Days Work.

DIADOCHUS.

Genuine BOOKS.

A Hundred Chapters concerning a Spiritual Life.

BOOKS Loſt.

Ten Definitions.

AUDENTIUS.

BOOK Loſt.

A Treatiſe of Faith againſt Hereticks.

ENDELECHIUS.

Genuine BOOK.

A Bucolick.

FLAVIANUS.

BOOKS Loſt.

Sermons upon different Subjects, whereof *Theodoret* produces ſome Fragments.

St. *JOHN CHRYSOSTOM*'s Works.

HOMILIES *and* SERMONS *upon the* PENTATEUCH.

Genuine Books ſtill Extant.

SIxty ſeven Homilies upon *Geneſis*, Volume I. of the *Eaton* Edition, from *Page* 1. to 522. and Vol. 2. of *Paris*, from *Page* 1. to 725.

Nine Homilies upon *Geneſis* in the Engliſh Edition Vol. 5. from *p.* 1. to 38. and in the *Paris* Edit. Vol. 2. from *p.* 725. to 773.

Two Fragments of Homilies---Upon *Adam* and *Abraham*. V. 5. Ed. Eton. *p.* 648. and 653.

Books Spurious, or Dubious.

Ten Homilies upon *Geneſis*, Engliſh Edition, V. 1. *p.* 39.

Hom. upon *Gen.* 1. *God ſaw all his Works*, &c. Ed. En. V. 5. *p.* 145. Ed. P. V. 6. *p.* 18.

Hom. upon theſe words, *Gen.* 1. *Let us make man after our own Image*, Ed. En. v. 5 *p* 645. P. v. 6. *p.* 24.

Latin Homilies, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9. 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15. upon *Geneſis* in the Latin Edition of *Lyons*, V. 1. *p.* 206, *&c.*

Hom. upon theſe words of *Abraham*, *Gen.* 24. v. 10. *Put thine hand under my thigh*, &c. Ed. En. v. 7. *p.* 565. P. v. 6. *p.* 30.

Hom. upon *Adam* driven out of Paradiſe, v. 7. Ed. En. *p.* 37.

A Sermon upon the Sacrifices of *Cain* and *Abel*, upon the Giants and the Flood, v. 7. Ed. En. *p.* 458.

Sermon upon *Abraham* and *Iſaac*, ibid. *p.* 394.

Hom. upon the brazen Serpent, *Num.* 21. Ed. En. v. 5. *p.* 669. P. v. 6. *p.* 49.

Another Homily upon the ſame, Ed. En. v. 7. *p.* 448.

Upon

A CATALOGUE of St. *Chryſoſtom's* Works.

Upon the Books of KINGS.

Genuine BOOKS.

Five Sermons concerning the Hiſtory of *Hannah* and *Samuel*. Ed. Eng. v. 5. from *p.* 50. to 83. and *Paris* v. 8. from *p.* 784. to 854.

Three Sermons of *David* and *Saul*; whereof the firſt is, v. 8. Ed. En. *p.* 10. And the two others, v. 6. *p.* 83. and 89. Ed. *p.* 841. 854. 864.

A Sermon upon the Hiſtory of *Elijah* and the Widow of *Sarepta*, 1 *Kings* 18. Ed. En. v. 8. *p.* 261. P. v. 5. p. 636.

BOOKS Spurious.

Several Sermons upon divers places of the Books of *Kings*, upon *David* and *Goliah*, Ed. L. v. 1. *p.* 243.

A Sermon upon the words of *David*, 2 *Kings* 7. ibid. *p.* 244.

A Sermon upon *Abſalom*, ibid. *p.* 245.

Sermon upon *Elijah* in Latin, ibid. *p.* 246. and in Greek, v. 6. *p.* 128. Ed. P.

Another Sermon upon the ſame, Ed. L. *p.* 248.

A Sermon of the Aſcenſion of *Elijah*, Ed. L. v. 1. *p.* 248.

A Sermon upon *Naaman*, *p.* 249.

A Sermon of *Eliſha*, *p.* 250.

A Sermon upon *Rachel* and her Children, Ed. En. v. 1. *p.* 317.

Upon *Jordan*, ibid. *p.* 41.

Four Greek Sermons upon *Job*, Ed. *Eton* v. 5. *p.* 949. P. v. 6. *p.* 76.

Five other Latin Sermons upon *Job*, Ed. L. *p.* 261.

A Sermon upon *Job*, ibid. 265.

A Sermon upon *Job* and upon *Abraham*, p. 267.

Upon the PSALMS.

Genuine BOOKS.

Sixty Homilies upon *Pſal.* 3d, *&c.* to the 13th. and upon the 41ſt. and 42d. and ſo to the 50th. upon the 100th. and 108th. and ſo on to the 117th. and from the 119th. to the end, v. 1. Ed. Eng. from *p.* 522. to 1016. and Vol. 8. *p.* 1. and 5. Ed. P. v. 3. *p.* 1. to 551.

An Homily upon *Pſal.* 13. Ed. P. v. 3. *p.* 833.

Two Homilies upon the Title of the 50th. *Pſal.* Ed. *Eton.* v. 1. *p.* 692. Ed. P. v. 3. *p.* 846. and 862.

BOOKS Spurious.

Two Latin Prefaces upon the *Pſalms*, Ed. L. v. 1. *p.* 269. and 270.

A Diſcourſe of the Uſefulneſs of the *Pſalms*, *p.* 272. ibid.

An Homily upon *Pſal.* 1. in Greek, v. 5. Ed. Eng. *p.* 677. In Latin, Ed. L. v. 1. *p.* 273.

An Homily upon the 9th. *Pſalm*, Ed. L. *p.* 313. upon the 14th. *p.* 323. upon the 22d. 24, 25, 26 29. 33. 37, 38, 39. 40. 42. 68. 71. 84. 90. 93. 95. 95. ibid.

An Homily upon *Pſal.* 4. Ed. Eng. v. 7. *p.* 431.

The Homilies upon *Pſal.* 51ſt. 95th. 100th. Ed. Eng. v. 1. *p.* 9. 11. and following, Ed. P. v. 3. *p.* 884.

Hom. upon *Pſalm* 101ſt, *&c.* to 107th. and the Expoſition of the 119th. Ed. Eng. v. 1. *p.* 92.

Upon the words of *Pſal.* 75. *Vovete & Reddite*, &c. v. 7. Ed. Eng. *p.* 260.

An Homily upon theſe words of *Pſal.* 38. *Man diſquieteth himſelf in vain*, Ed. Eng. v. 7. *p.* 568. Ed. P. v. 6. *p.* 114.

An Homily upon theſe words of *Pſal.* 121ſt. *Fiat pax in virtute tua*, &c. Ed. L. v. 1. *p.* 483.

An Homily upon *Pſal.* 92. *Dominus regnavit*, &c. v. 5. Ed. *Eton. p.* 680.

Homily upon theſe words of the 92d. *Pſal. Elevaverunt flumina*, &c. Eng. Ed. v. 7. *p.* 256.

Upon the other words of *Pſal.* 94. *Venite*, &c. ibid. *p.* 561.

Upon *Pſal.* 139. *Eripe me, Domine*, &c. *p.* 347. ibid.

Upon the Books of WISDOM.

Spurious.

Upon theſe words of the Third Chap. of *Wiſdom*, *They ſeemed as dead to the eyes of Fools.*--- Ed. L. v. 1. *p.* 555.

Upon the PROPHETS.

Genuine BOOKS.

A Sermon of the obſcureneſs of Prophecies, Ed. En. v. 6. *p.* 649. Ed. P. v. 3. *p.* 799.

A Sermon of the obſcurity of the Old Teſtament, Ed. En. v. 6. *p.* 658. P. v. 3. *p.* 813.

A Commentary upon the firſt Seven Chapters of *Iſaiah*, Ed. En. v. 5. *p.* 100. P. v. 3. *p.* 554, *&c.*

Five Homilies upon the 6th. Chapter of *Iſaiah*, Ed. En. v. 5. *p.* 127, *&c.* to 155. Ed. P. v. 3. *p.* 723. to 762.

An Homily upon the Seraphim, upon a paſſage of the 45th. Chapter of *Iſaiah*, verſe 7. Ed. En. v. 5. *p.* 155. and 160. P. v. 3. *p.* 763. 776.

An Homily upon *Jeremiah*, Ch. 10. v. 23. Ed. En. v. 5. *p.* 168. P. v. 3. *p.* 789.

BOOKS Spurious.

A Sermon upon theſe words of *Iſ.* Ch. 1. *If you will hear me, ye ſhall eat the good things of the Earth*, Ed. L. v. 1. *p.* 598.

A Sermon upon *Iſai.* Chap. 9. ibid. *p.* 613.

A Sermon upon theſe words, *Iſai.* Chapter 42d. *Sing unto the Lord*, Ed. L. v. 1. *p.* 614.

An Homily upon the Seals of the Books ſpoken of, *Iſai.* Chap. 46. v. 3. Ed. Eng. v. 5. *p.* 689. P. v. 6. *p.* 138.

A Sermon upon *Iſai.* Ch. 62d. of the coming of Jeſus Chriſt. Ed. L. v. 1. *p.* 615.

An Homily upon *Ferem.* Ed. L. v. 1. *p.* 616.

A Greek Homily upon *Suſanna*, Ed. Eng. v. 5. *p.* 703. Ed. P. v. 6. *p.* 141.

A Latin Sermon of *Suſanna*, Ed. L. v. 1. *p.* 617.

An Homily of the three Young Men in the fiery furnace of *Babylon*, Ed. En. v. 5. *p.* 698. P. v. 6. *p.* 148.

Homilies upon theſe words of the 6th. Chapter of *Zachar. Exce vir oriens*, Ed. L. *p.* 619.

Homilies upon whole BOOKS of the New Teſtament.

Genuine BOOKS.

Fourſcore and Ten Homilies upon St. *Matthew*, Ed. En. v. 2. from *p.* 1. to 555. Ed. P. v. 1. in N. T.

Eighty ſeven Homilies upon St. *John*, v. 2. Ed. En. *p.* 555. v. 2. Ed. P. in N. T.

Fifty and four Homilies upon the *Acts*, Ed. En. v. 4. *p.* 607.

Thirty

Thirty two Homilies upon the Epiſtle to the *Romans*, Ed. En. v. 3. *p.* 1. Ed. P. v. 3. in N.T.

Forty four Homilies upon the Firſt Epiſtle to the *Corinthians* with a Preface, and Thirty upon the Second, Edit. En. v. 3. 243. Edit. P. v. 5. in N. T.

A Commentary upon the Epiſtle to the *Galatians*, Ed. En. v. 3. *p.* 763. and Ed. P. v. 5. in N.T. *p.* 776.

Four and twenty Homilies upon the Epiſtle to the *Epheſians*, Ed. En. v. 3. *p.* 763. Ed. P. v. 5. in N. T. *p.* 864.

Fifteen Homilies upon the Epiſtle to the *Philippians*, Ed. En. v. 4. *p.* 1. Ed. P. in N.T. v. 6. *p.* 1.

Twelve Homilies upon the Epiſt. to the *Coloſſians*, Ed. En. v. 4. *p.* 89. Ed. P. v. 5. in N.T. *p.* 147.

Eighteen Homilies upon 1 *Theſſ.* and Five upon the Second, Ed. En. v. 4. *p.* 161. Ed. P. v. 6. in N. T. *p.* 262.

Eighteen Homilies upon 1 *Tim.* with a Preface, and Ten upon the Second, Ed. *Eton.* v. 4. *p.* 249. Ed. P. in N. T. v. 6. *p.* 402.

Six Homilies upon the Epiſtle to *Titus*, Ed. En. v. 4. *p.* 381. Ed. P. in N.T. v. 6. *p.* 619.

Three Homilies upon the Ep. to *Philemon*, Ed. En. v. 4. *p.* 411. Ed. P. in N.T. v. 6. *p.* 770.

Four and thirty Homilies upon the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, Ed. *Eton.* v. 4. *p.* 427. Ed. P. in N.T. v. 6. *p.* 692. which are ſaid to have been Collected after his Death, by a Presbyter of his Acquaintance.

Books Spurious.

An imperfect Commentary upon St. *Matth.* Ed. P. v. 2. in N. T. from *p.* 3. to 196.

Seven and twenty Latin Homilies upon St. *Matthew*, whereof the 13th. and 17th. are among St. *Chryſologus*'s Works, Ed. L. v. 2. *p.* 465, &c. to *p.* 502.

Fourteen Homilies in Latin upon St. *Mark*, ibid. from *p.* 513. to *p.* 551.

Six Homilies upon the Goſpel of St. *Luke*, *p.* 519. 529. and that of *Zacchæus*, *p.* 551.

Five Homilies upon St. *John*, *p.* 164, &c.

Diſtinct Sermons upon particular Texts of the New Teſtament.

Genuine Books.

A Sermon upon the Man that was ſick of the *Palſy*, ſpoken of in St. *Matth.* ch. 9. vol. 5. Ed. P. *p.* 814.

An Homily upon St. *Matth.* ch. 13. v. 7. *Enter in at the ſtraight gate*, Ed. Eng. v. 5. *p.* 175. Ed. P. v. 5. *p.* 125.

An Homily upon the Parable of the Servant who owed Ten thouſand Talents, *Matth.* ch. 18. Ed. En. v. 5. *p.* 196. Ed. P. v. 5. *p.* 1.

An Homily upon St. *Matth.* ch. 26. v. 39. *Father, if it be poſſible*, &c. Ed. Eng. v. 5. *p.* 203. Ed. P. v. 5. *p.* 114.

Five Sermons upon the Parable of *Dives* and *Lazarus*, Luk. 16. Ed. Eng. v. 5. *p.* 196. 220. 234. 242. 253. Ed. P. v. 5. *p.* 18, &c.

An Homily upon the Hiſtory of the impotent Man, related, *John* ch. 5. v. 3. Ed. Eng. v. 5. *p.* 264. Ed. P. v. 5. *p.* 102.

An Homily of the Uſefulneſs of reading the Holy Scripture upon the beginning of the *Acts*, Ed. Eng. v. 8. *p.* 111. P. v. 5. *p.* 582.

An Homily upon the Title to the *Acts*, Ed. Eng. v. 5. *p.* 274. P. v. 5. *p.* 151.

An Homily why the Book of the *Acts* is read in the time of Pentecoſt, Ed. P. v. 5. *p.* 831.

An Homily upon St. *Paul*'s Converſion, and changing of his Name, Ed. Eng. v. 5. *p.* 282. P. v. 5. *p.* 164.

An Homily upon the beginning of Ch. 9. of the *Acts*, Ed. Eng. v. 8. *p.* 60. P. v. 5. *p.* 544.

An Homily upon the Inſcription of the Altar at Athens, *To the unknown God*, Acts *Ch.* 17. Ed. Eng. v. 6. *p.* 722. P. v. 5. *p.* 556.

An Homily upon changing the Name of *Saul* into that of *Paul*, Ed. P. v. 5. *p.* 850.

An Homily upon *Rom.* 5. of glorying in Tribulations, *Ed.* Eng. v. 5. *p.* 292. P. v. 5. *p.* 180.

An Homily upon theſe words, *Rom.* 8. *All things work together for good to thoſe that love God*, &c. Ed. Eng. v. 5. *p.* 299. P. v. 5. *p.* 192.

An Homily upon the words Ch. 12. of the *Rom. If your Enemy hunger*, Ed. *Eton.* v. 5. *p.* 304. P. v. 5. *p.* 199.

Two Homilies upon *Rom.* Ch. 16. *Salute Priſcilla*, &c. Ed. *Eton.* v. 5. *p.* 314. and 321. P. v. 5. *p.* 216. and 226.

An Homily upon the beginning of 1 *Cor.* Ch. 1. ed. eng. v. 8. 111. P. v. 5. *p.* 568.

An Homily upon theſe words, ch. 7. 1 Cor. *Let every one have his Wife*, &c. Ed. *Eton.* v. 5. *p.* 330. ed. P. v. 5. *p.* 240.

An Homily upon Chap. 7. 1 *Cor.* about the Bill of Divorce, ed. eng. v. 5. *p.* 337. ed. P. v. 5. *p.* 251.

An Homily upon theſe words, *Ch.* 10. 1 Cor. *I would not, brethren, that ye ſhould be ignorant*, &c. ed. eng. v. 5. *p.* 343. ed. P. v. 5. *p.* 260.

An Homily upon theſe words, *Ch.* 11. 1 Cor. *It is convenient that there be Hereſies*, ed. *Eton*, v. 5. *p.* 362. ed. P. v. 5. *p.* 273.

Three Homilies upon 2 *Cor.* ch. 4. *Having the ſame ſpirit of Faith*, ed. eng. v. 5. *p.* 368. P. v. 5. *p.* 296.

An Homily upon theſe words, *Ch.* 11. 2. Cor. *Would to God you would bear with my folly a little*, ed. eng. v. 5. *p.* 392. P. v. 5. *p.* 332.

An Homily upon theſe words, *Ch.* 2. *Gal. I withſtood him to his face*, ed. eng. v. 5. *p.* 398. P. v. 5. *p.* 705.

An Homily upon theſe words, *Ch.* 1. to the *Philip.* whether Chriſt be preached under a pretence, or in truth, &c. ed. eng. v. 5. *p.* 410. P. v. 5. *p.* 343.

An Homily upon that *Ch.* 4. 1 Theſſ. *Concerning the dead*, ed. eng. v. 5. *p.* 418. P. v. 5. *p.* 375.

An Homily upon theſe words, 1 *Tim.* Chap. 5. *Let a Widow be choſen above ſixty years*, &c. ed. eng. v. 5. *p.* 425. P. v. 5. *p.* 387.

Books Spurious.

A Sermon upon *Herod* and the Innocents, *Matth.* Ch. 2. Ed. *Eton.* vol. 7. *p.* 318.

A Sermon upon theſe words of the Devil to Jeſus Chriſt, *If thou beeſt the Son of God caſt thy ſelf down*; which is attributed to St. *Ephrem* in ſome Manuſcripts, Ed. Eng. v. 7. p. 301.

A Sermon upon theſe words, *Matth.* ch. 6. *Take heed ye do not your Alms before men*, &c. Ed. En. v. 7. *p.* 486.

A Sermon upon St. *Matth.* ch. 7. v. 14, and 15. and upon the Lord's Prayer, Ed. Eng. v. 5. *p.* 183. Ed. P. v. 5. *p.* 137.

A Sermon upon theſe words of Jeſus Chriſt, in St. *Matth.* ch. 6. *See that you do not your Alms before men*, &c. Ed. Eng. v. 7. *p.* 488. Ed. P. v. 6. *p.* 523.

A Sermon upon the Woman that had an Iſſue of Blood, *Matth.* ch. 9. Ed. Eng. v. 5. *p.* 816. Ed. P. v. 6. *p.* 533.

A Sermon upon theſe words of St. *Matth.* ch. 13. *The Jews conſulted together*, Ed. Eng. v. 7. *p.* 752. Ed. *P.* v. 6. *p.* 385.

Three Sermons upon the Transfiguration, *Matth.* ch. 17. ed. eng. v. 7. *p.* 332. 339. 345.

A Sermon upon the Woman of *Cana*, ed. eng. v. 5. *p.* 771. ed. *P.* v. 6. *p.* 295.

A Sermon upon the Parable of an Houſholder and his Workmen, *Matth.* 20. ed. eng. v. 5. *p.* 508. ed. *P.* v. 6. *p.* 539.

A Sermon upon the withered Fig-tree, ed. eng. v. 7. *p.* 252. ed. *P.* v. 6. *p.* 552.

A Sermon upon theſe words of Jeſus Chriſt, *Matth.* ch. 18. *Whatſoever ye ſhall bind on earth*, &c. ed. eng. v. 7. *p.* 268.

An Homily upon *Matth.* ch. 21. *By what authority do ye*, &c. publiſhed by *Corelerius*.

A Sermon upon the Ten fooliſh Virgins, *Matth.* 25. ed. eng. v. 7. *p.* 554. ed. *P.* v. 6. *p.* 589.

A Sermon upon St. *Peter*'s denyal, *Matth.* ch. 26. ed. eng. v. 7. *p.* 275. ed. *P.* v. 6. *p.* 626.

An Homily upon theſe words, *Matth.* 26. *The Phariſees conſulted together to deſtroy Jeſus*, ed. eng. v. 7. *p.* 326.

Homilies upon the Women that brought Spices to the Sepulcher of Jeſus Chriſt, ed. *Eton.* v. 5. *p.* 740.

A Sermon upon theſe words of St. *Luke*, Cæſar Auguſtus *made a Decree that all the World ſhould be taxed*, Ed. *Eton.* v. 5. *p.* 715. ed. *P.* v. 6. *p.* 503.

A Sermon upon *Zacharias*'s Viſion, and *Elizabeth*'s Conception. Ed. *Eton*, v. 7. *p.* 340. Ed. *P.* v. 6. *p.* 412.

An Homily upon the Centurion, v. 7. ed. *Eton*, *p.* 403.

An Homily upon the reſurrection of the Widows Son at *Naim*, ed. *Eton.* v. 7. *p.* 439.

A Sermon upon the publican Woman, whoſe repentance is recorded in St. *Luk.* Ch. 7. ed. eng. v. 7. *p.* 440. ed. *P.* v 6. *p.* 395.

An Homily upon the parable of Seeds, *Luk.* 8. ed. eng. v. 7. *p.* 409.

An Homily of the Phariſee and the Banquet, *Luk.* 11. Ed. En. v. 7. *p.* 280. Ed. *P.* v. 6. *p.* 560.

Two other Sermons upon the ſame Subject, Ed. Eng. v. 7. *p.* 357. and 376.

Two Sermons upon the Parable of a man fallen among Thieves, *Luk.* 10. Ed. Eng. v. 7. *p.* 387. and 506.

An Homily upon theſe words, *Luk.* 12. *I came to bring War*, &c. Ed. Eng. v. 7. *p.* 478.

An Homily upon the Groat, *Luk.* 15. Ed. *Eton.* v. 7. *p.* 418.

An Homily of the Prodigal Son, Ed. Eng. v. 7. *p.* 539. Ed. *P.* v. 6. *p.* 369.

An Homily upon the Parable of *Lazarus* and *Dives*, Luk. 16. Ed. Eng. v. 5. *p.* 728. Ed. P. v. 6. *p.* 564.

A Sermon upon the Parable of the unjuſt Steward, *Luk.* 16. Ed. Eng. v. 7. *p.* 433.

An Homily of the Publican and the Phariſee, *Luk.* 18. Ed. Eng. v. 7. *p.* 233. Ed. P. v. 6. *p.* 569.

Another Sermon upon the ſame Subject, Ed. En. v. 7. *p.* 462.

An Homily upon *Zaccheus*, Ed. *Eton.* v. 7. *p.* 403.

An Homily of the Blind man and *Zaccheus*, Luk. 18. Ed. Eng. v. 5. *p.* 731. Ed. P. v. 6. *p.* 675.

An Homily upon the firſt words of St. *John*'s Goſpel; *In the beginning was the Word*, Ed. Eng. v. 5. *p.* 745. Ed. P. v. 6. *p.* 235.

A Sermon upon the Marriage in *Cana* of *Galilee*, *John* ch. 2. Ed. Eng. v. 7. *p.* 284. Ed. P. v. 6. *p.* 256.

An Homily upon *John*, ch. 11. v. 47. *The Jews aſſembled their Counſel*, Ed. Eng. v. 7. *p.* 532.

An Homily upon what Jeſus Chriſt ſaith of the Shepherd, *John* ch. 10. Ed. Eng. v. 5. *p.* 984. Ed. P. v. 6. *p.* 265.

An Homily upon Chriſt's coming to *Jeruſalem*, Ed. Eng. v. 7. *p.* 369.

A Sermon upon *Lazarus*'s reſurrection in *John*, ch. 11. Ed. Eng. v. 5. *p.* 270. Ed. P. v. 5. *p.* 146.

Four Homilies upon the ſame Subject, Ed. Eng. v. 7. *p.* 320. 524. 528. 530.

An Homily upon the Woman of *Samaria*, John 4. Ed. Eng. v. 7. *p.* 42. P. v. 6. *p.* 409.

Another Homily upon the ſame Subject, Ed. Eng. v. 7. *p.* 374.

An Homily of the man ſick of a Palſie, *John* 5. Ed. Eng. v. 7. *p.* 414.

An Homily of the man born Blind, Ed. Eng. v. 5. *p.* 761. P. v. 6. *p.* 432.

A Sermon upon theſe words of St. *John*, ch. 7. v. 24. *Judge not according to outward appearance*, Ed. Eng. v. 7. *p.* 272.

An Homily upon theſe words *Romans*, ch. 7. v. 15. *The good that I would I do not*, &c. Ed. *Eton.* v. 5. *p.* 789.

An Homily upon theſe words, 2 *Cor.* ch. 12. *My grace is ſufficient*, Ed. *Eton.* v. 5. *p.* 799. P. v. 6. *p.* 340.

An Homily upon theſe words of the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, *If we Sin wilfully*, *there remaineth no more Oblation*, &c. Ed. Eng. v. 5. *p.* 772. It is a Fragment of the 20th. and 15th. Homilies upon the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*.

Sermons upon ſome Points of Doctrine.

Genuine BOOKS.

SIx Sermons againſt the Jews, ed. eng. v. 6. *p.* 312, &c. P. v. 1. *p.* 385, &c.

An Homily of the Reſurrection of the Dead, Ed. Eng. v. 6. *p.* 703. Ed. P. v. 5. *p.* 440.

Sermons concerning the Pleaſures of another Life, Ed. *Eton*, v. 8. *p.* 71. P. v. 5. *p.* 647.

Five Sermons of the incomprehenſible Nature of God againſt the *Anomæans*, Preached at *Antioch*, Ed. *Eton*, v. 6. *p.* 389, &c. Ed. P. v. 1. *p.* 294.

A ſixth, Preached at *Conſtantinople*, Ed. *Eton*, v. 6. *p.* 434. P. v. 1. 698.

A Sermon of Conſubſtantiality, Ed. Eng. v. 6. *p.* 425. Ed. P. v. 1. *p.* 360.

A Sermon concerning the Requeſt of the Mother of *Zebedee*'s Children, Ed. Eng. v. 5. *p.* 206. P. v. 1. *p.* 374.

An Homily concerning the Prayers of Jeſus Chriſt. Ed. Eng. v. 6. *p.* 714. P. v. 5. *p.* 595.

Two Sermons; One againſt thoſe who affirm, that the Devil rules things here below; and the other, againſt ſuch as ask, Why God did not deſtroy him? Ed. Eng. v. 6. *p.* 680, and 690. P. v. 1. *p.* 285, and v. 5. *p.* 689.

Books Spurious.

A Diſcourſe upon the Apoſtle's Creed, Ed. *Eton*, vol. 3. *p.* 287.

A Sermon to Catechumens, Ed. Eng. v. 6. *p.* 971.

A Sermon directed to the Neophytes, ibid.

Another Sermon to thoſe that are to be Baptized, ibid. *p.* 851.

A Diſcourſe of the Trinity, Ed. Eng. v. 6. *p.* 955. P. v. 6. *p.* 189.

A Sermon

A Sermon of the Holy Ghoſt, Ed. Eng. v. 6. p. 729. P. v. 6. p. 204.

An Homily to prove that there is but one Lawgiver, in the Old and New Covenant. Ed. A. v. 5. p. 622. P. v. 6. p. 1.

Five Homilies of Providence and Deſtiny, Ed. Eng. v. 6. p. 563.

A Sermon concerning Faith, and the Law of Nature, Ed. Eng. v. 6. p. 837. P. v. 6. p. 177.

A Sermon againſt Hereticks, Ed. Eng. v. 6. p. 979.

A Latin Sermon upon the Aſſembly of Angels Ed. A. v. 5. p. 997.

Sermons upon ſeveral Subjects.

Genuine Books.

AN Homily when he was deſigned Prieſt, Ed. *Eton*, v. 6. p. 443. P. v. 4. p. 834.

One and twenty Homilies of Statues, Ed. *Eton*, v. 6. p. 447, &c. P. v. 1. p. 1, &c. to theſe muſt be joyned the 22d. concerning Enmity, which followeth in both Editions.

Sermons againſt the Superſtition of *New-years-day*, ed. eng. v. 5. p. 335. P. v. 1. p. 264.

An Homily of Baptiſm to thoſe who are to be baptized, ed. *Eton*, v. 6. p. 851. P. v. 1. p. 705.

The firſt Diſcourſe upon *Eutropius*, ed. eng. v. 8. p. 67. P. v. 3. p. 666.

One Sermon before he was Baniſhed, and another after his Return, ed. P. v. 4. p. 842. and 848. *Eton*, v. 7. p. 941. and 943.

A Sermon in Commendation of *Diodorus*, publiſhed by *Bigotius*.

A Sermon after his Return out of *Aſia*, ed. eng. v. 7. p. 944.

A Sermon concerning his Reconciliation with *Severianus*, ed. *Eton*, v. 7. p. 947, and 948.

A Sermon after the withdrawing of *Gainas*. v. 5. ed. P. p. 895. ed. eng. v. 7. p. 936.

Two Sermons after his Return from Exile, v. 5. ed. P. p. 91.

Books Spurious.

Fifty nine Homilies upon ſeveral Subjects, which follow after thoſe of Statues. Collections out of ſeveral Paſſages of St. *Chryſoſtom*, ed. L. v. 5. p. 75. ad. p. 188. v. 5.

A Sermon concerning falſe Prophets, ed. *Eton*, v. 7. p. 41. P. v. 6. p. 473.

A Sermon upon the beginning of the Year, v. 5. ed. P. p. 820.

A Diſcourſe of the *Circus*. ed. eng. v. 6. p. 974. P. v. 6. p. 489.

Againſt thoſe that fell aſleep upon *Whitſunday*, ed. eng. v. 6. p. 858.

A Sermon upon the Drought that was among the Inhabitants of *Theophania*. ed. A. v. 7. p. 352.

Moral Sermons.

Genuine Books.

AN Homily of Penance, ed. *Eton*, v. 7. p. 943.

The firſt Homily Intituled in the *Eton* Edition, of *Faſting*, v. 6. p. 824, P. v. 1. p. 579.

The 2d. and 3d. are loſt.

The 4th. ed. eng. v. 6. p. 798. P. v. 1. p. 588.

The 5th. ed. eng. v. 6. p. 769. P. v. 1. p. 596.

The 6th. ed. eng. v. 6. p. 78. P. v. 4. p. 487.

The 7th. is loſt.

The 8th. is the 2d. of Faſting in the Engliſh Edition, v. 6. p. 830. ed. P. v. 1. p. 612.

The 9th. ed. eng. v. 6. p. 779. P. v. 5. p. 887.

The 10th. ed. eng. v. 6. p. 763. P. v. 1. p. 623.

The 11th. ed. eng. v. 6. p. 693. P. v. 5. p. 632.

There is another Sermon concerning the Conduct of Life, which is Intituled, *Of Penance*, ed. *Eton*, v. 6. p. 804. which was Printed more exact by *F. Combefis*, with a Tranſlation at *Paris*, in 1645.

The Sermon concerning Anathema's, ed. eng. v. 6. p. 439. ed. P. v. 1. p. 803.

A Diſcourſe of Repentance, and of the Euchariſt, ed. eng. v. 6. p. 790. ed. P. v. 5. p. 888.

Two Diſcourſes of Prayer, ed. A. v. 6. p. 754. ed. P. v. 1. p. 145.

Two Sermons of Alms-deeds, and Hoſpitality, ed. eng. v. 5. p. 113. and 123. ed. P. v. 3. p. 689 and 712.

Another Sermon of Alms, ed. *Eton*, v. 6. p. 816. ed. P. v. 6. p. 283.

A Sermon againſt Gluttony, falſly Intituled, *The* 6th. *Diſcourſe*, concerning Providence, ed. *Eton*, v. 6. p. 879. P. v. 1. p. 740.

A Sermon againſt Lazineſs, ed. *Eton*, v. 6. p. 844. ed. P. v. 2. p. 882.

A Diſcourſe of Meekneſs, ed. *Eton*, v. 6. p. 740. P. v. 5. p. 538.

A Sermon concerning the Choice of a Wife, ed. *Eton*, v. 8. p. 80. P. v. 5. p. 355.

Two Homilies againſt thoſe that Faſt at *Eaſter*, and with the Jews, ed. *Eton*, v. 6. p. 366. and 377. P. v. 5. p. 608, and 630.

An Homily againſt Deſpair, ed. *Eton*, v. 8. p. 75. P. v. 5. p. 654.

A Sermon againſt diſcovering our Brethren's Faults, ed. eng. v. 6. p. 695. P. v. 5. p. 662.

A Sermon ſhewing that we ſhould not Preach to pleaſe, ed. eng. v. 8. p. 93. P. v. 5. p. 674.

Books Spurious.

Three Sermons of Penance, ed. *Eton*, v. 6. p. 905.

Another Sermon of Penance, ed. eng. v. 7. p. 282.

An Homily of Repentance and Continency, by *John* the Faſter, ed. *Eton*, v. 7. p. 641. P. v. 1. p. 809.

A Sermon of Prayer, ed. eng. v. 7. p. 476.

An Homily againſt Hypocriſie, ed. *Eton*, v. 7. p. 297. P. v. 6. p. 529.

A Sermon of Faſting, ed. eng. v. 7. p. 428.

A Sermon of Faſting, and of Alms-giving, ed. eng. v. 6. p. 883. P. v. 6. p. 635.

Several Sermons of Faſting, ed. eng. v. 7. p. 428. p. 466. p. 469. p. 470. p. 509. p. 510.

A Sermon of Alms-deeds, ed. eng. v. 7. p. 520.

Several Homilies about Providence, Riches, and Poverty, ed. L. v. 5. from p. 582. to p. 598.

A Sermon againſt Swearing, ibid. p. 599.

A Sermon againſt thoſe that live in Pleaſures, ibid. p. 600. and 601.

That none ſhould mourn exceſſively for the Dead, ed. eng. v. 6. p. 943.

A Sermon of Faith, Hope, and Charity, ed. eng. v. 7. p. 288. 293. 295. 299. 522.

Spiritual Admonitions, ed. *Eton*, v. 7. p. 481.

Two Homilies of ſpiritual Warfare, ed. L. v. 5. p. 294. and 296.

A Sermon

A Sermon of Diſcipline, ibid. *p.* 297.
A Sermon of Vertue, ibid. 298.
A Sermon to ſhew that we ſhould be more careful of the Salvation of the Soul, than of the health of the Body, ed. eng. v. 6. *p.* 893.
A Sermon of the Salvation of the Soul, ibid. v. 6. *p.* 968.
A Sermon of Patience, &c. ed. eng. v. 7. *p.* 435.
A Sermon to prove that a Diſciple of Jeſus Chriſt muſt be meek, ed. eng. v. 6. *p.* 903. *P.* v. 6. *p.* 468.
Sermons of Charity and Meekneſs, ed. eng. v. 6. *p.* 742. 750.
Other Moral Sermons, which are Collections out of St. *Chryſoſtom*, ibid. v. 5. *p.* 313. to 375.
A Sermon to ſhew, That whoſoever hath received any Gift of God, ought to impart the ſame to others, ed. eng. v. 7. *p.* 42.
A Sermon againſt thoſe that accuſe Prieſts of living at eaſe, taken out of St. *Chryſoſtom*'s Homilies, out of the 9th. upon the *Ep.* to the *Philip.* and out of the Homilies, upon the Ep. to *Tim.* and to *Titus*, ed. *Eton*, v. 6. *p* 896.
A Diſcourſe againſt thoſe that abuſed Virgins Conſecrated to God, ed. eng. v. 6. *p.* 976.

Sermons upon Feſtival Days.

Genuine Books.

AN Homily upon *Chriſtmas*, ed. *Eton*, v. 5. *p*51 i. *P.* v. 5. *p.* 417.
A Sermon of Jeſus Chriſt's Nativity, ed. *Eton*, v. 5. *p.* 846. *P.* v. 6. *p.* 493.
An Homily of Chriſt's Baptiſm, ed. eng. v. 5. *p.* 523. *P.* v. 1. *p.* 275.
A Sermon upon the Holy Week, ed. eng. v. 5. *p.* 540. *P.* v. 3. *p.* 712.
An Homily about *Judas*'s Treaſon, Preached upon Holy *Thurſday*, ed. A. v. 5. *p.* 547. *P.* v. 5. *p.* 406.
An Homily upon Chriſt's Paſſion, ed. *Eton*, v. 5. *p.* 663. *P.* v. 5. *p.* 431.
An Homily concerning the Croſs and the Thief, ed. *Eton*, v. 5. *p.* 567. *P.* v. 1. *p.* 437.
An Homily of Chriſt's Reſurrection, ed. eng. v. 5. *p.* 581. *P.* v. 5. *p.* 447.
A Sermon upon *Eaſter*, ed. eng. v. 5. *p.* 885. P. v. 6. *p.* 641.
A Sermon upon the Aſcenſion, ed. eng. v. 5. *p.* 595. *P.* v. 5. *p.* 457.
Four Sermons upon the Aſcenſion, *P.* v. 6. *p.* 448, &c.
Two Sermons upon Pentecoſt, ed. *Eton*, v. 5. *p.* 602. and 611. *P.* v. 5. *p.* 468. and 481.

Spurious Books.

An Homily upon the Annunciation, Ed. Eng. v. 5 *p.* 889. *P.* v. 6. *p.* 350.
Sermons upon the ſame Subject, Ed. Eng. v. 7. *p.* 515. 237. 247.
A Sermon upon *Chriſtmas*, v. 5. Edit. Eng. *p.* 843.
Three other Sermons upon the ſame Feſtival, Ed. Eng. v. 7. *p.* 307. 367. 400.
Two Sermons upon the Theophany, Ed. Eng. v. 7. *p.* 350. and *p.* 388. P. v. 6. *p.* 252. and *p.* 361.
An Homily of Circumciſion, and concerning *Simeon*, Ed. Eng. v. 5. *p.* 872. *P.* v. 6. *p.* 245.
A Sermon upon the Epiphany, which is alſo attributed to St. *Gregory Thaumaturgus*, ed. eng. v. 7. *p.* 657.
An Homily upon Mid-Lent, ed. eng. v. 5. *p.* 876.
An Homily of *Judas* his Treaſon, ed. eng. v. 5. *p.* 893.
An Homily upon Good-Friday, ed. eng. v. 5. *p.* 906. *P.* v. 6. *p.* 403.
An Homily upon the Good Thief, ed. eng. v. 5. *p.* 910.
A Sermon upon the *Paſſion*, ed. eng. v. 7. *p.* 439.
A Sermon concerning the Croſs, ed. eng. v. 7. *p.* 502. *P.* v. 6. *p.* 288.
A ſecond Sermon upon the ſame Subject, ed. eng. v. 5. *p.* 868. *P.* v. 6. *p.* 611.
A third Sermon, ed. eng. v. 7. *p.* 864. *P.* v. 6. *p.* 620.
A fourth, about the Worſhip of the Croſs, ed. eng. v. 7. *p.* 493. *P.* v. 6. *p.* 611.
A Sermon of the Exaltation of the Croſs, ed. eng. v. 7. *p.* 661. written by *Pantaleon* the Monk.
An Homily upon *Palm-Sunday*, ed. eng. v. 5. *p.* 882.
A Sermon of the Reſurrection, ed. eng. v. 5. *p.* 592. *P.* v. 6. *p.* 442.
Another Sermon upon Chriſt's Reſurrection, ed. eng. v. 7. *p.* 264. 506.
An Homily upon *Eaſter*, v. 5. ed. *Eton*, *p.* 148.
Seven Diſcourſes upon the Faſt of *Eaſter*, ed. eng. v. 5. *p.* 977.
Sermons upon Aſcenſion and *Whitſunday*, ibid.
Sermons upon Aſcenſion, ed. *Eton*, v. 7. *p.* 330. *p.* 424. *p.* 466.
An Homily on *Whitſunday*, ed. *Eton*, v. 5. *p.* 976. *P.* v. 6. *p.* 227.
An Homily between *Eaſter* and *Whitſunday*, ed. *Eton*, v. 7. *p.* 372.
An Homily upon the Feaſt of Pentecoſt, ed. *Eton*. v. 7. *p.* 382.
An Homily on Chriſt's ſecond coming, ed. *Eton*, v. 5. *p.* 782. *P.* v. 6. *p.* 651.

Sermons upon the Saints.

Genuine BOOKS.

A Panegyrick upon all the Saints, Ed. Eng. v. 5. *p.* 618. *P.* v. 5. *p.* 685.
A Panegyrick upon all the holy Martyrs, Ed. Eng. v. 5. *p.* 614. *P.* v. 1. *p.* 792.
An Homily concerning the Martyrs, Ed. *P.* v. 5. *p.* 860.
A Fragment of an Homily in praiſe of *Abraham*, Ed. Eng. v. 5. *p.* 653. P. v. 1. *p.* 799.
Three Homilies upon the *Maccabees*, and their Mother, Ed. Eng. v. 5. *p.* 640. 633. 637. *P.* v. 1. *p.* 516. 552. 556.
A Diſcourſe of St. *Peter* and *Elias*, Ed. Eng. v. 8. *p.* 18. *P.* v. 1. *p.* 758.
Seven Homilies in praiſe of St. *Paul*, Ed. *Eton*, v. 8. *p.* 33. *P.* v. 5. *p.* 492.
A Panegyrick upon St. *Ignatius*, Ed. *Eton*, v. 5. *p.* 498. P. v. 1. *p.* 508.
A Panegyrick upon St. *Meletius* Biſhop of *Antioch*, Ed. Eng. v. 5. *p.* 537. *P.* v. 1. *p.* 323.
Panegyrick upon St. *Babylas*, Ed. Eng. v. 5. *p.* 438. *P.* v. 1. *p.* 641.
A Panegyrick upon St. *Philogonius*, ed. eng. v. 5. *p.* 505. *P.* v. 1. *p.* 551.
Panegyrick upon St. *Euſtathius*, ed. eng. v. 5. *p.* 628. *P.* v. 1. *p.* 571.
A Sermon upon the S S. *Domnina*, *Berenice* & *Proſdoce*, ed. *Eton*, v. 5. *p.* 473. *P.* v. 1. *p.* 557.

An

An Homily upon St. *Pelagia*, Ed. *Eton*, v. 5. *p.*482 P. v. 1. *p.* 491.

A Sermon upon S. *Romanus*, Martyr of *Antioch*, Ed. *Eton*, v. 5. *p.* 488. *P.* v. 1. *p.* 508.

A Sermon upon S. *Barlaam*, Ed. Eng. v. 5. *p.*493. *P.* v. 1. *p.* 785.

A Sermon upon S.S. *Juventinus* and *Maximus* Martyrs, Ed. Eng. v. 5. *p.* 533. *P.* v. 1. *p.* 485.

Panegyrick upon S. *Lucian* Martyr, Ed. Eng. v. 5. *p.* 529. *P.* v. 1. *p.* 530.

Panegyrick upon *Julian* Martyr, Ed. Eng. v. 5. *p.* 621. *P.* v. 1. *p.* 535.

An Homily upon the Egyptian Martyrs, Ed. Eng. v. 5. *p.* 519. *P.* v. 1. *p.* 770.

Panegyrick upon S. *Phocas*, Ed. Eng. v. 5. *p.* 826. *P.* v. 1. *p.* 775.

Panegyrick upon S. *Theela*, Ed. Eng. v. 5. *p.*943. *P.* v. 1. *p.* 785.

An Homily upon S. *Baſſus*, Edit. *P.* v. 5. *p.* 869.

A Panegyrick upon S. *Droſis*, Edit. *P.* v. 5. *p.* 877.

Books Spurious.

A Sermon concerning *Joſeph* and Chaſtity, Ed. *Eton*, v. 5. *p.* 656. *P.* v. 6. *p.* 134.

A Diſcourſe about *Elias* the Prophet, Ed. *Eton*, v. 5. *p.* 672. *P.* v. 6. *p.* 128.

Upon S. *John*'s Conception, Ed. Eng. v. 5. *p.* 831. P. v. 6. *p.* 516.

A Sermon upon S. *John*, Ed. Eng. v. 7. *p.* 531. P. v. 6. *p.* 311.

Two Sermons upon S. *John the Baptiſt* and *Herodias*, Ed. Eng. v. 7. *p.* 545. and 549. *P.* v. 6. *p.* 281. 379.

Two other Sermons upon S. *John*, Ed. Eng. v. 7. *p.* 531. and 533.

A Sermon upon the Twelve Apoſtles, Ed. Eng. v. 5. *p.* 995. P. v. 6. *p.* 320.

An Homily upon S. *Peter* and S. *Paul*, Ed. Eng. v. 5. *p.* 995. *P.* v. 6. *p.* 315.

A Sermon of S. *Thomas*, Ed. Eng. v. 5. *p.* 837. *P.* v. 5. *p.* 324.

Another Sermon upon S. *Thomas*, Ed. Eng. v. 7. *p.* 575.

A Sermon upon S. *Stephen*, Ed. Eng. v. 5. *p.* 864. *P.* v. 6. *p.* 328.

Another Sermon upon the ſame, Ed. Eng. v. 9. *p.* 871.

Three others, Ed. Eng. v. 7. *p.* 579.

A Panegyrick upon S. *John the Evangeliſt*, Ed. P. v. 6. *p.* 605.

Two other Sermons upon S. *John the Evangeliſt*, Ed. Eng. v. 7. *p.* 342. 344.

A ſecond Sermon upon S. *Romanus*, Ed. Eng. v. 5. *p.*840. *P.* v. 1. *p.* 546.

St. Chryſoſtom's *Treatiſes.*

Genuine BOOKS.

A Book againſt the Gentiles, Ed. Eng. v. 5. *p.* 442. *P.* v. 1. *p.* 647.

A Writing againſt Jews and Gentiles, to prove that Jeſus Chriſt is God, Ed. A. v. 6. *p.* 622. *P.* v. 5. *p.* 729.

A Treatiſe againſt thoſe who find fault with a Monaſtick Life, Edit. *Eton*, v. 6. *p.* 161. *P.* v. 4. *p.* 355.

A Compariſon betwixt a Monk and a King, Ed. *Eton*, v. 7. *p.* 230. *P.* v. 4. *p.* 449.

A Treatiſe againſt ſuch as will be ſcandalized without a cauſe, Edit. Eng. v. 7. *p.* 1. *P.* v. 5. *p.* 756.

Two Diſcourſes to *Theodorus*, the ſecond ought to be placed firſt, Ed. Eng. v. 6. *p.* 55. *P.* v. 4. *p.* 545.

Six Books of the Prieſthood, Ed. Eng. v. 6. *p.* 1. *P.* v. 4. *p.* 1.

A Treatiſe of Compunction of heart to *Demetrius*, Ed. *Eton*, v. 6. *p.* 138. *P.* v. 4. *p.* 98.

Two Books of Compunction of heart to *Stelechius*, Ed. *Eton*, v. 6. *p.* 131. *P.* v. 4. *p.* 121.

Three Books of Divine Providence to *Stagirius*, Ed. Eng. v. 6. *p.* 84. *P.* v. 4. *p.* 1. 7.

A Treatiſe of Virginity, Ed. Eng. v. 6. *p.* 244. *P.* v. 4. *p.* 275.

Two Diſcourſes againſt Womens dwelling with Clergymen, Ed. Eng. v. 6. *p.* 214. and 230. *P.* v. 4. *p.* 225. and 247.

Another Diſcourſe ſhewing, That a Clergyman ought not to uſe jeſting, Ed. Eng. v. 6. *p.* 963. P. v. 6. *p.* 594.

Two Diſcourſes to a Young Widow, Ed. Eng. v. 6. *p.* 296. and 304. *P.* v. 4. *p.* 456. and 469.

A Treatiſe to ſhew that no man can be offended but by himſelf, Edit. Eng. v. 7. *p.* 36. *P.* v. 4. *p.* 498.

Two Letters to Pope *Innocent*, Ed. *P.* v. 4. *p.*593. and 599.

A Letter concerning his Perſecution, to the Prieſts and Biſhops caſt into Priſon. Edit. *P.* *p.* 600.

Two hundred forty two Letters to *Olympias* and others, Ed. Eng. v. 7. *p.* 51. to *p.* 205. *P.* v. 4. *p.* 603, &c. to *p.* 834.

A Letter to *Cæſarius* a Monk, Printed by it ſelf;

Spurious Book.

Liturgy, Edition *Eton*, v. 6. *p.* 983. *P.* v. 4. *p.* 522.

Edit. Eng. and *Eton*, ſignifies Sir *Henry Savile*'s Edition in Greek; *P.* is *Paris* Edition in Greek and Latin; L. is the *Lions* Edition, only in Latin.

ANTIOCHUS.

Genuine Books.

A Fragment produced by *Theodoret*, in his Second Dialogue.

Other Fragments produced by *Gelaſius* in the Book of the two Natures.

Books Loſt.

A Diſcourſe againſt Covetouſneſs.

A Sermon upon the Parable of the Man that was Born Blind, and ſeveral other Homilies.

SEVERIANUS.

Genuine Books.

A Sermon on the Seals, another upon the brazen Serpent, & ſeveral others which are found among St. *Chryſoſtom*'s.

Six Sermons of the Creation of the World.

Two Fragments produced by *Gelaſius* and ſome others, drawn from the *Catenæ* upon the Scripture.

Books Loſt.

A Commentary upon the Epiſtle to the *Galatians*.

A Treatiſe upon the Feaſt of the Baptiſm and Epiphany of Jeſus Chriſt.

A Diſcourſe againſt *Novatus*, and ſeveral Sermons.

ASTERIUS.

Genuine Books.

Eleven Sermons on different Subjects.

Extracts of ſeveral others related by *Photius*.

Three Homilies upon the *Pſalms*, publiſhed by *Cotelerius*; if they are really his.

Books Loſt.

Several other Sermons.

ANASTASIUS.

Genuine Book.

A Letter to *John* of *Jeruſalem*.

Books Loſt.

A Synodical Letter againſt *Origen*.

A Letter to *Ruſinus*.

A Letter to *Venerius*.

A Treatiſe of the Incarnation.

Suppoſititious Books.

Two Letters, one to the Biſhops of *Germany* and *Burgundy*, and the other to *Nectarius*.

CHROMACIUS.

Genuine Book.

A Diſcourſe upon the Beatitudes.

Books Loſt.

Commentaries upon the whole Goſpel of St. *Matthew*.

Several Sermons.

Suppoſititious Book.

Letter of *Chromacius* to St. *Jerom*, upon the Martyrology.

GAUDENTIUS.

Genuine Books.

Nineteen Sermons.

Four ſmall Treatiſes.

The Life of St. *Philaſtrius*.

JOHN of *Jeruſalem*.

Book Loſt.

An Apologetick againſt his Enemies.

Suppoſititious Book.

Treatiſe to *Capraſius* of the Inſtitution of Monks.

THEOPHILUS of *Alexandria*.

Genuine Books.

Three Paſchal Letters, among the Works of St. *Jerom*.

Three other Letters, *ibid.*

Some Greek Fragments of other Paſchal Letters, related by *Theodoret* and the Councils of *Epheſus* and *Chalcedon*.

Another Fragment of his Treatiſe againſt *Origen*, and two Fragments of a Treatiſe addreſſed to the Monks of *Scitha*.

Five Canonical Letters.

Books Loſt.

A Treatiſe againſt *Origen*.

A Treatiſe againſt the *Anthropomorphites*.

A Cycle of the Feaſt of *Eaſter*.

A Treatiſe to the Monks of *Scitha*, written againſt St. *John Chryſoſtom*.

Two firſt Paſchal Letters, and the Sixth.

THEODORUS of *Mopſueſtia*.

* *Vide* the Catalogue of his Works in his Life.

A TABLE *of the Writings of Eccleſiaſtical Authors*, &c.

PALLADIUS.

Genuine Books.

. . . . . *Hiſtoria Lauſiaca.*

Life of St. *John Chryſoſtom*, written perhaps by another *Palladius.*

INNOCENT I.

Genuine Works.

Thirty four Letters, whereof the Thirtieth is Suppoſititious.

St. *JEROM.*

Genuine Books ſtill Extant.

Forty nine Letters of Exhortation, Inſtruction or Commendation, with the Lives of St. *Paul* the Hermit, St. *Hilarion* and *Malchus* contained in the firſt Tome of his Works.

A Treatiſe againſt *Helvidius.*

Two Books againſt *Jovinian.*

An Apology for thoſe Books addreſſed to *Pammachius.*

An Apologetical Letter to *Domnion* and *Pammachius.*

A Letter and Treatiſe againſt *Vigilantius.*

A Letter to *Marcella* againſt *Montanus.*

A Letter to *Riparius* againſt *Vigilantius.*

A Letter to *Apronius* againſt the *Origeniſts.*

Two Letters to *Damaſus* upon the *Hypoſtaſes.*

A Dialogue againſt the *Luciferians.*

A Letter to *Avitus*, concerning the Errours of *Origen.*

A Tranſlation of the Letter of St. *Epiphanius* to *John* of *Jeruſalem.*

A Letter to *Pammachius* againſt the Errours of *John* of *Jeruſalem.*

A Letter to *Theophilus* againſt the ſame.

A Letter to *Rufinus.*

Three Books of Apology againſt *Rufinus.*

A Letter to *Cteſiphon*, and Three Books of Dialogues againſt the *Pelagians.*

Three Letters to *Theophilus.*

A Letter againſt *Vigilantius.*

Some other Letters on divers Subjects of Doctrine, particularly to St. *Auguſtin.*

A Treatiſe of the beſt manner of Tranſlating.

Fifty Critical Letters or thereabouts, upon the Holy Scriptures.

A Book of the Names of Countries and Cities mentioned in the Bible.

An Explication of the Proper Names of the *Hebrews.*

An Explication of the Hebrew Alphabet and Jewiſh Traditions.

Letters to *Minerius* and *Paulinus.*

A Treatiſe of Illuſtrious Men, or of Eccleſiaſtical Writers.

A Latin Verſion of the Text of the Bible from the *Septuagint.*

A New Verſion from the Hebrew Text.

Eighteen Books of Commentaries upon *Iſaiah.*

Six Books upon *Jeremiah.*

Fourteen Books upon *Ezekiel.*

One Book upon *Daniel.*

A Commentary upon *Eccleſiaſtes*, and upon the Twelve minor Prophets.

A Harmony of the Four Goſpels.

Four Books of Notes upon the Goſpel of St. *Matthew.*

Commentaries upon the Epiſtles of St *Paul* to the *Galatians*, to the *Epheſians*, to *Titus*, and to *Philemon.*

A Tranſlation of the Book of *Didymus*, concerning the Holy Ghoſt.

A Tranſlation of ſome Homilies of *Origen.*

A Tranſlation of *Euſebius*'s *Chronicon.*

Books Loſt.

Annotations upon the *Pſalms.*

A Commentary upon the Tenth *Pſalm*, and upon the Six following.

A Treatiſe upon the Book of *Job.*

A Treatiſe of Hereſies.

A Treatiſe of the Reſurrection.

A Letter to *Antius.*

Annotations upon the Prophets.

Suppoſititious Books.

Queſtions, upon the *Chronicles*, and upon the Books of *Kings.*

An Explication of the Names of Countries and Cities ſpoken of in the *Acts of the Apoſtles.*

A Commentary upon the Lamentations of *Jeremiah.*

A Book of Annotations upon St. *Mark.*

A Commentary upon the *Pſalms.*

A Commentary upon the Epiſtles of St. *Paul.*

A Letter to *Demetrias.*

Letters and Treatiſes in the laſt Tome, upon which there is a Cenſure paſt at the end of the Account of St. *Jerom*'s Works in this Volume.

RUFINUS.

Genuine Books.

Tranſlations of the Works of ſeveral Authors, of which there is a Catalogue in *Rufinus*'s Life.

Two Books of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory.

A Diſcourſe concerning the Falſification of the Books of *Origen.*

A Book of Invectives againſt St. *Jerom.*

An Apology, to Pope *Anaſtaſius.*

An Explication of the Creed.

An Explication of the Benedictions of *Jacob.*

A Commentary upon the Prophets, *Hoſea*, *Joel*, and *Amos.*

Books Loſt.

Several Letters, and ſome Tranſlations.

Suppo-

Suppoſititious Books.

A Commentary upon the Seventy five Firſt *Pſalms.*

SOPHRONIUS.

Genuine Book.

A Verſion into Greek of St. *Ferom*'s Treatiſe of Illuſtrious Men.

Books Loſt.

An Elogy on *Bethlehem.*
A Diſcourſe of the Ruin of *Serapis.*
A Tranſlation of St. *Ferom*'s Treatiſe of Virginity.
A Tranſlation of the Latin Verſion of the Pſalms and the Prophets, made by St. *Ferom.*

SULPICIUS SEVERUS.

Genuine Books.

An Abridgment of Sacred Hiſtory divided into two Books.
The Life of St. *Martin.*
Three Letters concerning the Vertues and Death of that Saint.
Three Dialogues.
Seven Letters.

Books Loſt.

Several Letters of Piety.

St. *PAULINUS.*

Genuine Books.

Fifty Letters of Doctrine and Piety.
The Paſſion of St. *Geneſius.*
Thirty two Pieces of Poetry.

Books Loſt.

An Abridgment of the Hiſtory of the Kings.
A Panegyrick upon *Theodoſius.*
A Letter to his Siſter, of the Contempt of the World; and ſome others.
A Treatiſe of Penance, and of the Praiſe of Martyrs.
Offices upon the Sacraments.

PELAGIUS.

Genuine Books.

A Commentary on the Epiſtle of St. *Paul* attributed to St. *Ferom.*
A Letter to *Demetrias*, and ſome others, in the laſt Tome of St. *Ferom.*
A Confeſſion of Faith, to Pope *Innocent.*
Fragments of a Treatiſe of the Power of Nature, and Free-Will, in St. *Auguſtin.*

Books Loſt.

A Treatiſe of the Power of Nature.
Several Books concerning Free-Will.

COELESTIUS.

Genuine Books.

Six Propoſitions.
Eight Definitions or Reaſonings.
A Profeſſion of Faith, to Pope *Zoſimus*, of which we have only ſome Fragments.

NICEAS.

Books Loſt.

Six Books of Inſtructions.
A Treatiſe addreſſed to a Virgin fallen into Sin.

OLYMPIUS.

Book Loſt.

A Treatiſe of the Beginning and Nature of Sin.

BACHIARIUS.

Genuine Work.

A Letter concerning the Penance of a Monk.

Books Loſt.

A Treatiſe of Faith.
A Diſcourſe concerning the End of *Solomon*'s Life.

SABBATIUS.

Book Loſt.

A Treatiſe of Faith.

ISAAC.

Genuine Book.

A Treatiſe concerning the Trinity and the Incarnation.

PAULUS OROSIUS.

Genuine Book.

An Univerſal Hiſtory, entituled *Hormeſta.*

A TABLE of the Writings of the *Eccleſiaſtical Author*, &c.

LUCIAN.

Genuine BOOK.

The Hiſtory of the Invention of the Relicks of St. *Stephen.*

AVITUS.

Genuine BOOK.

A Tranſlation of the Book of *Lucian*, of the Invention of the Reliques of St. *Stephen.*

EVODIUS.

Genuine BOOK.

A Treatiſe of Faith or of the Unity of the Trinity, among the Works of St. *Auguſtine.*

Suppoſititious BOOKS.

Two Books of the Miracles of St. *Stephen's* Relicks.

SEVERUS.

Genuine WORK.

A Letter of the Converſion of the *Jews* in the Iſland of *Minorca*, made by the Miracles of the Relicks of St. *Stephen.*

MARCELLUS MEMORIALIS.

Genuine BOOK.

The Acts of the Conference of *Carthage.*

EUSEBIUS.

BOOK Loſt.

A Treatiſe of the Myſtery of the Croſs.

URSINUS.

Genuine BOOK.

A Treatiſe concerning the Re-baptizing of thoſe Baptiz'd by Heretioks.

MACARIUS.

BOOK Loſt.

A Treatiſe againſt Aſtrologers.

HELIODORUS.

BOOK Loſt.

A Treatiſe of Virginity.

PAULUS.

BOOK Loſt.

A Treatiſe of Penance.

HELVIDIUS.

BOOK Loſt.

A Treatiſe againſt the Virginity of the Bleſſed Virgin *Mary*, refuſed by St. *Jerom.*

VIGILANTIUS.

WORKS Loſt.

Some Treatiſes of the Diſcipline of the Church.

St. *AUGUSTINE.*

TOME I.

Genuine WORKS.

Two Books intituled of Retractations.
Thirteen Books of Confeſſions.
Three Books againſt the Academicks.
A Treatiſe of Bleſſedneſs.
Two Books of Order.
Two Books of Soliloquies.
A Treatiſe of the Immortality of the Soul.
A Treatiſe of the Quantity of the Soul.
A Treatiſe of Muſick, divided into ſix Books.
The Book Of a Maſter.
Three Books of Free-will.
Two Books upon *Geneſis* againſt the *Manichees.*
A Book of the True Religion.
The Rule.

WORKS Loſt.

A Treatiſe of Beauty and Knowledge.
Treatiſes of Grammar, Logick, Rhetorick, Geometry, Arithmetick and Philoſophy.

Suppoſititious BOOKS.

Treatiſes of Grammar.
Of Logick.
Of Categories.
Of Rhetorick.
Monaſtick Rules.

TOME II.

Genuine WORKS.

Two Hundred and Seventy Letters, divided into four Claſſes.
The firſt contains the Letters written from the time of his Converſion to his Ordination, from the year 386. to the year 395. in Number thirty.
The ſecond contains the Letters written to the year 410. in Number 92.
The third, the Letters written between that time and his Death, to the Number of 109.
The laſt Claſs contains the Letters to which there are no dates; in Number 39.

Suppoſititious WORKS.

Thirteen Letters of St. *Auguſtin* to *Boniface*, and of *Boniface* to St. *Auguſtin.*
A Letter to *Demetrias.*
A Letter of St. *Auguſtin* to St *Cyril.*
A Diſpute with *Paſcentius.*

TOME III.

Which Contains the Treatiſes upon Scripture.

Genuine.

Four Books of Chriſtian Doctrine.
An imperfect Work upon *Geneſis.*

A TABLE of the Writings of the *Eccleſiaſtical Authors*, &c.

Twelve Books upon *Geneſis*.
Seven critical Books of the ways of ſpeaking uſed in the ſeven firſt Books of the Bible.
Seven Books of Queſtions upon the ſame Books.
Annotations upon *Job*.
The Looking-glaſs.
A Treatiſe of the Harmony of the Goſpels, divided into four Books.
A Commentary upon the Sermon of Jeſus Chriſt upon the Mount.
Two Books of Queſtions upon the Goſpel of St. *Matth.* 'Tis queſtion'd whether this Book be Genuine.
A Hundred and twenty four Treatiſes upon the Goſpel of St. *John*.
Ten Homilies upon the firſt Epiſtle of St. *John*.
An Explication of ſeveral places of the Epiſtle to the *Romans*.
An Imperfect Commentary upon the Epiſtle to the *Romans*.
A continued Commentary upon the Epiſtle to the *Galatians*.

Suppoſititious.

Treatiſe of the Miracles in the Scripture, divided into three Books.
A Diſcourſe of the Benedictions of the Patriarch *Jacob*.
Queſtions upon the Old and New Teſtament.
An Explication of the Revelation.

TOME IV.

Genuine.

An Explication of the Pſalms.

TOME V.

Genuine.

An Hundred eighty three Sermons, upon ſeveral paſſages of the Old and New Teſtament.
Eighty eight Sermons upon the great Feſtivals of the Year.
Sixty nine upon the Feſtivals of the Saints.
Twenty three upon divers Subjects.
Fragments of the Sermons of St. *Auguſtin*.

Suppoſititious.

The laſt Claſſe of Sermons which contains thoſe that are dubious.
The Addition which contains three hundred and ſeventeen ſuppoſititious Sermons.

TOME VI.

Which Contains the Dogmatical Works.

Genuine.

Anſwers to eighty three Queſtions.
Two Books of Queſtions to *Simplicianus*.
Anſwers to Eight Queſtions of *Dulcitius*.
A Treatiſe of the Belief of things that we know nothing of.
An Explication of the Creed.
A Treatiſe of Faith and good Works.
The Manual to *Laurentius*.
The Combat of a Chriſtian.
The Book of Inſtruction.
A Treatiſe of Continence.
A Treatiſe of the advantages of Marriage.
A Treatiſe of the Holy Virginity.
A Treatiſe of the advantages of Widowhood.
Two Books concerning thoſe Marriages, which cannot be excuſed of Adultery.
A Book concerning Lying.
A Treatiſe againſt Lying.
A Treatiſe of the Labour of Monks.
A Treatiſe againſt the Predictions of the Devil.
A Treatiſe of the care we ought to have for the dead.
A Treatiſe of Patience.
A Sermon upon the Creed.

Suppoſititious.

Three Sermons on the Creed.
A Sermon of the fourth Day of Paſſion Week.
A Diſcourſe concerning the Deluge.
A Sermon upon the Perſecution of the *Barbarians*.
A Sermon upon the new Canticle
A Sermon of the Diſcipline and Uſefulneſs of faſting.
A Sermon upon the taking of *Rome*.
A Collection of Twenty one Queſtions.
Sixty five Queſtions.
A Book of Faith to *Peter*.
A Book of the Spirit, and of the Soul.
A Treatiſe of Friendſhip.
A Book of the Subſtance of Love.
A Book of the Love of God.
Soliloquies.
A Book of Meditations.
A Treatiſe of Contrition of Heart.
The Manual.
The Looking-glaſs.
The Looking glaſs of a Sinner.
The Ladder of Paradiſe.
A Treatiſe of the knowledge of Life.
A Book of the Chriſtian Life.
A Book of wholſom Inſtructions.
A Book of the twelve Abuſes of the Age.
The Combat of Virtues and Vices.
A Book of Sobriety and Charity.
A Book of true and falſe Repentance.
A Treatiſe of Antichriſt.
A Treatiſe upon the *Magnificat*.
A Treatiſe of the Aſſumption of the Bleſſed Virgin.
A Diſcourſe concerning the Viſitation of the Sick.
Some Sermons.
Sermon to the Brothers Hermits.

TOME VII.

Genuine.

Twenty two Books of the City of God.

TOME VIII.

Contains his Writings againſt Heretick.

Genuine.

A Treatiſe of Herefies to *Quodvultdeus*.
A Treatiſe againſt the *Jews*.
A Treatiſe of the Uſefulneſs of Faith.
A Treatiſe of two Souls.
A Conference with *Fortunatus*.
A Treatiſe againſt *Adimantus*.
A Treatiſe againſt the Epiſtle of the foundation of the *Manichees*.
Thirty three Books againſt *Fauſtus* a *Manichee*.
A Conference with *Felix*.
A Treatiſe of the Nature of Good.

A Book

A Book againſt *Secundinus*.
Two Books againſt the Adverſary of the Law and the Prophets.
A Treatiſe againſt the Prisſilianiſts and the Origeniſts.
An Anſwer to a Diſcourſe of an *Arian*.
A Conference againſt *Maximinus*.
Fifteen Books of the Trinity.

Suppoſititious.

A Diſcourſe of five Hereſies.
A Trial between the Church and the Synagogue.
The Book of Faith.
A Memorial of the manner of Receiving the *Manichees*.
A Book of the Unity of the Trinity.
A Treatiſe of the Eſſence of the Divinity.
A Dialogue of the Unity of the Holy Trinity.
A Book of Eccleſiaſtical Doctrines.

TOME IX.

Contains the Treatiſes againſt the Donatiſts.

Genuine.

A Hymn againſt the Donatiſts.
Three Books againſt the Epiſtle of *Parmenian*.
Seven Books of Baptiſm.
Three Books againſt *Petilianus*.
A Letter to the Catholicks againſt *Petilianus*.
Four Books againſt *Creſconius*.
A Book of one Baptiſm againſt *Petilianus*.
An Abridgment of the Conference of *Carthage*.
A Diſcourſe addreſs'd to the Donatiſts after the Conference of *Carthage*.
A Conference with *Emeritus*.
Two Books againſt *Gaudentius*.

WORKS Loſt.

A Book againſt the Epiſtle of *Donatus*.
Two Books againſt the Donatiſts.
A Book againſt *Centurius*.
A Book of the Proofs and Teſtimonies againſt the Donatiſts.
A Treatiſe againſt a Donatiſt.
Advertiſements to the Donatiſts.
A Diſcourſe addreſſed to *Emeritus*.

Suppoſititious.

A Sermon concerning *Ruſticianus*.
A Book againſt *Fulgentius*.

TOME X.

Contains the Treatiſes againſt the Pelagians.

Genuine.

Three Books of Merits, and of the Remiſſion of Sins.
A Book of the Spirit, and of the Letter.
A Treatiſe of Nature and Grace.
A Book of the Acts of *Pelagius*.
A Treatiſe of the Grace of Jeſus Chriſt.
A Treatiſe of Original Sin.
A Treatiſe of the Perfection of Juſtice.
Two Books of Marriage and of Concupiſcence.
Six Books againſt *Julian*.
Four Books to *Boniface*.
A Book of Grace and Free-will.
A Treatiſe of Correction and Grace.
A Treatiſe of the Predeſtination of the Saints.
A Treatiſe of the Gift of Perſeverance.
Six Books of the ſecond Work againſt *Julian*.
Four Treatiſes of the Origin of the Soul.

Suppoſititious.

A Treatiſe, entituled *Hypognoſticon*.
A Treatiſe of Predeſtination and Grace.
A Treatiſe of Predeſtination.

ZOSIMUS.

Genuine WORKS.

The Firſt Letter to the *Africans*.
The Second Letter to the *Africans*.
The Third Letter to the *Africans*.
A Fragment of a Letter to all the Biſhops againſt *Cæleſtius* and *Pelagius*.
A Letter to the Biſhops of *Gaul* of the Privileges of the Church of *Arles*.
A Letter to the Biſhops of *Gallia Viennenſis*, and *Gallia Narbonenſis*.
A Letter to *Hilary* of *Narbon*.
Two Letters to *Patroclus*.
A Letter to the People of *Marſeilles*.
A Circular Letter againſt *Urſus* and *Tuentius*.
A Letter to *Heſychius*, Biſhop of *Salona*.
A Letter to the Clergy of *Ravenna*.
A Letter to the Biſhops of *Byzacena* very doubtful.

BONIFACE I.

Genuine WORKS.

A Letter to the Emperour.
A Letter to *Patroclus*, and to the Biſhops of the Seven Provinces of the *Gauls*.
Letters to *Hilary* of *Narbon*.

SYNESIUS.

Genuine BOOKS.

A Diſcourſe of the manner of Reigning well.
A Diſcourſe to *Pæonius*.
A Book, entituled *Dion Pruſæus*.
A Panegyrick upon Baldneſs.
Two Books of Providence.
A Diſcourſe of Dreams.
One hundred and fifty Letters.

WORKS loſt.

Cynegeticks.

A Table of the Acts, Profeſſions of Faith, and Canons of the Councils, mentioned in this Volume.

Councils.	*Years held in.*	*Acts, Profeſſions of Faith, and Canons.*
Of *Rome.* under *Innocent.*		A Preface and ſixteen Canons.
Of *Milevis.*	402	Five Canons.
Of *Conſtantinople* and of *Epheſus.*	400 & 401	Acts of this Council in *Palladius.*
In the Suburbs of *Chalcedon.*	403	Acts of this Council, an Abridgement of them in *Photius.*
Of *Carthage.*	403	Acts, related in the Acts of the 3d. Conference of *Carthage.*
Of *Carthage.*	404	Acts of this Council in the Code of the Canons of *Africa.*
Of *Carthage.*	405	An Abridgment of the Acts in the ſame Code.
Of *Carthage.*	407	Twelve Canons in the ſame Code.
Of *Carthage.*	408	Deputations mention'd in the *African* Code.
Another of the ſame Year.		
Of *Carthage.*	409	A Declaration in the *African* Code.
Of *Carthage.*	410	Deputation, *ibid.*
Of *Ptolemais.*	411	See the 67th. Letter of *Syneſius.*
Of *Carthage.*	411	Acts.
Of *Zerta.*	412	The 141ſt. Letter among thoſe of St. *Auguſtin.*
Firſt of *Carthage* againſt *Cœleſtius.*	411	Fragment of the Acts of this Council in St. *Auguſtin,* Book 2. Of Nature and of Grace.
Conference of *Jeruſalem.*	415	Acts.
Of *Dioſpolis.*	418	Acts, in St. *Auguſtin,* in the Book of the Acts of *Pelagius.*
Second of *Carthage* againſt *Cœleſtius* and *Pelagius.*	416	
Of *Milevis.*	416	Letters, 175th 176th. and 177th amongſt thoſe of St. *Auguſtin.*
Of *Carthage.*	417	Letter to *Zoſimus,* and a Collection of ſome pieces.
Of *Carthage.*	418	Eight Canons againſt the Errours of *Pelagius,* and Ten Canons concerning Diſcipline.
Of *Tella* or *Zella.*	418	Some Canons.
Of *Carthage* concerning *Apiarius,* in the Year.	418	Acts. Letter to *Zoſimus.*
Another in	419	
Of *Ravenna.*	419	Acts, Thirty three Canons, ſix other Canons, Letters to *Boniface,* and to *Cœleſtine.*
Of *Carthage* in the Year.	420	
Of *Conſtantinople.*	426	A Synodical Letter.
Of *Carthage* againſt *Leporius.*	427	Profeſſion of Faith, and Letter to the Biſhops of *Gaul.*
Of *Conſtantinople.*	428	

A Table of all the Writings of the *Eccleſiaſtical Authors* mentioned in this Volume, according to the Order of their Arguments.

Treatiſes for the Chriſtian Religion againſt the Pagans *and* Jews.

ST. *Chryſoſtom's* Treatiſe againſt the *Gentiles.*
Prudentius's two Books againſt *Symmachus.*
St. *Chryſoſtom's* ſix Sermons againſt the *Jews.*
A Diſcourſe againſt the *Jews* and *Gentiles.*
St. *Auguſtin's* Book of the true Religion, and of the manners of the Church.
——His twenty two Books of the City of God.
——His Treatiſe againſt the *Jews.*
——His Letters 16th. 17th, 91ſt, 232d, 233d, 234th. 235th.

Treatiſes againſt Hereticks.

St. *Auguſtin's* Treatiſe of Hereſies.

MANICHEES.

St. *Auguſtin's* two Books upon *Geneſis* againſt the *Manichees.*
——His Book of the Manners of the Church, and of the Manners of the *Manichees.*
——Of the Uſefulneſs of Faith.
——Of Two Souls.
——Conference with *Fortunatus* and *Felix.*
——Againſt *Adimantus.*
——Againſt the Epiſtle of the Foundation of the *Manichees.*
——Againſt *Fauſtus,* Thirty three Books.
——Of the Nature of Good.
——Againſt *Secundinus.*
——Againſt the Adverſary of the Law and the Prophets. Two Books.
—— Letters 79th. and 236th.

ORIGENISTS.

Anaſtaſius's Letter to *John* of *Jeruſalem,* and a fragment of a *Synodical* Letter of his againſt *Origen.*
John of *Jeruſalem* his Apology.
Theophilus's Paſchal Letters.
St. *Jerom's* Apologetick to *Domnion* and *Pammachius.*
——Letters to *Apronius* and *Avitus* againſt the Errours of *Origen.*
——His

A TABLE of the Writings of the *Eccleſiaſtical Authors*, &c.

——His three Books of Apology againſt *Ruſinus*.
The Invectives of *Ruſinus* againſt St. *Jerom*.
——His Apology to Pope *Anaſtaſius*.
St. *Auguſtin*'s Treatiſe againſt the *Origeniſts* and *Priſcillianiſts*.
——His 237th Letter againſt the *Priſcillianiſts*.
——His 265th. Letter againſt the *Novatians*.

ARIANS.

St. *Jerom*'s Treatiſe againſt *Helvidius*.
—— His two Books againſt *Jovinian*, with his Apology to *Pammachius*.
——His Treatiſe againſt *Vigilantius*, and two Books againſt the ſame.
——Dialogue againſt the *Luciferians*.
St. *Auguſtin*'s Anſwer to the Diſcourſe of an *Arian*.
——His Conference againſt *Maximinus*.
——His Letters 238th. 239th, 240th, 241ſt, and 242d.

PELAGIANS.

St. *Jerom*'s Letter to *Cteſiphon*, and three Books of Dialogues againſt the *Pelagians*.
St. *Auguſtin*'s Treatiſe againſt the *Pelagians*, contained in the tenth *Tome* of his Works, whereof ſee the Catalogue in the preceding Table.
——His Letter 140th. and others noted in the Table of Letters, diſpoſed according to their Arguments by the Benedictines.
Canons of the Council of *Carthage* of the Year 418.
Acts of the Council of *Dioſpolis*, of the Conference of *Jeruſalem*, and of the Councils of *Carthage* and *Mileviſ* againſt *Pelagius* and *Cæleſtius*.

DONATISTS.

St. *Auguſtin*'s Treatiſes againſt the *Donatiſts*, contained in the ninth Tome of his Works. See the Catalogue as above.
——His other Treatiſes and Letters againſt the ſame Hereticks; whereof there is a Table at the end of the ninth *Tome*.
——His Letter 23d. and others marked by the *Benedictines* in the Table of Letters.

Treatiſes upon the Articles of Religion.

St. *Chryſoſtom*'s ſix Diſcourſes, of the incomprehenſible Nature of God.
——His Treatiſe of the Divine Providence to *Stagyrius*.
——Treatiſe of Virginity.
Ruſinus's Explication of the Creed.
The Confeſſions of Faith of *Pelagius* and *Cæleſtius*.
St. *Auguſtin*'s Treatiſes of the true Religion, and the Manners of the Church.
——his explication of the Creed.
——Manual to *Laurentius*.
——Diſcourſe of the Inſtruction of the Ignorant.
——Diſcourſe of the Belief of things we cannot comprehend.
——Treatiſe of Faith and Good Works.
——Treatiſe of the Uſefulneſs of Faith.
——Letters upon divers Articles of Religion, marked in the Catalogue of the *Benedictines*.
——his Books of Retractations.

Upon the Trinity.

St. *Jerom*'s two Letters to *Damaſus* upon the *Hypoſtaſes*.
St. *Chryſoſtom*'s Sermon concerning the Conſubſtantiality.
A Treatiſe of *Iſaac* a converted *Jew*, upon the Trinity and the Incarnation.
St. *Auguſtin*'s fifteen Books upon the Trinity.

Upon the Incarnation.

Fragments of Homilies of *Flavianus* and *Antiochus*, produced by *Theodoret*.
Fragments of *Theodorus Mopſueſtenus*.
St. *Chryſoſtome*'s Letter to *Cæſarius* againſt the Errors of *Apollinaris*, where alſo the Euchariſt is ſpoken of.

Upon different Subjects.

St. *Chryſoſtom*'s Homily concerning the Reſurrection of the Dead.
—— his Sermon concerning *Dæmons*.
St. *Paulinus*'s Twelfth and Forty ſecond Letters concerning the Fall of Man and the Merits of Jeſus Chriſt.
St. *Auguſtin*'s Books againſt the Academicks.
——his Treatiſe of Bleſſedneſs.
——Treatiſe of Immortality, and of the quantity of the Soul.
——Diſcourſe of Muſick.
——Book of a Maſter.
——Three Books of Free-will.
——Anſwers to ſeveral Queſtions.
——Anſwers to the Queſtions of *Simplicianus*, and *Dulcitius*.
——Two Diſcourſes againſt Lying.
——Another Diſcourſe concerning the Prediction of *Dæmons*.
——Four Books concerning the Origination of the Soul.

Treatiſes concerning the Diſcipline of the Church.

The Canonical and Paſchal Letters of *Theophilus*.
The Letters of Pope *Innocent* I.
Some of St. *Chryſoſtom*'s Sermons upon the chief Feaſts of the Year.
St. *Chryſoſtom*'s Defence of a Monaſtick Life.
——Compariſon between a Monk and a King.
——Books of the Prieſthood.
——Two Diſcourſes to *Theodorus*.
——Three Treatiſes of Compunction of heart.
——Treatiſe of Virginity.
——Two Diſcourſes againſt Women's cohabiting with Clerks.
——Diſcourſe to a Nun againſt Raillery.
——Two Diſcourſes to a Young Widow.
——Homily of Anathema and ſome others of his.
St. *Jerom*'s Letters contained in the firſt Tome of his Works.
——Treatiſes againſt *Jovinian* and *Vigilantius*.
Several Letters of St. *Paulinus*, and particularly the 1ſt. 2d. 45th. 46th. 22d. 23d. 26th. 29th. 30th. 32d. 38th.
Letter of *Bachiarius* concerning Penance.
Urſinus's Treatiſe againſt the Reiteration of Baptiſm conferr'd by Hereticks.
St. *Auguſtin*'s Treatiſes concerning Continence and the benefits of Marriage, of Holy Virginity, of the advantages of Widowhood, of adulterous Marriages, of the labour of Monks, and of the care they ought to have for the Dead.
——his Anſwers to the Queſtions of *Dulcitius*.
——Letters marked in the Table of the *Benedictins*.
The Letter of Pope *Zoſimus* and Pope *Boniface* I.
Syneſius's Letters, and particularly the 5th. 9th. 11th. 12th. 13th. 57th. 58th. 79th. 89th. 66th. 67th. 76th. 95th. and 105th.

Canons of the Councils related at the end of this Volume.

Books

A TABLE of the Writings of the *Eccleſiaſtical Authors*, &c.

Books of Morality and Piety.

Treatiſes and Fragments of Books of *Evagrius Ponticus*.
Spiritual Diſcourſes of *Mark* the Hermit.
Prudentius's Pſychomachia, Cathemerinon, and *Hamartigenia*.
Diadochus's Hundred Chapters of a Spiritual Life.
Severianus's Sermon among the Works of St. *Chryſoſtom*.
Aſterius of *Amaſea*'s Sermons with the Extracts of *Photius*.
Gaudentius's Works.
The forty nine Letters contained in the firſt Tome of St. *Jerom*'s Works.
St. *Chryſoſtom*'s Sermons, whereof ſee the Catalogue in the Table.
——— his Diſcourſes of Piety and Morality, ſee the Catalogue *ibid.*
——— the greateſt part of his Letters.
Sulpicius Severus's Seven Letters.
——— the greateſt part of the Letters of St. *Paulinus*, and particularly the 1ſt. 13th. 22d. 23d. 30th. 32d.
St. *Paulinus*'s Diſcourſe to *Alethius*, entituled the Eccleſiaſtical Treaſure.
Letter to *Marcella* and to *Celancia* attributed to St. *Paulinus*.
——— His Thirty two Poems.
Pelagius's Letter to *Demetrias*, and ſome others in St. *Jerom*.
St. *Auguſtin*'s Confeſſions.
——— Book of the manners of the Church.
——— Soliloquies.
——— Book of the true Religion.
——— moſt part of his Sermons, chiefly thoſe of the ſecond, third, and fourth Claſſes.
——— Treatiſe of Faith and Good Works.
——— Manual to *Laurentius*.
——— Chriſtian Combat.
——— Treatiſe of Patience.
——— Moral Letters, mentioned in the Table of the *Benedictines*.
The Diſcourſes of *Syneſius*; and, particularly, that of the manner of well Reigning, and thoſe concerning Providence.
———His Letters, and particularly the 95th.

Commentaries and Diſcourſes upon the Holy Scripture.

BOOKS of Criticiſm.

St. *Jerom*'s Treatiſe of the beſt manner of Tranſlating.
——— his Book of the Names of Countries and Cities ſpoken of in Scripture.
——— Explication of the proper Names of the *Hebrews*.
——— Explication of the Hebrew Alphabet.
——— Book of the Tradition of the *Jews*.
——— Fifty Letters upon divers critical Queſtions upon the Bible.
——— Letters to *Minerius* and *Paulinus*.
——— Verſions of the Text of the Bible from the Septuagint and from the Hebrew.
——— Harmony of the four Goſpels.
St. *Chryſoſtom*'s Homily upon the beginning of the Acts, of the Uſefulneſs of reading the Holy Scripture, and ſome others.
St. *Auguſtin*'s four Books of the Chriſtian Doctrine.
——— his ſeven Books, of particular ways of ſpeaking, uſed in the ſeven firſt Books of the Bible, and Queſtions upon the ſame Books.
——— The Mirrour of Scripture.
——— Harmony of the Goſpels.
——— Letters 143d. 137th. and 132d.
Books upon all the Scriptures.
See the Catalogue of St. *Chryſoſtom*'s Works.

Upon the Old Teſtament.

Six Sermons of *Severianus* upon the Creation of the World.
An Imperfect Work of St. *Auguſtin*'s upon *Geneſis*.
St. *Auguſtin*'s twelve Books upon *Geneſis*.
——— Explication of all the Pſalms.
Aſterius's three Homilies upon the Pſalms.
Explication of the Benedictions of *Jacob*.
St. *Jerom*'s Commentaries upon *Iſaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel*, and upon the twelve minor Prophets.
Rufinus's Commentaries upon the Prophets *Hoſea, Joel*, and *Amos*.
St. *Auguſtin*'s Notes upon *Job*.

Upon the New Teſtament.

St. *Jerom*'s Notes upon the Goſpel of St. *Matthew*.
St. *Auguſtin*'s Commentary upon Chriſt's Sermon in the Mount.
——Queſtions upon St. *Matthew*'s and St. *Luke*'s Goſpels.
——— Seventeen other Queſtions upon St. *Matthew*'s Goſpel.
——— A Hundred twenty four Treatiſes or Homilies upon St. *John*'s Goſpel.
Chromacius's Diſcourſe upon the Beatitudes.
St. *Jerom*'s Commentaries upon St *Paul*'s Epiſtles to the *Galatians, Epheſians, Titus* and *Philemon*.
Pelagius's Commentary upon all St. *Paul*'s Epiſtles, attributed to St. *Jerom*.
St. *Auguſtin*'s Explications of ſeveral paſſages in the Epiſtle to the *Romans*.
——— Imperfect Commentary upon the Epiſtle to the *Romans*.
——— Commentary upon the Epiſtle to the *Galatians*.
——— Ten Homilies upon the firſt Epiſtle of St. *John*.
——— Hundred eighty three Sermons upon ſeveral paſſages in the Old and New Teſtament.
——— Several Letters, noted in the Catalogue of the *Benedictines*.

Hiſtorical Treatiſes.

Vigilius of *Trent* his Letter concerning Martyrs.
Prudentius's Abridgment of the Hiſtory of the Old and New Teſtament.
——— Hymns of Crowns.
Palladius's *Hiſtoria Lauſiaca*.
——— Life of St. *John Chryſoſtom*.
St. *Jerom*'s Lives of St. *Paul* the Hermit, St. *Hilarion* and *Malchus*.
——Treatiſes of Illuſtrious Men, with *Sophronius*'s Verſion.
——Tranſlation of, and Supplement to *Euſebius*'s Chronicle.
St. *Chryſoſtom*'s Panegyricks of the Saints, whereof ſee the Catalogue in the Table.
——— Letters to Pope *Innocent* and ſome others.
Rufinus's two Books of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory.
A Diſc. concerning the falſification of the Books of *Origen*.
Sulpicius Severus's Abridgment of ſacred Hiſtory.
——— Life of St. *Martin*.
——— Dialogue concerning the Vertues of that Saint.
——Another Dialogue of the Lives of the Eaſtern Monks.
Paulinus's Paſſion of St. *Geneſius*.
——— Letter 49th and Poems upon St. *Felix*.
Paulus Oroſius's Univerſal Hiſtory.
Hiſt. of the Invention of St. *Stephen*'s Relicks made by *Lucian*, and Tranſlated by *Avitus*.
Severus's Letter concerning the Miracles wrought by St. *Stephen*'s Relicks in the Iſle of *Minorca*.
Acts of the Conference of *Carthage* digeſted by *Marcellus Memorialis*.
Some Serm. of St. *Auguſtin*, upon the Feaſts of the Saints.
St. *Auguſtin*'s Treatiſe of Hereſies.
——— Hiſtorical Letters, mark'd in the Catalogue of the *Benedictines*.
Acts of the Councils, mentioned at the end of this Volume.

A General

A General INDEX.

Of the Principal Matters contained in the Third Volume.

A

Abnegation. To renounce the Riches of this World, unless we renounce our selves signifies little. . . . .

Absolution. Not to be granted to Penitents in danger of Death, but upon condition that if they recover their Health, they shall continue in a State of Penance 214

Acacius of *Berœa*, Enemy to S. *Chrysostom*, 9 Received a Letter of Communion from Pope *Innocent*, with a Charge not to continue his Hatred to that Saint, 11. This Letter is the Nineteenth among those of that Pope 70

Afflictions. Their Usefulness, 17. They are the Portion of the Saints, 30, 47. God often permits the most Just and Holy Men to be Afflicted with Poverty and Diseases 59

Alexander, who succeeded *Porphyry* in the Bishoprick of *Antioch*, was the First among the *Eastern* Bishops, that put S. *Chrysostom's* Name into the *Diptychs*, 11. The Fifteenth Letter of *Innocent* I. is addressed to him 69

Alms, 18. Their Effects, 40. As the water of Baptism extinguisheth the Fire of Hell, so the abundance of Alms extinguishes the Fire of Lust which remains after Baptism, or at least hinders it from enflaming 60

Ammonius an *Egyptian* Monk 8

Anastasius Pope, succeeded *Siricius*, 58. Condemned the Books and Person of *Origen*, *ibid.*

Anathema, Not to be pronounced upon light occasions against any, nor any rashly to be Condemned 21

Andragathius, Master in Philosophy to S. *John Chrysostom* 7

Angels. Their Creation, 189. They have Care over Men, Assist at the Divine Mysteries, and every one of the Faithful hath his Guardian Angel, 35. Why *Moses* did not speak of their Creation 53

Antiochus Bishop of *Ptolemais*, in *Phœnicia*, 52

Antoninus Bishop of *Ephesus*, Exarch of all *Asia*, accused in a Council held at *Constantinople* 8

Apparition of the Dead 155

Arms. The Profession of Arms is not forbid, 159

Arsacius, Brother to *Nectarius*, ordained Bishop of *Constantinople*, in place of S. *John Chrysostom*, in Exile 10

Asterius Bishop of *Amasea* a City in *Pontus* 53

Attention necessary in Prayer 44

Atticus Successor to *Arsacius* in the See of *Constantinople*, during the Exile of S. *John Chrysostom* 11

Audentius a Bishop in *Spain* 5

St. *Augustin*, Born at *Tagasta* a City of *Numidia*, 125. Learns Grammar there, and Studies Humanity at *Madaura*, and Rhetorick at *Carthage*, *ibid.* Returns to *Tagasta*, where he taught Grammar and frequented the Barr, *ibid.* He taught Rhetorick at *Carthage*, is engaged in the Errors of the *Manichees*, from thence he went to *Rome*, and after to *Milan*, making the same Profession, *ibid.* He there renounced the Errors of the *Manichees*, and having received Baptism, returned to *Hippo*, where against his Will he was ordained Priest by *Valerius*, *ibid.* The same Bishop made him his Co-adjutor, and he was ordained Bishop by the Primate of *Numidia*, 126. Dies in his own City, while it was besieged by the *Vandals*, *ibid.* A Critical Disquisition upon his Works, *ibid.* His Genius 206, 207.

Avitus a Priest of *Spain*, Friend to *Paulus Orosius*. 122

B

Bachiarius, a Christian Philosopher. 121

Balls. No Enemies so dangerous, as Nocturnal Divertisements, Balls, Musick-Meetings, and pernicious Dancings 46

Baptism. We receive by Baptism, not only Pardon and Remission of our sins, but also the Grace of the Holy Ghost, and several other spiritual Gifts, 36. It matters not who Baptizes, provided it be in the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost 198

Basil, Friend of S. *Chrysostom* 7

Basilina, Mother of the Emperor *Julian* 8

Benefices. The Goods of the Church are the Patrimony of the Poor 7

Bishop. Qualities which are necessary to him, 28, 29. He ought to be Learned, 29. His

only Care ought to be to please God, *ibid.* The Glory of a Bishop, is to relieve the necessities of the Poor, 77. He ought to be an Example to his whole Church, *ibid.* They ought to be judged by those of their Province, 9. The Infamy of Bishops is not the Infamy of the Church, 214. They ought to be an Example to the people 215
Boniface I. Successor to Pope *Zosimus* 210
Bonosus, an ancient Companion of S. *Jerom* 74
Bread, a Mark of Union.

C

Canons, It is not permitted to a Bishop to be ignorant of them 69
Carterius, Superior of the Monks in the Suburbs of *Antioch* 7
Cœlestius, Companion and Disciple of *Pelagius*, 120. condemned in the Synod of *Carthage*, 207
Cœlibacy of the Clergy 85
Charity ought to be the sole end of all our Actions, 142. The Duties of Christian Charity cannot diminish; and the more we perform, the more we have to do 159
Children. A Father that brings up his Son ill is more cruel than if he had put him to Death 47
Chromacius, Bishop of *Aquileia* 58
S. *John Chrysostom*, Native of *Antioch*, 6. Baptized by *Meletius*, 7. Hides himself and flies to avoid being Ordain'd Bishop, *ibid.* Ordained Deacon by *Meletius*, and Priest by *Flavianus*, *ibid.* Elected Bishop of *Constantinople*, and ordain'd by *Theophilus* Bishop of *Alexandria* his Enemy, *ibid.* His strict Discipline caused him to be hated, *ibid.* His pastoral Vigilance, *ibid.* Reunites the *Eastern* and *Western* Churches, 8. Assembles a Synod at *Ephesus*, *ibid.* The Empress *Eudoxia* enraged against him, urges *Theophilus* to come to *Constantinople*, 9. He holds a Synod in the Suburbs of *Chalcedon* against S. *Chrysostom*, who refuses to be judged by that Council, his Enemies being the principal Judges, *ibid.* He was there deposed, *ibid.* The Emperor orders him to be banish'd, and he was accordingly conducted to a little City in *Bithynia*, 10. His return to *Constantinople*, *ibid.* Another Discontent of *Eudoxia*, *ibid.* A new Council confirms the first Sentence of Deposition against this Saint, *ibid.* *Violences*, and Edicts against S. *Chrysostom*, *ibid.* He Surrenders himself into the hands of those that had Orders to Arrest him, and is conducted to *Nice*, and from thence to *Cucusus*, the place of his Exile, *ibid.* Calamities at *Constantinople*, after the removal of S. *Chrysostom*, *ibid.* He writes to Pope *Innocent*, and to the Bishops of the *West* to implore their help, 11. The Pope sends him Letters of Communion, *ibid.* And also obtains Letters from *Honorius* to his Brother *Arcadius* in his Favour, *ibid.* Violence offer'd to the Persons that brought those Letters, *ibid.* S. *Chrysostom* remov'd from *Cucusus* to *Pityus*, a City upon the *Euxin* Sea, and dies in this Journey, *ibid.* Peace restored after his Death, 12. Critical Remarks upon his Works *ibid.*
The Church consists not in the Walls of it, but in the Holy Union with the Members of Jesus Christ, 13. It's perpetuity is an invincible proof of the truth of Religion, 34. The Church mixes the good with the bad, till the day of Judgment 198
Clinicks, Those who receive Baptism in their Bed, at the point of Death 36
Comedies. It is a kind of Adultery to go to Comedies 46
Communion. The forgetting of Injuries and Reconciliation, is a condition Essentially necessary to the worthy receiving the Sacrament, 21. The Revengeful is as unworthy of the Holy Communion, as the Blasphemer and Adulterer, 41. Disposition for worthy receiving 43
Council of *Carthage*, of the Year 403 *P.* 218
Council of *Carthage*, of the Year 404 *ibid*
Council of *Carthage*, of the Year 405 *ibid*
Council of *Carthage*, of the Year 407 *ibid*
Two Councils of *Carthage*, of the Year 408 *p.* 219
Council of *Carthage*, of the Year 409 *ibid*
Council of *Carthage*, in the Year 410 *ibid*
The First Council of *Carthage*, against *Cœlestius* in the Year 412, *p.* 221
Council of *Carthage*, in the Year 417 *p.* 222
Councils of *Carthage*, in the Year 418 *ibid*
Council of *Carthange*, in the Years 418, and 419, concerning the Cause of *Apiarius* 224
Council of *Carthage*, in the Year 420
Council of *Carthage*, in the Year 427 against *Leporius*
Council in the Suburbs of *Chalcedon* at the Oak in 403 *p.* 217
Council of *Cirta*, or *Zerta*, in the Year 412, *p.* 221
Councils held by S. *Chrysostom* at *Constantinople*, and at *Ephesus*, in 400, and 401 *p.* 217
Council of *Constantinople*, in the Year 426
Council of *Constantinople*, in the Year 428
Council of *Diospolis* in the Year 418 *p.* 221
Council of *Milevis* held in the Year 402 *p.* 217
Council of *Milevis* against *Cœlestius* and *Pelagius*, in the Year 416 *p.* 222
Council of *Ptolemais*, in *Pentapolis*, in the Year 411 *p.* 220
Council of *Ravenna*, in the Year 419
Council of *Tella*, or *Zella*, &c. of the Year 418 *p.* 224
Concupiscence, and an Inclination to evil, are the Consequents of the Sin of the first Man 35
Conference of *Carthage*, in the Year 411 *p.* 220
Conference of *Jerusalem*, in the Year 415 *p.* 221
Continence. True Continence consists in the suppressing all the Passions 180
Conversion. It is never too late to be converted 78
Correction, Ecclesiastical Princes have submitted to it, as well as others of the Faithful 38
Covetousness a kind of Idolatry, 45. Consists in the desire of having more than we ought to have. Other Vices diminish in time, but Covetousness encreases as we grow in years 55
Custom is a bad Reason where it is sinful 17
Customs of Churches ought to be observed, 82, 139 141
Cross. The Efficacy of the Sign of the Cross 5

Curiosity will not make us discover Mysteries, but it will make us lose the Faith, that must carry us to Salvation, and eternal Life 60

D

Dead. Oblations for the Dead received in the Church, 138. When the Eucharist is administred, or Alms made for all the Dead that have been baptized, they are Thanksgivings for those that have been extremely Good; they are Intercessions for those that have not been great Sinners; and as for those that have been very bad; if these things bring no Comfort to them, they serve at least for Consolation to the living, 178, 179. The Dead not to be lamented, but to rejoyce that they have left this unhappy Life, to enjoy an eternal Blessed one, 48. Their Relations ought to give Alms for them 38

Death. A Christian instead of fearing ought to desire it 48

Decentius Bishop of *Eugubium*, a City of *Umbria* in *Italy* 67

Devotion. Women ought not to give any cause of Discontent to their Husbands, by an indiscreet Devotion 167

Diadochus Bishop of *Photice*, a City of the ancient *Epirus* 5

Diadorus, Superior of the Monks in the Suburbs of *Antioch* 7

Dioscorus, a Monk of *Egypt* 8

Divinity, impossible to define it 2

Donatus, S. *Jerom*'s Master 73

Drunkenness is of all Vices the most dangerous, and the most to be hated 45

E

Ecclesiasticks, their Dignity, 75, 76, their Duties, *ibid.* Their Habits 77

Education of Children, 79. Mothers are not less charg'd with the Education of Children than Fathers, 12, 18. Education of Daughters, 78, 80

S. *Epiphanius*, Bishop of *Cyprus*, a great Enemy to *Origen* 9

Evagrius, Three of that Name, *Evagrius Ponticus*, *Evagrius* of *Antioch*, *Evagrius Scholasticus* 1

Eucharist. Sacrament, 105. Eucharist explained, 59, 60. Disposition fit to partake of it, *ibid.* To receive it Fasting, 142. Dispositions requisite to worthy Communicating 37

Eudoxia, Empress of *Constantinople*, enraged against S. *Chrysostom* 9, 10

Evodius, Bishop of *Uzala* in *Africa* 122

Eusebius, Bishop of *Valentinople* in *Asia* 8

Eusebius, Father of S. *Jerom.* 73

Eusebius, an Ecclesiastical Author of the Fifth Century. 123

Euthymius, a Monk of *Egypt* 8

Excommunication unjust, does more Injury to him, that Pronounces it; than to him against whom, it is pronounced 167

Exuperius, Bishop of *Tholouse*, to whom *Innocent* I. addresses his Third Letter 68

F

FAITH. The beginnings of Faith, of Conversion, and of good Inclinations come from God and not from our Free-will, 163. Faith stops not at a curious search into Natural things, 179. The beginning of Faith and of Good Desires is the Effect of Grace, 203. We ought to believe that God is, what he hath Revealed to us himself. We must not examine his Actions with a Rebellious Spirit, but admire them with Faith and Submission 60

The *Falls* of Great Men should teach the most holy, not to be Presumptuous 171

Fast. It is a great Scandal to Fast on the Lord's Day, 139. Fast of Lent, 20. Fasting ought to be accompany'd with Abstinence from Vice, 53. Fasting consists not in a simple abstaining from Meats, but also in abstaining from Sins, and the Practice of Vertues, 42. It concerns not the Mouth alone, but the Ears, the Hands, the Feet, and all the parts of the Body, *ibid.* It consists not only in the retrenching our Meals, but in the reforming the Manners, *ibid.* We may have a reason for not Fasting, but there can be none for not correcting a vicious habit, *ibid.*

Fear causes Charity to enter, but Charity drives out Fear 174

Flavianus, a Priest of *Antioch*, Successor to *Meletius* in the Bishoprick of that City 6

Florentius, Bishop of *Tivoli*, to whom *Innocent* I. addressed his Eighth Letter 69

Frequent Communion 141

Free-will. Vide *Will* in *W.*

Friends. Whom we ought to choose 41

G

Games of chance are the occasions of Blasphemies, Anger, Injuries, and all sorts of Crimes 46

Gaudentius, Bishop of *Brescia*, 59. The Life of S. *Philastrius* his Predecessor attributed to him *ibid.*

Genesis is the Foundation and Source of all the Truths which are in the Law and the Prophets 53

Gerontius, Bishop of *Nicomedia*, driven from his See 8

God. To think of the Glory of God in all things, 43. God alone is the Sovereign good of our Souls, 133, 148. God is the Source of a Happy Life, and true Vertue consists in the Love of God, 154. True Blessedness consists in the knowledge of God, 130. The Apparitions of God are made by the Ministring Angels, who make use of Bodies to make those Apparitions 194

Goods. We ought to consider all that we have received, as not belonging to us, 54. Men are not the Masters but the Dispensers of their Goods 55

Grace of God. Man cannot be deliver'd from Ignorance and the Necessity of Sinning, but by the assistance of God, 133. The Grace of Jesus

ſus Chriſt neceſſary to make us good, is intirely free, 158. Twelve Articles which comprehend all that we are obliged to believe concerning Grace 163

Grace of Jeſus Chriſt. Reaſons of the Neceſſity of it, 71, 91. To implore it by fervent Prayer 215

Greatneſs, is like Shadows and Fantoms which diſappear after they have diverted us a very ſhort time. They are as Flowers that wither away of a ſudden at once after having ſpent their luſtre 55

H

Habits. God hath given to Man Wool and Flax, to defend him from the Injuries of the Weather 54

Hatred is as an Executioner that tears the bowels of thoſe that harbour it 41

Heliodorus, Prieſt of *Antioch* 123

Helvidius, Heretick, Diſciple of *Auxentius* 124

Heraclides, Deacon, ordained Biſhop of *Epheſus* 8

Heraclides, ordained Biſhop of *Epheſus* by S. *Chryſoſtom*, depoſed in the Council held againſt that Saint 9

Hereticks. Thoſe that return to the Boſom of the Church are put under Penance, after they had quitted it to enter into a Sect of Hereticks, 70. The example of ſome ill Catholicks cannot ſerve as a pretence to Hereticks to ſeparate themſelves from the Church 134

Hiſtoria Lauſiaca, vide in *L.*

Honours. How fine a Figure ſoever we make in this World, the end is always the Grave, which buries all men in eternal oblivion 55

Humility. The greateſt Action we can do and the moſt pleaſing to God, is to have low thoughts of our ſelves, 44. Humility blameable, that hath not Faith for its foundation

Hypepa, a City of *Aſia* 8

I

Jeſus Chriſt. His Divinity 16, 19

John of Jeruſalem, Succeſſor to S. *Cyril* in the Biſhoprick of that City, was a great Defender of the Books, Opinions and Partiſans of *Origen*, 61. His Quarrel with S. *Epiphanius*, *ibid.*

S. *Jerom*, his Birth, Education and Studies, 73, 74. Paſſes into the Eaſt, *ibid.* Receives the Order of Prieſthood at *Antioch*, *ibid.* Goes to *Bethlehem*, *ibid.* Came to *Conſtantinople*, and from thence to *Rome*, *ibid.* Returns to *Bethlehem*, where the Ladies *Paula*, *Euſtochium* and *Melania*, came to him, 75. His Death, *ibid.* Cenſure upon his Works, *ibid.* his Character 103

Impenitence Final, is what we are to underſtand by the Sin againſt the Holy Ghoſt 158, 174

The Incarnation. If we could give a Reaſon for this Myſtery, it would no more be wonderfull; if an example were to be found of ſuch a thing, it would not be ſingular 155

Injuries. That we ought not to revenge them, nor condemn thoſe that have offer'd them to us, but conſider them as a puniſhment for our ſins 3

Injuſtice. It is not a leſs vertuous thing to ſuffer Injuſtice patiently than to give Alms 13

S. *Innocent* I. Succeſſor to P. *Anaſtaſius* 67

Interſtices that ought to be obſerv'd in the conferring of Holy Orders 209

Invention of the Holy Croſs

Joannites, a Name given by the Enemies of S. *John Chryſoſtom* to thoſe who remained firm to that Saint during his Perſecution 10

Iſaac, A Chriſtian Author, once a Jew 121

The Juſt, God permits them to be afflicted for three Reaſons; 1. To correct them; 2. To purifie them; 3. To try them: and this ſeverity he exerciſes againſt them is the ſeverity of a Father 59

Juſtice. It is not Fear that renders us good, but the Love of *Juſtice* 54

Juſtification. We cannot be Juſtified but by Faith in *Jeſus Chriſt* 159

Juſtina Empreſs favoured the *Arians*, and perſecuted S. *Ambroſe* 59

K

KINGS; Wherein their Happineſs conſiſts 188

L

Lauſiaca Hiſtoria written by *Palladius*, and addreſſed to one *Lauſus* 66

Libanius, S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Maſter in Rhetorick 7

Liberty. Evil conſiſts in the ill uſe of our Liberty 192, 193

Life. The preſent Life being nothing but a Journey, a Train of Miſeries, a Baniſhment from our Countrey, we ſhould be moſt miſerable if it had not an end 48

Lord's-day, and Feſtivals, ſhould be ſpent in Exerciſes of Devotion 38

Love of God is a ſtrong fixing the heart on God, which makes us deſpiſe all that is not of God 39

Lucian, a Prieſt of *Greece* 122

Lucian Biſhop of *Signi*, to whom the Twentieth Letter of S. *Innocent* is Addreſſed 70

Lying, is to ſay a thing which we think not, with deſign to abuſe, 182. We ought not to tell a Lye neither for our Life, or for any other Reaſon whatſoever, 183. Tropes, Parables and Figures are not Lyes *ibid.*

Luſt. To preſerve and encreaſe Charity, we ought to oppoſe and weaken Luſt 177

M

Macarius, a Monk 123

Manners, that young People ought to have 130

Mark the Hermit, not he that lived under the Emperor *Leo* 2

Marcellus Memorialis 123

Marriage, what ought to be the end of Marriage among Chriſtians, and of the Duties of married

ried People, 17. A Second Marriage cannot be lawfull, if the first Wife is not dead 69
Martinianus, Bishop in *Macedonia*, to whom the Twenty-first Letter of S. *Innocent* I. is directed 70
Martyrs, not only the Patterns of Vertue, but the Accusers of Vices, 56. Those that are Afflicted, have recourse to them, *ibid.* They Implore with confidence their Intercession, *ibid.* The best way of Honouring them is by Imitating their Vertues 18
Masters ought to Treat their Servants with sweetness and goodness, considering them as their Brothers, and that they are made of the same Mould with themselves, that they have the same Creator, the same Nature, *&c.* 57
Christian *Maxims* established by S. *Chrysostom* in his Sermons 48
Mediator. That quality belongs only to Jesus Christ 189
Megalius, Bishop of *Calamia*, Primate of *Numidia* 126
Melchisedechian Hereticks 3
Metropolitan. Each Province must submit to its Metropolitan 211
Miracles are wrought by the Power of God, 189. A Christian Life and good Works more to be esteem'd than the Gift of working Miracles 16
S. *Monica*, the Mother of S. *Augustin*, died at *Ostia* 128
Monks. The Monastick state, 79, 114. The Labour of the hands one part of the Monastick state, 183. Counterfeit Monks are Hypocrites, whom the Devil sends abroad into the World clad in the Monastick Weeds *ibid.*
Moses. In what Sence he was a Prophet in the History of the Creation of the World 53
Montanists, their Errorrs 85
Musick ought to Elevate the Heart and Mind to a Cœlestial and Divine Harmony 131
Mysteries. We ought not to penetrate into them by humane Reason, but ought to be content with what the Scripture says of them 17, 35

N

Niceas, Bishop in *Romania* 120
Nicholas, a Monk 3

O

DIvine *Offices* against those that neglect them to go to Comedies and Publick Shews 12. Necessity of Assisting at them 13, 38
Olympius, Bishop, Originally of *Spain* 120
Ordinations. Those who make Ordinations against the prescribed Rules, shall themselves be Deprived of the Sacerdotal Dignity as well as those they have Ordained 71
Origen, his Errors, 66. Three Monks of *Egypt*, Sir-named the *Long-brothers*, condemned by *Theophilus*, Bishop of *Alexandria*, for refusing to Sign the Condemnation of *Origen*, 8. The Accusations formed against them, were Calumnious. 9. S. *Epiphanius*, Bishop in *Cyprus*, prepossessed by *Theophilus*, came to *Constantinople* to Excommunicate them, *ibid.* But having reflected upon it, desisted *ibid.*
The true *Ornament* of a Christian is Purity of Life 166

P

PAcon, Hermit, his History 2
Pagans; Their Theology is ridiculous 189
Palladius, Originally of *Galatia*, Ordained Bishop of *Helenopolis*; from whence he passed to the Bishoprick of *Aspuna* in *Galatia*, 66. A friend to *Rufinus*, a Defender of *Origen*, a Partisan of *Pelagius*, and Enemy to S. *Jerom* *ibid.*
Pamsophius, Bishop of *Nicomedia*, in the place of *Gerontius* 8
Pardon of Enemies 16
Patience, and Pardon of our Enemies, 13, 16. No Good comparable to that of Patience 32
Patricius, Father to S. *Augustin* 125
Paul, Bishop of *Heraclea*, President of the Council where S. *Chrysostom* was Deposed 9
Paulus Orosius, a Priest of *Spain*, of the City of *Tarragon* 122
Paul, a Bishop, Author of a Treatise of Repentance 123
S. *Paulinus*, Native of *Bourdeaux*, Disciple to *Ausonius*, retired into *Spain* with his Wife *Therasia*, and was made Priest at *Barcelona* against his will. He parted from thence for *Italy*, and Retired to *Nola*, whereof he was ordained Bishop, and died there, 113. His Works, 113, to 117, *&c.* His Genius 118
Paulinianus, Brother to S. *Jerom*, Ordained by S. *Epiphanius* 61
Pelagius, an English Monk, Disciple to *Rufinus*, and chief of the Heresie that bears his Name, 119. Attacked by S. *Jerom*. Errors of this Heretick 91
Pelagians, their Errors, 159, 160. Abridgment of the Doctrine of S. *Augustin* against them 204, 205
Penitents should not dye without the Peace of the Church 182, 214
Penance usefull at all times, 2. The Necessity and Conditions of a real Penance, 31, 32. God considers not the Length, but the Fervour of it, 37. Conditions of it, 38. The true Penitent hath nothing in his view but to leave no Evil unpunished that he hath committed, 153. To judge of a Penance, we must have regard to the Labour, Sighs and Tears of the Penitent, and forgive him his Sin, when he hath made a proportionable satisfaction, 68. Penance is not usefull but when he that changes his Resolution can correct his past Life; and Regret and Grief for Sins past can be of no great use when they are not in a state of doing nor practising Vertue 54
Publick *Penance*. Those that have been put to publick Penance, cannot be afterwards admitted into the Clergy 70, 71
Persecution. Whether it be permitted to Priests, to Clerks or Bishops to fly and abandon their

Flocks in time of Perſecution? 165. The Careſſes of this World are often more dangerous than Perſecutions *ibid.*
S. *Peter*, Chief of the Body of the Apoſtles, *&c.* 16
Phocas Martyr, a Native of *Synope*, and a Gardener by Profeſſion 56
Piety. The Principle of Chriſtian Piety is to bring all things to God 159
Pilgrimages, the chief intention we ought to have in making Pilgrimages, is the aſſiſting the Poor 38, 85
Platoniſts knew the true God 189
Polychronius, Biſhop of *Apamea* 215
The *Pope* ought to maintain the Canons 210
Porphyrius Elected Biſhop of *Antioch* in place of *Flavianus* 10
Poverty, of great advantage to thoſe that know how to make good uſe of it 40
Power Eccleſiaſtical and Civil; their Difference 14
Prayer. Application is neceſſary to him that prays, *&c.* 14. Prayer quenches the Deſires of the Fleſh, the Love of Riches, and removes from the Minds of Men the Thoughts of Glory and Vanity, 57. It ought to be preferr'd before any other Work, 3. Common-prayer is an excellent Harmony proceeding from the Concord of Charity, 38. God often does not immediately grant us what we ask, that he may excite our Ardency 44
Prayer for the Dead
The *Praiſes* of Men, how to be received, 165. Exceſſive Commendations give as much Remorſe to the Conſcience as Sins, when we find not in our ſelves the Vertues there commended *ibid.* & 25
Preachers. The Obligations they are under, 16. What ought to be their End, 171. In what manner they ought to preach the Word of God 77
Prieſts, the Reſpect which is due to them, 12, 14, 46. Diſorderly Prieſts to reſpect their Character, 46, 47. Prieſthood; Excellence of its Dignity 14
Pride. The more good we do, the leſs we ought to boaſt, 44. That Pride is commendable which makes us Deſpiſe the World, and all that appears great in the Eyes of Men
Priſcillianiſts; their Errors 193
Probability, a Damnable Maxim 129
Solemn *Proceſſions* inſtituted at *Conſtantinople* by S. *John Chryſoſtom* 8
Prophecies, their Obſcurity when taken away 14
Providence. In following the Commandments of God we act, but in all the reſt God conducts us by the motions of his Providence, without our having any part in the Events, 177
Prudence. The Prudence of a Man not to be judged of by the number of his Years 27
Prudentius, Born at *Saragoſſa* in 348 5

Q

Quartodecimani, Hereticks ſo called 8

R

Religion of Jeſus Chriſt, 78. Efficacy of the Religion of Jeſus Chriſt 5
Relicks. The Remembrance of the Actions of Saints, and the Combats of Martyrs, is one of the moſt powerful Motives we can make uſe of, to carry Chriſtians to Piety and Vertue; and it is for this Reaſon, that their Relicks are preſerved, *&c.* 56. It is in Honour of the Martyrs that we preſerve their Relicks with Veneration, 56. Relicks and Invocation of Saints, *ibid* and 85
The *Renouncing* of all things to follow Jeſus Chriſt, ought to go even to the leaving Father and Mother for the Service of God 166
Repaſt. Prayer before and after 12
Reprimands. Their Uſefulneſs 17, 19
Reſtitutions. We are obliged to reſtore Goods gotten by Theft, Rapine and Oppreſſion, to thoſe from whom they were taken; and it is not enough to give it to the Poor 154
Reſurrection of Bodies 211
Rheticius Biſhop of *Autun* wrote a Commentary upon the *Canticles* 78
Rich Men are only Diſpenſers of their Goods for the Aſſiſtance of the Poor, 40. God has not given them Wealth, but that they might impart to the Poor, and he hath alſo made the Poor and Miſerable, that Rich Men might have an opportunity to exerciſe their Pity and Charity
Riches are not forbidden, provided we make good uſe of them, 41. It is impoſſible to gather great Wealth without Sin 54
Ruſinus Presbyter, Condemned as a Heretick by Pope *Anaſtaſius*, 58. Contemporary with S. *Jerom*, 107. Embraced a Monaſtick Life, and went afterwards to *Jeruſalem*, *ibid.* having tranſlated the Works of *Origen*, he became his Defender, *ibid.* Return'd to *Rome*, *ibid.* Dies, *ibid.* his Works, *ibid.* and 108. his Genius 108, 110

S

Sabbatius, Biſhop in *Gaul* 121
Saints. The Happineſs they will enjoy after the Reſurrection, They help us in our Neceſſities, A Deſcription of their Felicity 190
Scandal. That we muſt always keep our ſelves in the Boſom of the Church, notwithſtanding the Scandals we may be afflicted with 161
Schiſmaticks. Their good Works are uſeleſs 143
The Holy *Scripture*, and Reaſon cannot ever be contrary, 152. Charity and Humility are the two Keys without which we cannot underſtand the Holy Scripture, 170. The reading of it recommended, 79, 80, 81, 95, 135. The Uſefulneſs of that Reading, 18, 39. Its Simplicity 103
Secundus, Father to S. *John Chryſoſtom* 6
Semipelagians. Principal points of the Doctrine 164
Serapion S. *John Chryſoſtom's* Deacon 8
Servants, ought readily, and with a good Will obey their Maſters 57
Severianus Biſhop of *Gabala*, in *Cœleſyria*, 8, 75. S.

75. S. *Chryſoſtom* made him Preach at *Conſtantinople*, during his Journey into *Aſia*, *ibid* S. *Chryſoſtom* being returned drove him out, *ibid.* The Empreſs cauſes him to return, and reconciles him outwardly with S. *Chryſoſtom*, *ibid.* His Works *ibid*
Severus Endelechius 5
Severus Biſhop of the Iſle of *Minorca* 122
Simony. Six Biſhops depoſed for giving Money to be Ordained 8
Simplicianus Biſhop of *Milan* 3
Sin. We are our ſelves the Authors of our Sins, 6. Sin is the only thing that a Chriſtian ought to Fear, 20, 32. Nothing but Sin that makes us truly miſerable, 32. Sins committed after Baptiſm, are greater and more dangerous, than thoſe committed before, 127. When a Man is fallen into one Sin, he is very often led on by this firſt Crime into all ſorts of Iniquities, 56. We hate Sin in proportion as we love Juſtice 152
Siſinnius Martyr. His Relicks ſent to *Milan* 4
Solitude; The Advantages of it, 76. Excellency of a ſolitary Life 30
Sophronius, Friend to S. *Jerom* 111
The *Soul.* Its Habitation is in God, who hath created it, 131. made in the likeneſs of God, *ibid.* hath no Corporeal Dimenſion, *ibid.* not a part of God, 161. Errors of the *Pelagians*, concerning the Creation of Souls 204
Sulpicius Severus Prieſt of *Agen*, a Diſciple of S. *Martin*, and Friend of *Paulinus* Biſhop of *Nola*, 111. His *Genius* 112
Superſtition is a Vice that ſets it ſelf off with the Name of Vertue 214
Swearing. It is moſt dangerous to make a Jeſt of Swearing, and the ſureſt way is never to ſwear at all 155
Syneſius, Originally of *Cyrene*, Biſhop of *Ptolemais*, 211. Catalogue of the Treatiſes which he wrote, 212. his Genius 215
Roman Synod under *Innocent* I. 216

T

Tapers lighted in Churches 85
The *Tavern* is filled with Impiety and Intemperance 46
Temptations. We muſt reſiſt the Temptations of the Devil in this World 44
Theodorus Biſhop of *Mopſueſtia*, Condemned with his Writings long after his Death, in the Fifth Council, by the Contrivance of the Emperor *Juſtinian* 64
Theophilus Biſhop of *Alexandria*, 7. *Chryſoſtom*'s Enemy, 9. Even after his Death, 11. Succeſſor to *Timotheus*, 62. Finiſhed the ruin of Idolatry in his own City, *ibid.* his Character 63
Traditions of the Church 86
Trinity impoſſible to be explained 2
Truth; the Enquiry after it can only render a Man happy, 129. It is never permitted to betray Truth 183

V

Vain-Glory corrupts, and renders the beſt Actions Uſeleſs; as Prayer, Faſting and Alms 57
Valerius Biſhop of *Hippo* 125
Victricius Biſhop of *Roan*: S. *Innocent* I. directs his Second Letter to him 68
Chriſtian *Vigilance.* Temptations are uſeful, provided we are always upon our Guard, and that we have continually a Watch over our ſelves 44
Vigilantius Prieſt, a Native of *Gaul* 124
Vigilius; Five of the Name, 1. *Vigilius* of *Africa*. 2. *Vigilius* the Deacon, 3. *Vigilius* Biſhop of *Tapſus* in *Africa*, 4. *Vigilius* Biſhop of *Breſcia*. 5. *Vigilius* a Biſhop at the Council of *Agde* 3
Vigilius Biſhop of *Trent*, Martyr under the Conſulſhip of *Stilico* *ibid*
Virgins that Marry after having made a Vow of Chaſtity 216
Virginity: What muſt be done to preſerve it, 81. the Advantages of it, 84. Though Parents may inſpire into their Children, the Love of Virginity; yet they cannot oblige them to make a Vow of perpetual Continency, 60. Virginity as much above Marriage, as Heaven is above the Earth, 31. Virginity ſignifies nothing, if it be not joyn'd with Charity and Meekneſs 17
Urſinus a Monk 123

W

Watchfulneſs, vide *Vigilance*
War. How we may make War like a good Chriſtian 159
Widowhood. Though Second Marriages are not forbidden, it is Nevertheleſs much better to continue in Widowhood, 31. The State of Widowhood is to be preferr'd to that of Marriage 182
Free-Will. The Will is enclined to Evil, and cannot do Good, without the Aſſiſtance of the Grace of God, 158. Sin conſiſts in the ill Uſe of our Free-Will 172
Works. The Error of thoſe that believe they ſhall be juſtified by their Works 2

FINIS.

ERRATA.

PAg. 4. Lin. 9. from bottom of the Text, read *Second, the Petition.* P. 5. l. 6. after *Auguſtus's Age*, add, *His Thoughts are juſt enough, and worthy of a good Chriſtian: He has ſome things elegantly written, which are read with pleaſure.* P. 12. l. ult. r. *Hymn* P. 15. note Col. 1. l. 16. from bot. r. *poſitively ſays ſo.* P. 17. l. 20. dele *juſtifying.* P. 20. l. 5. from bot. for *10th.* r. *17th.* P. 23. l. 17. from bot. r. *Fragments of it.* Ibid. l. 13. from bot. r. *not unworthy.* P. 24. l. 38. after *conſecrated to God*, add *P. 976. Sermons Catechumens.* P. 25. not. col. 1. l. 3. from bot. for *which* r. *what.* P. 38. l. 1. for *after* r. *alter.* P. 49. l. 10. from bot. for *Book* r. *principal Books.* P. 50. l. 21. from bot. r. *printed at Paris.* P. 55. l. 7. from bot. for *Firſt* r. *Fifth.* P. 60. l. 42. dele *by the bye.* P. 61. l. ult. for *ſuppoſed* r. *ſuppoſitious.* P. 63. l. 2. from bot. r. *that came firſt, provided it could.* P. 64. l. 20. from bot. r. *Fortune, to put for.* P. 65. l. 6. for *Eaſe* r. *Freedom.* P. 71. l. 8. for *the conſequence* r. *a continuation.* P. 78. l. 32. dele *ſince.* Ibid. l. 7. from bot. r. *obliged if they would do it well, to have.* P. 79. l. 10. for *many* r. *heavy.* P. 86. l. 41. r. *an enumeration.* P. 90. l. 37. dele *that.* P. 92. l. 39. r. *Dignity in a manner.* P. 125. l. 12. from bot. r. *that all that deſigned to embrace a Spiritual.* P. 131. l. 30. r. *Said. I writ whileſt I was in that City, a Dialogue.* P. 138. l. 19. from bot. for *the Latter* r. *theſe Letters.* P. 144. l. 36. for *to oblige* r. *of obliging.* P. 150. l. 10. from bot. dele *but.* P. 153. l. 15. from bot. for *that it is* r. *by how much it is.* P. 161, l. 10. from bot. r. *wiſeſt.* P. 174. l. 32. for *found* r. *formed.* P. 184. l. 6. r. *his Epiſcopal Office.*

Proper Names Miſtaken.

MElania (p. 1.) for *Melanius. Pulmannus* (p. 5.) for *Putmannus. Severianus* (p. 6.) for *Severus. Iſidore* for *Iſodore* Paſſim. *Cotelerius* for *Cotelierius* Paſſim. *Euſtathius* (p. 21.) for *Euſtachius. Armens* (p. 33.) for *Armenis. Mopſueſtia* for *Mopſueſta* Paſſim. *Aptilia* (p. 72.) for *Appilia. Aſella* (p. 81.) for *Acilla. Vercella* (p. 83.) for *Vercella. Patavinenſis* (p. 84.) for *Patarinenſis. Tanis* (p. 92.) for *Tunis. Expiratus* (p. 151.) for *Expiratus.*

Smaller miſtakes, which are not very numerous, are left to the Readers Candour.